

I propose to discuss this evening the relation which the State bears to the liquor traffic. I say the State because, under our republican forms, the State is sovereign to deal with matters of domestic administration subject only to certain limitations in the Constitution of the United States. It is the source of power from which authority flows to all subordinate municipalities to tax, to license, or to 'prohibit the' various avocations of its citizens, and, however it may see fit to delegate the same, must be held responsible, in the first instance, for a proper and salutary control.

Objections made to any interference on the part of the State with the sale of alcoholic beverages usually take one of two forms:

First—That all such regulation partakes of the nature of sumptuary enactment, and is therefore foreign both to the spirit of the age and the genius of our government.

Second—That it is volatile of personal rights; no such power ever having been delegated to the government, and hence is at war with our constitutions, State and National.

As a good deal of stress is laid upon both grounds of opposition, especially among political managers, it may be well to consider their force and truth at the very outset of this inquiry. Indeed it will usually be found that those who are defeated by the overwhelming mass of testimony, as to the ill effects upon society of this liquor traffic, take refuge in loose general theories and misapplied terms of reproach.

Sumptuary Laws.

People who undertake to dwell together in society relinquish a part of their natural liberty for the good of all, and it is, therefore, in the name and interest of such social carfare alone that society is justified in enforcing its restrictions. But sumptuary laws originate out of a very different hypothesis and look to a very different object. They are imposed upon individuals with direct reference to self, and not out of any protection to the rights of others which are supposed to be infringed. Ostensibly they proceed on the ground, that it would be better for the individual, primitive of his comfort or happiness or virtue, and hence usually emanate from some arbitrary government claiming the right to absolute authority in the premises. Thus the sumptuary laws of England in the 13th and 14th centuries, regulating the clothing to be worn, the dishes to be served at dinner, the styles of architecture to be employed—in short various modes of preserving distinctions of classes in society, were avowedly founded on the idea that the lord of the manor had a property in the vile in and his belongings.

Prohibitory Laws,

on the contrary, contemplate exclusively the effect of evil practices on others who, by virtue of an equal citizenship, are entitled to protection. They grow out of the principle "you must so use your own as not to harm another." Incidentally they may benefit, it is true, all persons restrained, but that is not their object; and this applies to all restrictive legislation. Thus, when the law undertakes to punish the purveyor of stolen goods, you do not say that it is to legislate men into being virtuous, although honesty is undoubtedly a virtue. And why! Because you perceive that primarily it is not the moral wrong which is aimed at in the prohibition, but the enforcement of a social discipline essential to the rights of private property. And just so when the sale of alcoholic drinks is prohibited, you do not say that it is to enforce total abstinence on the part of individuals, although that may largely follow the removal of temptation to indulgence; but that its object is to protect society from the curse of drunkenness, the natural consequence of promiscuous sale of intoxicating liquors. The difference between sumptuary and prohibitory laws is therefore apparent. The former operate against the person to regulate his tastes; the latter operate against the traffic to effect its suppression. Prohibition differs in no wise from many other sanitary, quarantine and police regulations, and has no sumptuary feature about it. The citizen may still poison himself with alcohol if he chooses and can get it; but he shall not sell the poison to his neighbors.

Constitutional Rights.

In a democratic society such as ours, where government derives all its power from the people, and where it is strictly limited in that power by written constitutions, it may be safely assumed that no action could be had

affecting so large and powerful an association as the liquor interest without a most jealous scrutiny as to its authority and rightfulness. Indeed, I might go further, and say that no enactments have ever had to encounter more hostility to break their force, or render them inoperative, than prohibitory statutes. If therefore, after such ordeal they be found, established in the judicial opinion of the whole country, there ought to be no further carping at them as being indefensible or unconstitutional.

Let me say, then, once for all, that this whole subject has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States, in a number of cases, and it has there been held, that such regulations do not conflict with the reserved power of Congress over commerce between the States, and is a rightful and proper exercise of power reserved to the people of the several States. Whilst some question was made as to importation of liquor in original packages, none at all was entertained of the power to regulate even to prohibition, when once the package was broken after arrival.

The Decisions.

Thus Chief Justice Taney, in the License Cases, (5 Howard, 504,) says: "And if any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to the citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice or debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, to prevent it from regulating or restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether, if it thinks proper."

Justice Catron goes even further into the logic of the question, and states what is now no longer controverted among legal minds: that license and prohibition rest on precisely the same ground. Of authority, so far as constitutional right is concerned.

He says:

"I admit as inevitable that if the State has the power of restraint by license to any extent she has the discretionary power to judge of its limit, and may go to the length of prohibiting sales altogether."

Justice Grier puts it strongly thus:

"It is not necessary to array the appalling statistics of misery pauperism and crime which have their origin in the use and abuse of ardent spirits. The Police Power, which is exclusively in the State, is competent to the correction of these great evils, and all measures of restraint or prohibition necessary to affect that purpose are within the scope of that authority."

Here at Home,

Justice Napton, in the case of *Austin vs. State*, 10 Mo., 591, says:

"We are not aware that there is any provision in our Constitution which would prevent the Legislature from prohibiting dram selling entirely; nor have the Legislature been prevented from placing such restrictions upon this business as they may think fit. To sell drams without a license is not a privilege which either our citizens or strangers can enjoy in this State. Whenever the Legislature prohibits any calling or profession, it ceases to be lawful."

Still later in *State ex re Kyger vs. Holt Co. Ct. Fagg*, Justice, in deciding that County Courts had unlimited and absolute authority to prohibit and refuse the issuance of licenses if they saw proper, thus expresses the opinion of the Supreme Court.

"It cannot be said with propriety, as we think, that it is the policy of our laws to regard the business of dram-selling in any other light than as a mere privilege granted under restrictions and conditions that clearly imply a tendency to affect injuriously the public morals and therefore not to be encouraged either by the laws themselves or the courts of the country. The business of the retailer is not a matter of personal right nor one that the interests of the public at large demand that he should be permitted to carry on."

All Courts of this State

follow unswervingly these decisions up to the present day, and that too without the faintest dissent. Nor do I know of any adjudged case anywhere in the whole country, which denies the power of a State, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to prohibit the sale of liquors as injurious to the public welfare and dangerous to the public peace. If it can scarcely be conjectured, however, that any law violative of individual liberties, or citizen rights, or the spirit of free government would have met with this unreserved sanction at the hands of such illustrious jurists. I am entitled therefore, I think, to conclude that the second objection, equally with the first, falls, and

that whatever criticism is levelled against prohibitory laws must repose upon considerations of expediency, and cannot take color either from legal or political constructions of the power of the State in the premises.

Traditional Unreason.

The present relations of the State, in this country, to the traffic in alcoholic liquors is an inheritance from much older countries, where it grew up in rude stages of society; where its social influence was modified by other causes; where the aims of government itself were but poorly analyzed amid the conflict of encroaching powers; and where the necessities of revenue were the first requisite, and a levy on so-called luxuries gave the largest return to impecunious dynastic governments. In this manner the public thought of European countries touching the license system has so perpetuated itself that it now claims a prescriptive right to pass unchallenged as the common sense of mankind, and those who question the soundness of that thought either in financial, social or moral aspects are apt to be denied a hearing. This, it will be found, is especially the case with populations coming amongst us from abroad, who, having long held such licenses as liberties conferred by the supreme authority, or franchises commuted in taxes, are prompt to defend accustomed usages as inalienable rights. When they dwell longer with us however, they become more tolerant, both of discussion and amendment in this behalf. It is only their philosophers who never learn anything, or forget anything. But America, with its free government, coming from the people and caring for the people, is destined to revise this as well as many other social problems, and the existence of a chronic idea upon the banks of the Rhine, or the Po, or the Danube, that the traffic in liquor should be licensed for revenue, and not repressed, no more sanctifies it in our eyes than does the commercial treaty of England forcing opium on the Chinese commend that barbarism for imitation.

Precedent vs. Prophecy.

In other words, precedent of such sort, is of no real force in the entirely changed relation here of governors and governed. The financial reason fails before self-imposed taxation; the social question becomes one of waste rather than privilege, and the moral issues assume a magnitude and grandeur not found elsewhere, from the very potency of public opinion to mould the future for us and our children. There is indeed still more exalted considerations, if it were appropriate to discuss them, which may be thought to depend primarily on the true solution of this question. Richard Cobden long since said: "Every day's experience tends more and more to confirm me in my opinion that the temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reforms," and if, as Emerson hints in one of his remarkable utterances, we are even in this day weaving the garments of a New Time, which shall be, radically, other and different from any that has gone before, in its beliefs, its growths, its sympathies, its disciplines, its rule of life and relation of man to man, does it not behoove us that we lay deep and broad the base of this reform, in the greatest good of the whole, and not suffer it to append as a corollary of personal abstinence or indulgence.

The License Tax.

In Missouri, the manufacture of alcohol in all its different forms, whether for use in the arts or consumption as a beverage, is left at present entirely to the control of the National Government. But the retail of intoxicating beverages is taken charge of by the State, declared to be unlawful in the first instance, and only permitted where a license has been obtained. The statute is carefully prepared, consists of many sections, purports to be pre-eminently a tax on the occupation, and has stringent provisions for enforcement, if only they were called into effect.

I have experienced some difficulty in arriving at exact results, even as to the mere matter of revenue under this law, from defective statements, poor compilation, and clear evasions attendant upon its loose administration.

It would seem that if the State goes into the business of "intoxicating" at all, it ought at least to report accurately to the people—if not the murders, robberies, embezzlements, suicides, divorces, seductions, bankruptcies and promiscuous knaveries incited thereby,—yet at least the revenue got, the alcohol distilled, the aggregate of liquors sold, and the gross earnings of the licensed retailers. All that can be gathered from the Auditor's report is that the total of merchant and other licenses foots up about \$250,000 dollars a year, and it is estimated by him that dram shops yield about one-half of this sum. Thus

\$125,000 A Year

fully represents the whole outcome of this barbarous system of revenue so far as the State is concerned. It does not begin to pay the costs in criminal cases, which in 1876 were \$227,380; nor the expense of the Penitentiary, which for the same period set down at \$176,522. Yet both these extravagant outlays may trace paternity largely to the licensed dramshop.

On all other matters of information touching crime and pauperism and intemperance, the archives of the State are rayless and dark, so that it will be necessary to rely upon the more general statistics compiled under national authority.

By reference to the census of 1870 and the classification embracing Missouri, it will be found that the number of distilleries in this State was in that year 91, the breweries operated 124, the wholesale liquor houses 313, and the licensed

Retail Dealers 5,922.

The population of the State by the same authority was placed at 1,721,295, which would give an average of 290 persons to each vender of intoxicating liquors. The home production of distilled. Spirits was 2,287,285 gallons, of beer and ale 368,968 barrels, and of other alcoholic mixtures 95,000 cases, or about *nine gallons* to every man, woman and child in Missouri. What of this is retained and what exported cannot be positively known; neither do we know how much more is surreptitiously made which passes no inspection. A close approximation to the actual consumption can, however, be made by a comparison of the licensed dram shop sales of other like communities with our own. Thus, an estimate based on extended statistics in several of the Middle States, shows that each retail dealer must take in not less than \$5,000 a year, gross receipts, to support a saloon with its incidental expense of stock, rent and attendance. This corresponds too with other information derived from the retailers themselves, and with the statement put forward in their memorials demanding a reduced license. It is further confirmed by Superintendent Kennedy, of New York, who placed police at 223 licensed dram shops, and found the average visits were 134 daily, with an expenditure of from \$16 to \$18, or more than \$6,200 a year. As this is

A Central Fact,

of grave importance, I may be pardoned for still further verifying it by data at hand.

Dr. Edward Young, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department at Washington, in reply to a call for information; after remarking upon the "exaggeration of receipts of internal revenue from sales of merchandise, including liquors," and saying by way of parenthesis, "temperance, in common with almost every good work, has suffered from the intemperate zeal of its advocates, and from no cause to a greater extent than exaggerated statements of facts," "gives the aggregate cost for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, at \$600,000,000, as follows:

This divided among the 146,000 retail dealers reported for that year, would give an average of between \$4,000 and \$5,000; showing the previous estimate to be substantially right. By such triple verification therefore, by the consumption of liquor, the cost of retailing, and the amount of sales, it will be seen that Missouri, with her 5,922 licensed dram-shops, expends for alcoholic drinks the enormous sum of

\$29,600,000 A Year.

And this is waste. All other expenditures in which our people indulge bring back in some way or other a return; but this yields nothing either of fruit, or growth, or enhancement. In the original shape it would supply food to thousands of human beings; whilst in a rectified form it is a destroying agent, productive only of 'other ruin. Compare this waste, too, with the wealth, of which we boast so much, as the result of our industry. Our State ranks among the first in the Valley of the Mississippi as to those great elements which go to constitute productive capacity. Yet this waste is equal to one-fourth of all the farm crops of Missouri, which, according to the census of 1870, was \$103,035,759. It is more than one-third of all the capital invested in manufactures, which was \$80,257,244. And it is nearly one-half the actual cost of all our completed railroads, which may be

set down at \$60,500.000. It would seem as though content should sit enthroned amid this abundance. But employers complain of sad

Depression in Business,

and the unemployed parade the red flag, demanding to live more at ease. Think you there is no skeleton in our house of State? There is reason in the cry of distress that goes up from workers who have no work; there is catastrophe in the wants of laborers who will not starve. And yet this vast and cruel waste is three times the sum annually paid to all the farm hands in Missouri, which was returned as \$8,797,487, and very nearly equals the entire wages of all our skilled working men, placed at \$31,055,445. Applied productively instead of destructively, it would double the earnings of the latter and quadruple those of the former. Invested permanently as a cumulating fund, it would inspire every branch of trade and commerce with inconceivable activity. Diffused through minor industries, it would people our vacant lands, plant homesteads on every quarter section, make labor lord of its own leisure, convert the shaft-sinker into the share-holder, and make money plenty with the toiling million in the only way it will ever get to be plenty, by stopping all waste of the hardest earned wages in the laud, of which there is none so frightful as this entailed by drink. We wonder why hard times continue so long, why no fight of the dawning shows anywhere; but consider how else it to come than by is

Surplus Saving.

If the cost of living leaves no margin at the year's end, how is the man, the family, or the country to get better off? And with workingmen it is a known fact that the majority does not obtain a support from their own labor alone, but are forced to depend on their children for from one-third to one-quarter of the family earnings. The Massachusetts Labor Bureau report contains returns of more than 50,000 workingmen taken at the census of 1875, which show the average annual income from daily wages, earnings of wife and children, garden crops, all combined at \$534.99 to each head of family. The average cost of living, on the other hand, is \$488.96. This leaves a possible saving of \$46.03 yearly, or 8 per cent. What is actually realized, however, is about \$16.55, or only 3 per cent. And certainly the industrial condition of Massachusetts will compare favorably with that of any other State. It may, indeed, be taken as a flattering type of the whole country. Thus the dollar of surplus, or the dollar of debt, becomes the vital problem of life, and seeing how small the margin is which separates living from starving, can we wonder, in the face of six hundred millions of wages dedicated to the Still and the dram shop, there should be prostrate industries, and idle hands, and sullen hearts? The good time coming will as surely need that other order be taken of the saving and the spending.

Look it, my friends, square in the face, this great spectral fact which is

Haunting our Homes,

and terrifying our small economies, and consider what its forebodings are, under another aspect.

The indebtedness of the State of Missouri as taken from the last Treasurer's Report was: January 1, 1877, \$17,248,000, and stands now, if the maturing bonds of 1877 and 1878 have been met, at something over \$15,000,000. We perceive then, that the amount consumed in dram drinking in this Commonwealth during each year, is about twice the whole debt of the State. Again, the expenditure of the State establishment, Legislative, Judicial and Executive, sinking fund, interest on bonds, and all eleemosynary institutions was, in 1876 \$2,843,950. Hence, it will appear that the amount of wasted wealth dedicated to dissipation each year, is more than ten times the cost of administering the laws, keeping the peace, caring for the unfortunate, and punishing the wrongdoers. And this

Is Called Government!

Under the aegis of our Constitution, we have made wise and, as we believe munificent provision for educating the children of the State, by setting aside one-fourth part of the Revenue Fund for that purpose; realizing, with some additions provided by law, about \$500,000 a year. With still greater fortitude the districts tax themselves in addition more than \$1,500,000. The Superintendent gives the total for 1875, as \$2,189,860. But this, it will be seen, is nothing like the sum annually expended for intoxicating liquors—a mere bagatelle

compared with the munificent endowment of the dram shops—those nurseries of debauched youth and palsied old age.

The aggregate wealth of the whole State, as shown in its fiscal report for 1876 is \$560,777,361, and on this the limit of taxation is about 1½ per cent, in the rural sections, and 2½ in the towns and cities. At times the burden reaches 3 per cent., and then it is felt to be insupportable. But as shown, the annual expenditure for alcoholic beverages is nearly double that or 6 per cent, of the whole capital. With such a tax upon our resources as this latter, can we afford to live honestly or pay our debts?

Governing and Governed

I have given first attention to the matter of domestic economy in considering the relation of the State to the sale of intoxicating liquors, simply because that is put forward by government itself as the ostensible excuse for license. But there are other and higher interests involved in this sanction than any which can be measured by mere money. For permanence and prosperity a democratic government, more than any other, must draw inspiration from the best elements of society. Its rulership must be pure; its citizenship must be untainted, in purpose no less than in practice. To the making of its laws there must be summoned intelligence and integrity; for the rapport of those laws when made, there must be enlisted virtue, and courage, and conscience. It is thus seen that the State, when confronted with any question of internal administration affecting directly its citizens, must consider its influence upon them, both as controlling the State and as controlled by it—as governing, and as governed. To the former pertains the active management of affairs, to the latter the experiencing of all public policies. Let us look first at the connection this question may have with the conduct of the State as a ruling power.

Effect on Suffrage.

What immediate effect the sale of intoxicating liquors is likely to have upon the exercise of popular suffrage, that great governing agency in this country, we are not left to conjecture. It may be judged of from the sentence which the State itself has seen fit to pass upon the practice. By a very stringent provision of the law, on all days of general election the sale of alcoholic drinks is absolutely forbidden, the saloons are required to be closed, and any violation is punished as a misdemeanor. Thus the State takes two very important attitudes: *First*, It declares that dram selling is in its very nature dangerous to any right exercise of citizenship. *Second*, that the only way to avoid that danger is to prohibit the traffic on all occasions of its exercise. Now, if this be true as regards a mere incipient act of governing, why is it not equally true when applied to a still more elaborate exertion of such authority? If the citizen may not help rule a village when so tempted, how shall he assist at governing a

State or Nation?

If he shall not be permitted to vote his own vote when surrounded by the demoralizing traffic of open saloons, by what logic is he held competent to vote a representative vote under like conditions? And again, is the mere act of balloting of more moment than the matured counsel which should attend upon the discussion of all grave questions of State? These are matters I leave for the afterthought of those who suggest that prohibition is undemocratic—that is, unfavorable to the rule of the people. I would not wish to exaggerate the extent to which the nefarious influence of the dramshop enters into the governing conduct of our citizens, but when consideration is given to the usual appliance for managing parties, and when we recognize how completely our own has become a government of mere parties, it will scarcely be denied by any one that the 'Dram-shop' is more controlling than the Legislature, inasmuch as it is the pivot of the primaries. It is there that the autocrats of rudimentary politics assemble to carouse over the choice of available candidates and those who do not *set'em up* on the occasion are pretty apt to be left out in the cold. Indeed, the ward canvass of late years has become substantially

A Pilgrimage

from sample room to saloon, and from grocery to groggery, whilst the deposits of candidates, as has been

lately testified in our Courts, are too often left there in *escrow* to stimulate idle retainers in ballot stuffing, false counting, and voting dead men's names. In the country districts it is little, if any, better; only the drinks are further apart. The whisky shanties at the crossroads, eye-sores of every neighbor-hood where they become established, are by force of their attractions a resort for those soldiers of fortune who turn the scale in close elections and thereby rule the hour. Frequently they become, likewise, headquarters for central committees, from whence go forth edicts to shove delegates and pack nominating conventions.

I may illustrate this by an incident.

A late member of our General Assembly visiting, as one of a Committee, the State Penitentiary, inquired of a convict what brought him there. "Whisky," he quietly answered, and then asked in return. "And what brought you to Jefferson City?" Truth compelled the legislator to respond, "I believe it was whisky brought me here too." So it seems that the dram shop influence plays its part conspicuously in recruiting both the

Great Assemblies

at the State capital. Indeed, it is not going too far to say, that the extent to which the politicians of the country are compromised with the liquor interest, and the associations which fester around its 6ites, have done more than all else to deter men of upright character and business qualification from engaging heartily in political pursuits. They see that the qualities which command success are boon companionship rather than mental capacities, and shrink back from such competition. The result of excluding the classes best qualified for public service from public position is only too visible in official delinquencies and violated trusts. Nor is this all, or perhaps the worst feature of such a regime. Defalcations may be borne with. New victims may step into the places of disgraced favorites. But the exclusion of strong convictions and high purposes from the control of the country, puts a premium upon moral cowardice which candidates for favor are swift to appropriate. It has become a world-wide criticism, that there is less of independent thought among the statesmen of America than those of any civilized people on earth. They sometimes adopt principles which have been pioneered through obloquy into victory, by men they ridicule as radicals but the growth of ideas is always outside of parties. As for any initiation on this present subject from them, rest assured they would rather sin against the Holy Ghost than against the beer barrel.

Wendell Phillips,

Thinker, orator, agitator, abolitionist, prohibitionist, inflationist, friend of the workingman, tribune of the people, alarm-clock of this century, has been denounced as 'a visionary enthusiast, if not absolutely insane, since I can first remember; yet, periodically, every ten years, the politicians catch up with him, steal part of his platform and damn the balance. In fact, say what you please, this nation loves courage, hates cowardice, and at last will show its appreciation of the man who thinks out and acts out the faith that is in him. Whence then comes this evasion, timidity, indirectness which emasculates our public life and has given a new and sinister meaning to the strong old English word *politic*? Shakespeare said—

*"This land was once enriched
With politic grave counsel."*

But such expression would scarcely fit our degenerate speech. The politic of today is that which creeps and burrows. This is shown signally in the changed relation of the press which has almost lost control over politics. The newspapers of widest circulation scarcely claim a morganatic Party connection. Day by day the able editor is ceasing to be a factor in shaping our representative system. The machine is run by the bummers and inspired by the dramshops. Where it will all end no one dare predict. I can see no further along, if the present state of things shall continue, than Freedom Drunk, and

That is Communism.

If you turn now to the influence of this liquor traffic upon citizens in the attitude of the governed, in which relation the state is most deeply pledged to their well being, you come upon social facts of transcendent consequence. Whatever virtue shall be possessed by the people in their subject character, whatever shall tend to elevate their lives, to make them more susceptible to duty, more incorruptible, will unquestionably be so much gained in the direction of good government. And all that operates in hostility thereto is a wrong done to good citizenship. It is the recognition of this that causes public opinion to welcome all reforms and induces

multitudes to give countenance to them, even though they do not reform them-selves. The aggregate good is plain as the sun that shines; the personal adhesion is put off, or its influence undervalued. And to no reform has the general public ever given more sympathetic greeting than to that which seeks to abate the evils of intemperance. The patient ear listens to the pitying speech which tells its miseries, and all tender emotions gather to the rescue of the fallen ones. Indeed so sacred are the depths of feeling which are sounded by its appeals that many are loth to profane its conquest by any invocation of law. Moral suasion is their talisman. And blistered be the tongue that would speak reproach to such pure enthusiasm. But this is a very practical world where result follows cause with unfailing sequence, and surroundings which have produced intemperance in the first instance are very sure to tempt relapse after enthusiasm shall have subsided.

Deliver me from Evil.

It will not be disputed that excessive dram drinking fostered by exposure of liquor for sale at every available point, in the countless saloons, which invite to the social glass, at the cheaper bar rooms that retail only intoxication, down in the wine vaults, or back in the beer houses, has produced habits of indulgence not admirable by any "means in the influence either upon body or mind. Treating and being treated have become chronic evils. The drink question meets you in every quarter, and at every hour. It salutes you before breakfast if you go to market, upon the street as you hurry to business, before you go upon 'change, on 'change after change, at luncheon, at dinner, promiscuously thereafter till supper, and even in the interludes of amusement if you venture to concert of opera. I believe it has not yet invaded the church, but some of the laity looks very askance at the parson if he exceeds his allotted thirty minutes. Consider, too, other nations have various forms of Salutation, as, "May you ever prosper," "Peace is with you," "Christ has arisen." We mostly say, "What do you drink?" The effect of all this is terrible. It makes it almost impossible to reform, when the habit threatens, without a sacrifice at the same time of all social intercourse. It generates alternate exhilaration and depression of the mental equilibrium entirely fatal to any sound judgment or persistent purpose. It works its own miracle of creating a craving for more with every new satiation, and substitutes an

Ulcerated Appetite

in the stead of natural tastes. Indeed there is nothing known within the whole realm of science that has the power to degrade men and women like alcohol. It is easy to see then how, surrounded by so many incentives, such multiplied temptations, those who wish to emancipate themselves from the cruel habit are drawn back into indulgence. And it is still easier to understand how having such fatal fascination for its victims it benumbs conscience and then leaves them open to any crime that may tempt. Thus both as a remote and as a proximate cause, the liquor traffic become the prolific parent of nearly all the crime which afflicts the State. This is established by statistics of large and varied embracement, which leave no room for any doubt. The literature of prohibition is full of such exhibits, and I might cite you abundant illustration, from the earliest testimonies of Sir Matthew Hale to the latest reports of the numerous boards of Public Charities. But the present is scarcely fit occasion for such review. Frederic Hill, Inspector of Prisons in England, declares that he was within the truth when stating "as the result of extensive and minute inquiry, that in four cases out of five where an offense has been committed, intoxicating, drink has been one of the causes." Elisha Harris, in our own country, writing on prison discipline, says "full *eighty-five* per cent of all convicts give evidence of having in some degree been prepared or enticed to do criminal acts. Because of the physical and distracting effects produced upon the human organism by alcohol." Of 34 murders in one year, in Philadelphia, 30 came of drink. Of 32,775 commitments, 25,551 were traceable directly to intemperance. Of 75,692 arrests in New York City, 34,696 were for

Drunkenness and Disorder.

In fact, all the annals of penitentiaries, houses of correction and jails but confirm what you see so patent in daily police reports, that intoxication and crime go hand in hand down the slippery paths to perdition. And this moral plague is contagious, constantly spreading, making its conscription younger every generation. But the blunted moral sense which breeds dishonesties among individuals, when brought into contact with the State turns its employ into rings of plunder and combination for spoils. Those who have witnessed the growth, in late years, of the sentiment that *robbery of the State is no robbery unless punished*, will not need to be told that it

finds its culmination in that organized association, known as the lobby,. Whose trade is corruption, whose appliance is human weakness, and whose bible is the bottle?

The effect however of this opens traffic in intoxicating drinks is visible in the

Morals of Public Thought

long before it takes on any violent types or depravity. What the state licenses the community will persist in regarding as right. Thus all reverence for law is undermined in those who still believe it wrong, and all faith in morals is shaken with such as stickle for the law, so that obedience to authority, which constitutes good citizenship, finds itself embarrassed either in accepting or repudiating legalized intoxication. Indeed, it goes much further, for we thus have the state as a teacher of morals inculcating by way of a first lesson, that the beginnings—whether of virtue or vice, are, in its estimation, matters, of indifference. How early the seeds of disobedience are sown by such teaching may be well learned from reports of the Boston public Schools, where, by careful inquiry, it has been shown "among the causes for truancy that which so far transcends all others as to be considered the cause of causes, is the early use of intoxicating drinks." Such is the attestation of Mr. Philbrick, for so many years Superintendent. If to this be added the

Educating Influence

of the dram shops, for they are the rendezvous of riper profligates ambitious to encourage the young to emulate their courses, some idea may be formed of the antagonism thus interposed to any higher moral and psychical development. Even if the great object of government then was merely the suppression of crime, without other or nobler purpose, does it not sap the very foundations of its strength and permanence by sanctioning the license system? Is it not equally Fatal as a policy of state, to the governing and the governed?

And here I might properly rest this analysis, were it not that there is one great element of society which revolves in a sphere of its own, and is scarcely to be classified under either of these aspects—I mean the families of the people, the centers of domestic rather than public life. The dramshop law is not merely a menace, it is a crime against the

Marriage Tie.

The State first licenses the sale of intoxicating liquors and then declares habitual intoxication cause for divorce. This is separation made easy, and ninety-nine out of every hundred cases which occur in our Courts rest that ground. It is not the question here whether drunkenness is sufficient cause, but if it is how the government can excuse itself for Upholding and legalizing the traffic which causes drunkenness? And where one family is thus dissolved by a legal edict, in consequence of such induced intoxication, how many thousands upon thousands die out, or are virtually destroyed, which make no outward sign? It is in the heart of the mother and the terror of the child that this dread visitant first finds recognition. It is over ruined hopes, and broken promises, and lost respect and wounded love that drunkenness invades the home, and when once there it is only a question of how long before every affection which binds that family together will be trampled out of being. And the future of citizenship is thus accursed before it is born into time. Equally fatal likewise is it to the health of offspring—that fruit of marriage out of which the State survives. The

Hereditary Taint

of liquor is as well known in medicine as that of any pulmonary disease and society at large tolerates after a fashion and provides for the decrepitude of children thus begotten in alcohol by furnishing asylums for the idiotic and insane. Mental obliquity in some form is sure to crop out in its scions. Dr. Ray, a very high authority, in his work on "Hygiene" says "another potent agency in vitiating the quality of the brain is habitual intemperance, and the effect is far oftener contained in the offspring than in the drunkard himself." Dr. Howe says "that of the cases of idiocy not one-fourth can be identified as born of even temperate parents." In other words persistent functional disturbance at last brings about organic change and thus permissively the state contributes to

Degeneracy of Type

in its members. The National Medical Association, at Detroit, expressed its sense upon this point by a resolution declaring in express terms that "the use of alcoholic liquors entails diseased appetites and enfeebled constitutions upon offspring." Sir H. Thompson, a practitioner of European reputation, recognizing the same fact, says "I have no hesitation in attributing a very large proportion of some of the most dangerous and painful maladies which come under my notice to the ordinary and daily use of fermented drink, taken in the quantity conventional deemed moderate." And it is this Indus of disease which so often spreads itself through two or three generations of imbecility before it takes on final forms of madness. In brief, it is the mental leprosy of our people. In the Islands of the Sea the lepers are corralled apart and forbidden to propagate. With us, on the contrary, ardent encouragement to beget scorbutic children is state policy.

What has been advanced will have been said too little purpose if it fail to convince you, that in all the relations whom this liquor traffic bears to the State, it is altogether indefensible and should be prohibited. Whether viewed economically or politically or socially—whether as a matter of morals or of policy—in what guise sever it be seen there is no redeeming feature about it. Can it then be suppressed by the State, and if so, by what best method, are the questions which at once crave answer?

Prohibition a Success.

Prohibition, it must be borne in mind, is a fact to be made good, not merely a law to be passed—a thing to be accomplished practically, and not a mere theory to be left to die from want of enforcement. And first, then, let me say that its feasibility is just as apparent as the suppression of any other condemned practice among men. Indeed the sale of intoxicating drinks is more capable of prevention than any single vice of individuals; for gales require a large number of customers to make them profitable, and numbers cannot engage in such violation of law without discovery. If only the government be sufficiently in earnest, and its officers be reliable, there cannot be any difficulty about stamping it out as easily as a cattle pest. This talk, then, that prohibition is a failure, is all bosh. It has been a success in many lands, and wherever vigorously set about; and to-day is more of a success in Maine than any law against any crime involving equal prospective gain. There are, no doubt, some evasions of the most stringent statute known to our age, but certainly not a hundredth part so many as there are infractions of our license law, which only aims to collect a tax.

Illustration:

For the further information of all those skeptics who are so doubtful about prohibition, I may refer them to Sweden where, in a population of three and a half millions of people, only 450 places of open sale are allowed, and those under a most rigid supervision. In England, the report of the Committee of the Province of Canterbury, embracing upwards of a thousand parishes, shows that there is neither public house nor beer shop known. In Scotland, many extensive estates and large industrial establishments have adopted the system as a purely business enterprise, and its effect has been a miracle of prosperity. In the United States, owing to the timidity of political parties, and the immense control acquired by the liquor interest, the experiment has only struggled up, here and there, *as a demand of the people*, over and above the head of parties; but wherever tried faithfully, it has been a success.

Four Prosperous States

have Prohibition now engrafted on their codes, and the dram sellers there, if any there be, do not complain of its non-enforcement, or make light of its severe penalties. In many whole sections of other States, where local option obtains, there is absolute suppression effected. In a number of counties of Missouri, and conspicuously in Clay, there is not a dram shop tolerated. And if I wished a signal instance I might cite you here at home to the only large iron industry now in operation, that has not baulked its labor in all the panic times, and bid you note well the fact that for long years, throughout its five and twenty square miles of territory, no drop of liquor has ever been permitted to be sold.

How to Establish it

is the other and more involved inquiry. Elsewhere, communities have only arrived at a solution of the problem after laborious effort and much disappointment, so that no doubt, we too shall have to struggle up out of difficulty into triumph. Yet let not this be any discouragement, for no cause was ever well won that was not well fought. The fact of prohibition may be reached in various ways, all dependent, however, on a pronounced public opinion to inaugurate and maintain it. To accomplish that, agitation is first of all necessary—agitation by all ways, incessant, unflinching agitation. Neal Dow says that before the State of Maine was convinced, it was sown all over knee deep with prohibition literature. As the people of Missouri are the swiftest in the world to arrive at conclusions and adopt a true policy, it may not take so much discussion; but the facts will have to be broadly stated and freely disseminated. Again; no element of repression can be safely disregarded. In the agricultural districts, hostility to all drunkenness is so well established as a sentiment that it is ready to take oh forms refusing to issue permits. To this end the present dram-shop law offers.

Signal Opportunity.

By one of its provisions no Judge of any County Court is permitted to issue a license to any drain shop unless it shall be *first petitioned for by a majority of all the tax-payers of the township, town, or city block*. Furthermore it is required that this petition be *renew*. *[unclear: the] 4th day of July, in [unclear: every] year* or the license shall be void and the traffic unlawful, this affords fitting opportunity to test the sense of every neighborhood, to arraign delinquent courts in every county, to enforce the law as to all its prohibitory features. Not one in fifty of the 5,922 dram shops in Missouri is to-day entitled to remain open. Let this be the celebration then, to which all men in Missouri opposed to drunkenness shall address themselves by way of organized protest at the anniversary of the nation's independence, and if you will do so with the spirit of your fathers in 1776, you will achieve a deliverance for the State second in importance to none that has yet been accomplished.

A Constitutional Amendment,

embracing prohibition and so framed as to be self-operative, will, more directly than any other method, present this question to the people of the State. It has, too, the great advantage of an immediate appeal, and of permanency when adopted. It can be insisted upon now, without disturbing the sensitiveness of existing parties or necessitating their political antagonism. It should, therefore, be urged in every district at the coming canvass, and no man should be permitted to go to the Legislature, *if he can be defeated*, who will not pledge himself to have submitted such a constitutional amendment to a vote of the people. This is, in very truth the right of petition in its largest sense, which the people have reason to demand, and those candidates who refuse assent to so democratic a request, maybe set down as fit only to be driven from public life. The agitation of such an issue in the pending election will make clear to the State that this is not a mere vapid parade of sentiment, but means business. It will notify the politicians to set their houses in order and prepare to enlist anew. "Under which king, Bezonian!"

"Speak or Die!"

To insure prohibition, however, neither laws nor constitutions are sufficient. Behind all these there must be rigid enforcement civil proceedings for redress, criminal arraignment for punishing and the entire appliance which comes of legislations intent to effect Suppression of the traffic. This can only be sustained by political association pertinent to that end. And as the cause of prohibition more and more approaches supremacy it will formulate itself into partisan shape. For, after all, it is with men we have to deal, and men in power only respond to organized sentiment. I counsel, therefore, that you prepare the way, even at this early day, for the "Prohibition Alliance," which is to rule the future of Missouri in despite and over the head of all other associations opposed to its behest. In politics as in nature the law of life is "the survival of the fittest," and politicians should understand, and if they do not yet realize it, should be taught the lesson anew, that such organization as will not respond to the vital issues of the age must be content to disappear.

Future Life Questions Discourses delivered in Westminster Abbey, November, 1877, By Rev. F.W. Farrar, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Re-delivered by Rev. S. Edger, B.A., in the Lorne Street Hall, Auckland.

No. I Eternal Punishment.

"For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead."—1 PET, iv., 6.

WHEN I spoke from this place last Sunday on the question, "Is life worth living?"—when I preached three Sundays ago on heaven, some of you may possibly have thought, "This is all very well for true Christians—all very well if, in this world, there were only taints; but the saints are few in number, and the world is full of sinners. See what a spectacle it presents! Look at the coarseness and the foulness exhibited at every turn in the streets around us! Walk at night in squalid purlieus, not far even from this Abbey, where glaring gin-palaces are busy, and, amid the reek of alcohol, you may hear snatches of foul oaths and odious songs — streets where women sit shuddering in wretched garrets, to think of the brutal hands that will strike, of the brutal feet that will kick them when the drunkard staggers home, and where the young lads of the schools, over which we spend so many millions of money, are being daily ruined and depraved by being lured into low haunts of gambling and degradation. Or walk, attain, in the thronged haunts of commerce, where myriads are utterly and recklessly absorbed in that hasting to be rich who shall not be innocent; or judge, from the stage and the opera that vice in higher places is none the less dangerous because it is more gilded and perfumed. Look at all these facts, and then tell us—not in an ideal world, but in this world which looks too often as though it wore a world without souls—in a world where there is so much of cruel selfishness, of degraded purpose, of serpentine malice and insane desire—oh, tell us, in such a world as this, how does it, this that you have said apply? Alas! the vast majority of men and women whom we see are not saints but sinners, and too often contented with their sins; and covetousness, and drunkenness, and lust, and lying, and dishonesty, and hatred, claim each their multitudes of votaries and of victims. Have you, then, any right to paint the world in rose colour? Is it not mere insincerity, mere clericalism, to shut your eyes to patent facts? We who, by our very presence in this sacred place, shew that we do not belong to the classes openly and flagrantly irreligious, are yet, many of us, great sinners. Even when there is no dread crime upon our consciences, many of us are far from God. Our hearts are stained through and through by evil passions. We are tied and bound with the chain of our sins. You bid us repeat; but how many do repent? You, the clergy, who stand often by the bed-sides of the dying, who know how men live, and that in nine cases out of ten they die as they have lived, if your theory of life is to be entertained, if it is not to be a mere professional sham, what do you think about the future? Tell us about the lost.

My brethren, you have the fullest right to ask these questions, and it is our bounden duty to answer them; and I, for one, in all deep humility, yet now and always asking God for fearless courage and perfect honesty, will try to give you such answer as I can. If it be but the fragment of an answer, it is because I believe it to be God's will that no other should be possible; but, at least, I shall strive to speak such truth as is given me, and to answer no man according to his idols. Those who take loose conjectures for established certainties, those who care more for authority than reason and conscience, those who pretend to dignify with the name of Scriptural argument the ever-widening Spirals of dim and attenuated inference out of a narrow aperture of single texts, those who talk with the glib self complacency of an ignorance which takes itself for knowledge, as though they alone had been admitted into what, with unconscious blasphemy, they call the council-chamber of the Trinity; they, perhaps, may speak readily of fire and brimstone, and may feel the consolatory glow of a personal security as they dilate upon the awfulness and the finality of the sufferings of the damned. But those who so faith must have a broader basis than hollow representation—than the ambiguousness of opposing tests—those who grieve over the dark shadows flung by human theologians over God's light; those who believe that reason and conscience and experience, no less than "Scripture, are also books of God, and that they, too, must have a direct voice in these great decisions; they will not be so ready to snatch God's thunder into wretched and feeble hands. They will lay their mouths in the dust rather than make sad the hearts which God hath not made sad. They will take into account the grand principles which dominate through Scripture, no less than its isolated expressions; and, undeterred by the base and feeble notion that virtue would be impossible without the horrors of an endless hell, they will declare their trust that even after death, through the infinite mercy of the loving Father, the dead shall be alive again, and multitudes, at any rate, of the lost be found.

I cannot pretend, my brethren, to exhaust in one sermon a question on which, as you know, whole volumes have been written. There are some of the young in this congregation—many of you, I regret to see, are standing. I am reluctant ever to trespass too long upon your attention, and I cannot, therefore, profess to day to meet and to silence all objections. But one thing I can do, which is to tell you plainly what, after years of thought on the subject, I believe; and what I know to be the belief of multitudes, and of yearly increasing

multitudes, of the wisest and the most learned in our Church. What the popular notion of hell is, you, my brethren, are all aware. Many of us were scared with it in our childhood. It is, that the moment a human being dies, at whatever age, under whatever disadvantages, his fate is sealed hopelessly, and forever; and that, if he die in unrepeated sin, that fate is a never-ending agony, amid physical tortures the most frightful that can be imagined; so that when we think of the future of the human race, we must conceive of a vast and burning prison in which the lost souls of millions writhe and shriek forever, tormented in a flame that never will be quenched. You have only to read the manuals—you have only to look at the pictures—of the Roman Catholics on the one hand, and of Nonconformists on the other, to see that such has been and is the common belief of Christendom. You know how Dante, in his vision, comes to a dark wall of rock, and sees, blacker in the blackness, the chasm of hell's colossal portal, and over it in characters of gloom, the awful line, "All hope abandon, ye who enter here"; and how, passing through it, they reach a place where, in this mere vestibule, sighs and wailings tremble through the starless void, and the sound of voices, deep and hoarse, and of hands smitten wildly together, whirls always through that stained and murky air. But it is even more awful to find such things in our own great writers, who had no belief, like Dante, in that wailing agony of purgatory into which poor souls might gladly plunge, assured that they too, redeemed and purified, should at last pass into their Paradise rest. Bead how the great Milton, after telling us of the super-eminence of beatific vision, plunges at once into this dreadful sentence—That "they who have been wicked in high places, after a shameful end in this life, which God grant them, shall be thrown down eternally into the deepest and darkest gulf of hell, where, under the trample and spurn of all the other damned, and in the anguish of their torture, they shall have no other ease than to exercise a bestial tyranny over them. They shall remain in that plight forever, the basest, the lowermost, the most dejected, the most underfoot and downtrodden vassals of perdition." Or read Bishop Jeremy Taylor's sermon on Christ's advent to judgment, and see how his imagination revels in the Tartarean glare which he pours over his lurid page, as he tells us how God's hand shall press the sins and the intolerableness, the amazement, and the disorder, the smart and the sorrow, the guilt and the pain of all our sins, and pour them into one chalice, and mingle them with an infinite wrath, and make the wicked drink off all the vengeance, and force it down their unwilling throats with the violence of devils and accursed spirits. Or, once more, read in Henry Smith, the silver-tongued Platonist of Cambridge, how, "when iniquity hath played her part, all the furies of hell shall leap on the man's heart as on a stage. Thought calleth to fear, fear whistleth to horror, horror beckoneth to despair, and saith, 'Come and help me to torment this sinner.' Irons are laid upon his body like a prisoner. All his lights are put out at once." Can we wonder that, receiving and believing such doctrines as these one of our poets wrote:—

*"Place me alone in some frail boat.
Amid the horrors of an angry sea,
"Where I, while time say move, shall float;
Descrying neither land nor day.
Or under earth my youth confine.
To the night and silence of a cell,
Where scorpions with my limbs may twine,
O, God, so Thou forgive me hull."*

Or that Shakespeare exclaims—

*"It's too horrible!
The weariest and met loathed earthly life,
That age, ache, penury, imprisonment
Can lay on nature, It a paradise
To what we dream of death."*

Well, my brethren, happily the thoughts and hearts of men are often far gentler and nobler than the formula; of their creeds; and custom and tradition prevent even the greatest from facing the full meaning and consequences of the words they use. When Milton talks as I have read to you of hell, he is but giving form and colour to his burning hatred of irresistible tyranny and triumphant wrong, and when Jeremy Taylor and other great divines and poets write thus of it, they give us but the ebullient flashes from the glowing cauldron of a kindled imagination. What they say is but, as it were, the poetry of indignation. It is only when these topics fall into the vulgar handling of hard and narrow bigots,—it is only when they reek like acrid fumes from the

poisonous crucible of mean and loveless hearts, that we see them in all their intolerable ghastliness. I know nothing so calculated to make the whole soul revolt with loathing from every doctrine of religion, as the easy complacency with which some cheerfully accept the belief that they are living and moving in the midst of millions doomed irreversibly to everlasting perdition. Augustine dared to say that infants dying unbaptised would certainly be damned, though only with a qualified damnation. Thomas Aquinas lent his saintly name to the abominable fancy that the bliss of the saved may be the keener because they are permitted to gaze on the punishment of the wicked; and another writer talk of God as holding up the wicked in hell with one hand, and tormenting them with the other. Now, even when a saint of God speaks like this he sins, and no language can be stern enough to reprobate the manner in which these elder brothers of the prodigal have turned God's Gospel of plenteous redemption into anathemas, and all but universal perdition.

Which of us has not heard sermons or read books to the effect that if every leaf of the forest's trees, and every grain of the ocean's sands stood for billions of years, and all those billions of years were exhausted, you would be no nearer the beginning of eternity than you were at the first; and that (pardon me for reproducing what I abhor) if you could conceive of an everlasting toothache, or an endless cautery, or the incessant scream of a sufferer under the knife, that would give you but a faint conception of the agony of hell; and yet, in the same breath, that the majority of mankind are doomed to hell by an absolute predestination? Which of us has not heard teaching which implied, or did not shrink from even stating this; and dare any one of you regard it as other than blasphemy against the merciful God? If you are not unaffected when the destitute perish of hunger, or the dying agonies in pain, is there any human being worthy of the dignity of a human being who does not revolt and sicken at the notion of a world of worm and flame? Someone, who is not of us, wrote yesterday to the *Times*, how—standing in that Parisian prison where the Girondists held their last supper, whence Danton passed to the scaffold, where Robespierre lay, on the night before his execution, in his blood, where Marie Antoinette poured out her soul on the last evening of her life—he saw an exquisite crucifix of ivory left since she had left it there. That queen and mother had clung to it all night in her last agony. And he then adds, that, "in such a scene, all logic, doctrine, politics, severity of judgment are hushed, and human nature asserts its preeminence, and claims the whole field of thought for pity. In presence of that agonising figure upon the cross, the whole soul revolts against judicial terrorism in whatsoever name, by whatsoever tyrant, committed." He is speaking, of course, of earthly tyrants; but, my brethren, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" And shall the image of the crucified Redeemer inspire in one who rejects His divinity the noble pity which seems as if it were alien to many of His sons? I can at least sympathise with the living poet who cries, in contemplation of such thoughts:

*"Were it not thus, O King of my salvation,
Many would curse to Thee, and I for one,
Fang Thy bliss and snatch at Thy damnation.
Scorn and abhor the shining of the sun.
Ring with a reckless shivering of laughter,
Wroth at the woe which those have seen so long
Question if any recompense hereafter
Waits to atone the intolerable woe."*

St. Paul again and again flings from him with a "God forbid" the conclusions of an apparently irresistible logic. We, surely, who have no irresistible logic of any kind against us in this matter, but only, in great part, spiritual selfishness and impenetrable tradition, do we not, in the high name of the outraged conscience of humanity, nay, in the far higher name of the God who loves us, of the Saviour who died for us, of the Holy Spirit who enlightens us; do we not hurl from us representations so cruel, of a doctrine so horrible, that every nerve and fiber of our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life revolts at it? Ignorance may, if it will, make a fetish of such a doctrine; Pharisaism may write it broad upon its phylacteries; hatred may inscribe it instead of "holiness to the Lord"; sacerdotalism may set it forth in doctrines in which it simulates and degrades the name of Love; but here, in the presence of so many living, and in this vast mausoleum of the glorious dead,—here, amid the silent memorials of the men of fame and the fathers who beat us, of whom many, though not saints, were yet noble though erring men; and whom, though they and we alike shall certainly suffer, and suffer bitterly, both here and hereafter, the penalty of unrepented sin, we cannot and will not think of as condemned to unutterable tortures by irreversible decrees. I repudiate these crude and ghastly travesties of the holy and awful will of God. I arraign them as mercilessly ignorant I impeach them as a falsehood against Christ's universal and absolute redemption. I denounce them as a blasphemy against God's exceeding and eternal love. More acceptable, I am very sure, than the rigidest and most uncompromising orthodoxy of all the Pharisees who have

ever judged their brethren since time began,—more acceptable by far to Him who, on His cross, prayed for His murderers, and who died that we might live—more acceptable, I say, than the delight which, amid a deluge of ruin, hug the plank on which itself alone is saved, would be the noble and trembling pity which made St. Paul declare himself ready to be anathemaed from Christ for the sake of his brethren—which made Moses cry to God at Sinai, "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin; yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin;—and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written."

But I would ask you believe, my brethren, that I speak now not with natural passion, but with most accurate theological precision, when I say that, though texts may be quoted which give *prima facie* plausibility to such modes of teaching, yet, to say nothing of the fact that the light and love which God Himself has kindled within us recoil from them, those texts are, in the first place, alien to the broad unifying principles of Scripture; that, in the next place, they are founded on interpretations demonstrably groundless; and in the third place, that, for every one so quoted, two can be adduced on the other side. There is an old, sensible, admitted rule of theology—*Theologia parabolica non est demonstrativo*—in other words, that phrases which belong to metaphor, to imagery, to poetry, to emotion, are not to be formulated into necessary dogmas, or crystallised into rigid creeds. If this rule be used to test them, nine-tenths of the phrases on which these views are built fall utterly to the ground. But even where it otherwise, once more, in the name of Christian light and Christian liberty—once more, in the name of Christ's promised Spirit, I protest against the ignorant tyranny of isolated texts, which has ever been the curse of Christian truth, the glory of narrow intellects, and the cause of the worst errors of the worst days of the most corrupted Church. Ignorance has engraved texts upon her sword, and oppression has carved them upon her fetters, and cruelty has tied texts about her faggots; and ignorance again has set knowledge at defiance with texts woven on her flag. Gin-drinking has been defended out of Timothy, and slavery has made a stronghold of the Epistle to Philemon. The devil, you know, can quote Scripture for his purpose, and quoted texts against Christ Himself; and when St. Paul fought the great battle of Christian freedom against the curse of the law, he was anathematized with a whole Pentateuch of texts. But, my brethren, we live under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and our guide is the Scriptures' of God in their broad outlines—the revelation of God in its glorious unity, the books of God in their eternal simplicity read by the illumination of that Spirit of Christ which dwelled in us except we be reprobates. Our guide is not, and never shall be, what our Saviour called, "the letter that killeth"—tyrannous realism of ambiguous expression, the asserted infallibility of isolated words.

But if this great and awful doctrine of the state of the dead in the future is to be made simply and solely a matter of texts; if, except as a dead anachronism, you do not really mean what you say when you say, "I believe in the Holy Ghost"; if we prefer our sleepy shibboleths and our dead traditions to the living promise, "I will dwell in them and walk in them," then, by all means, let this question be decided by texts alone. But then, first, you must go to the inspired original, not to the erroneous translation; and, secondly, you must take words and you must interpret words in their proper and historical significance, not in that sense which makes thorn convey to you a thousand notions which did not originally belong to them. Now, I ask you, my brethren, very solemnly, where would be the popular teachings about hell if we calmly and deliberately erased from our English Bible the three words "damnation," "hell," and "everlasting?" Yet I say unhesitatingly—I say, claiming the fullest right to speak with the authority of knowledge—I say, with the calmest and most unflinching sense of responsibility—I say, standing hero in the sight of God and of my Saviour, and it may be of the angels and spirits of the dead, that not one of those words ought to stand any longer in our English Bibles, and that being in our present acceptance of them, simply mistranslations, they most unquestionably will not stand in the revised version of the Bible if the revisers have understood their duty. The verb "to damn" in the Greek Testament is neither more nor less than the verb "to condemn," and the word translated "damnation," or rather the two words, are simply the words which, in the vast majority of "instances, the very same translators have translated, and rightly translated, by "judgment" and "condemnation." The word "*aionios*," translated "everlasting," is simply the word which, in its first sense, means "ago long" or "*eoneon*," and it is, in the Bible itself, applied and over again to things which have utterly and long since passed away; and, in its second sense, it is something above and beyond time—something spiritual, as when the knowledge of God is said to have eternal or "*eoneon*" life. So that when, with your futile billions of years, you foist into the word "*aionios*" the fiction of an endless time, you do but give the lie to the mighty oath of that great angel who set one foot on the sea and the other on the land, and, with one hand uplifted to heaven, sware, by Him that liveth for ever, that time should be no more.

And, finally, the word rendered hell is in one place the Greek word *Tartarus*, borrowed, as a word, for the prison of evil spirits, not after, but before the resurrection. It is in five places *hades*, which simply means the world beyond the grave, and it is in twelve places *gehenna*, which means primarily the Valley of Hinnon, outside Jerusalem, into which, after it had been polluted by Moloch worship, corpses were hung, and where fires were lit; and, secondly, it is a metaphor, not of final and hopeless, but of that purifying and corrective, punishment which, as we all believe, docs await impenitent sin, both here and beyaond the grave. But, be it

solemnly observed, the Jews to whom, and in whose metaphorical sense, the word was used by our blessed Lord, never did, either then, or at any period, attach to that word *gehenna* which lie used, that meaning of endless torment which we have been taught to apply to hell. To them, and, therefore, on the lips of our blessed Saviour who addressed it to them, it meant not a material and everlasting fire, but an intermediate, a metaphorical, and a terminable retribution.

Thus, then, my brethren, finding neither in Scripture nor anywhere, anything to prove that the fate of every man is at death irrevocably determined, I shake off the hideous incubus of atrocious conceptions attached by false theology to the doctrine of final retribution. But neither can I dogmatise on the other side. I say nothing to uphold the Romish doctrine of purgatory. I cannot accept the spreading belief in conditional immortality. I cannot preach the certainty of what is called universalism—that is, the view that all will finally be saved. That last doctrine—the belief that good shall fall at last, far off, yet at last, to all—does indeed derive much support from many passages of Scripture; and it, or a view closely analogous to it, was held by : Origen, the greatest and noblest, by Gregory, of Nyssa, the most fearless, by Clement of Alexandria, the most learned, by Justin, one of the earliest of the fathers. It was spoken of in some places with half approval, and in others with very modified reprobation, by theologians like St. Ambrose, St. Irenaeus,—even in his better moments, by that man who has cast so dark a shade over theology—St. Augustine himself; and in modern times, among many others, that doctrine has been held by grand and most orthodox theologians like Bunsen and Theodor von Moltke among the Germans, and the saint of God among ourselves, like Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, and Bishop Ewing of Argyle. And further, whatever may have been the motives which influenced them, it is, at any rate, a fact that the Reformers struck out of the Prayer-book that article which originally decreed "All men shall not finally be saved." I care but little for individual authority in such matters; but this much is proved, at least, by these different theories of wise and holy men—that God has given us no clear and decisive revelation on the final condition of those who have died in sin. It is revealed to us that God is love, and that to know Him is eternal life, and that it is not His will that any should perish, and that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive but how long even after death, man may continue to resist His will, how long he may continue in that spiritual death which is alienation from God that is one of the secret things which God has not revealed. But this much, to any rate, that the fate of man is not finally and irreversibly and necessarily sealed at death, you yourselves—unwittingly, perhaps, but none the less certainly—admit and declare and confess every time you repeat the Apostles' Creed; for thus you say that Christ descended into hell; and the sole passage which proves that article of the Creed is the passage in which St. Peter tells us that Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison, who sometime were disobedient. St. Peter tells you in so many words, in the passage which I have chosen for my text, that the Gospel was preached to them that are dead; and if, as the Church in every age has held, the fate of those dead sinners was not irrevocably fixed by death, then it must be clear and obvious to the very meanest understanding that neither of necessity is ours.

There, then, my brethren, is the sole answer which I can give you to your question, "What about the lost my belief is fixed upon that living God who is the Saviour of all men. My answer is, with Thomas Erskine of Linlathen that we are lost here as much as there, and that Christ came to seek and to save the lost; and my hope is that the vast majority of the lost will at length be found. If any hardened sinner here, shamefully loving his sin and despising the long-suffering of his Saviour, trifles with that doctrine, it is at his own deep and awful peril. But if, on the other hand, there should be souls among you (and are there not ?)—souls very sinful indeed, but yet not hardened in sin—souls that feel, indeed, that ever amid their failing they long, and pray, and love, and agonise, and strive to creep nearer to the light, then to you I say, have faith in God. There is hope for you—hope for you even if death overtake you before the final victory is won; hope for the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven; hope for the mourners, for they shall be comforted; though you, too, if you should continue in sin, may have to be purified in that gehenna of *eternal* fire beyond the grave. Yes, my brethren, "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woo unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his labours shall be given him." But say also, as Christ's own apostles said, that there shall be a restitution of all things; that God willeth not that any should perish; that Christ both died and rose and revived that He might be the Lord both of the dead and of the living; that as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; and that the day shall come when all things shall be subdued unto Him that God may be all in all.

No. II. "Are there few that be Saved?"

"Then said one unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved ? And He said unto him, Strive to enter in at the strait gate."—LUKE xiii., 23, 24.

This passage, my brethren, give us the very essence of our Lord's teaching respecting the present and the

future. Since Ho had dwelt so often on the difficulty and narrowness of the up-hillward path, and on the few who toil in it, whereas we see many rushing along the broad road that leadeth to destruction—someone, who, perhaps, had more spiritual speculative curiosity than moral earnestness, wanting to know the issues of this conflict, asked Him the plain, direct question, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" Now, supposing that were so—supposing that, as thousands of theologians have taught for thousands of years, the vast majority are, in the next world, for ever lost, would it not have been only fair to admit it? Would not our Lord's teaching have gained terrific force from admitting it? Had the answer to the question been a plain, "Yes, only few are saved"; and had that view been as essential to morality as some assert, surely it would have been worse than dangerous—it would have been (be it said with reverence) wrong to suppress it. But what is the answer of the Divine wisdom? Is it some glaring deluge of fire and brimstone for billions of years? Is it in that style in which the coarse terrorism of the Puritan is at one with the coarse terrorism of the Inquisition? No; but it is a refusal to answer. It is a strong warning to the questioner. It is a tacit rebuke to the very question. It is the pointing to a strait gate and to a narrow way whereby alone we can enter into the kingdom of God. In this sad world it is but the few who find that way, and until they find it they cannot see the kingdom of God; but there is not one word here about an irreversible doom to material torment. If we still yearn for any nearer answer about the future, we may find it, perhaps, in the glorious words of the prophet Isaiah, "Fear not, for I am with thee. I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather j them from the west. I will say to the north, j Give up; and to the south, Keep not back. Bring my sons from afar, and my daughters j from the ends of the earth." Or, in the dazzling vision of the seer of the Apocalypse, "I beheld, and lo ! a great j multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and alms in their hands." Or, again, we may find it in those calm words of our Lord's own promise, "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you." But the spirit of the answer of our blessed Lord on this occasion is this: "The fate of the souls whom He hath made is in the hands of Him who made them, and not in thine. Enter though in at the strait gate."

It was in that spirit, my brethren, that j strove to speak to you last Sunday, believing that much popular teaching about the awful subject of future retribution, its physical torments, its endless, and necessarily endless duration, gives us an utterly false picture of the God of love, which, though it may find warrant in texts wrongly translated or ignorantly misunderstood, finds no warrant, either in the general tone of Scripture, or in God's no less sacred teachings through our individual souls. And if some would represent such a view as dangerous, I reply that my only question is, "Is it true?" It is falsehood which is always dangerous, but truth never. It is not for us to construct, after our own fashion, the unseen world. Things are as they are. Theologians may go on spinning their systems unto the world's end; but things are as they are, and they will be as they will be; and for us to misrepresent them by the fallibility of human system, or, worse still, at the bidding of human expedients, is a blasphemy against truth and against God. What is dangerous is to drive some into indignant atheism, and ' to entangle others under frightful superstition, and to crush yet others with a horrible despair by representing to them Him whose name is Love, as a remorseless avenger, instead of as a Father", gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, "neither keepeth He His anger forever." You think, perhaps, that men will not love God without the terrors of an endless hell. So thought not David. He said, "There is mercy with Thee; therefore shalt Thou be feared." Evil souls and foolish souls, I know, make any doctrine dangerous. St. I Peter tells us that they wrested the writings of St. Paul, as they did also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction. Would you, therefore, have had the Scriptures un-Written? Ought St. Paul never to have taken to his pen? Some of the fathers, I am afraid, held what I believe to be the truth in this matter, just as hundreds of our best clergy, I know, hold it at this day, but fear to preach it. But the greatest and best of the Fathers did j preach it, and many of the saints, at whose feet I would gladly sit, have ' preached it in this age. And if we see a truth, are we to be orthodox liars for God by suppressing it because those ' think it dangerous who believe in no more'. Potent motive for virtue and the love of God than a ghastly fear? Are we to come before the very God of truth with a lie in our right hands? Richard Baxter—a saint of God, if ever there as one—avowed his belief that even a suicide, if hurried by sudden passion to self-slaughter, may be saved. "And if," he nobly added, ' if it should be objected that what I say should encourage suicide, I answer, I am not to tell a lie to prevent it." But, oh! My brethren, I am not afraid, and I shall never be afraid, of doing harm by asking you to think noble things of God. I not afraid to bid you plead with Him, in the spirit of righteous Abraham, with, "Be it far from Thee, O Lord. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Or to say of Him, with holy Paul, "Shall there be injustice with God? God forbid I" I am not afraid to plead with Him that syllogism which, as Luther said, sums up all the psalms of David—"The God of pity pities the wretched. We are wretched; therefore, not surely in this short world only, but forever, God will pity us."

Punish us? Yes, punish us, because He pities; but God judges that He may teach. He never teaches that He may judge. He will, indeed, condemn us; it may be hereafter, and it must be, if we die in willful sin, to his *eoneon* fire; but it is the fire of love. It is to purify, and not to torture; it is to melt, and not to burn; and we

would be molted by that fire of love by flames far fiercer than are blown to prove and purge the silver ore adulterate. God Himself tells us that He afflicteth not willingly, but for our profit, that we may be partakers of His Holiness; but it would be the utter contrary of this to torture us forever in a hopeless hell. And shall we belie His own words? Our Church, thank God, wiser than her wisest, tenderer than her tenderest, ministers, speaks otherwise in her Burial Service; and I who believe in a God whose name is Love; who rely with all my heart on the mercy of the Merciful; who put my whole trust and confidence in that loving God who is the Saviour of all men; who think that the key to all the dreadful perplexities of life and death lies in the belief that Christ lived and Christ died—I say, God forbid ! I would trust far rather to the instinct of the Christian, and to the Christian poet or saint, than to the pedantry of the Pharisaic dogmatist. I would rather accept, as reflecting the mind of God, the broad humanitarian charity, the keen and tender sensibilities, than the hard systems of heartless theologians. And our greatest living poet writes thus in the very spirit of my text:—

*"At last I heard a voice upon the slope
Cry to the summit, 'Is there any hope?'
To which on answer pealed from that high land,
But in a tongue no man could understand.
And on the glimmering limit, far withdrawn,
God made Himself an awful rose of dawn."*

Dismissing then, all controversy, which I never wish to introduce into this or any pulpit, nor deigning to answer mere angry ignorance or raging prejudice, but realising, with deep responsibility, the sacredness of this place, and desiring, in deepest humility, to lead aright the thoughts of men and women with open minds and loving hearts, I will ask you to glance a little closer with me at God's ways with man—not in idle speculation, not in the interests of any dogma, but because a few years hence death stares us in the face, and because faith in the future may beneficially influence our work in the present. Let us for a moments glance at what we are, and at what we may hope in the future for others and for ourselves.

There are, in the main, three classes of men. There are the saints; there are the reprobates; there is that vast intermediate class lying between, yet shading off by infinite gradations from these two extremes. Of the saints, my brethren, I shall not speak. Their promise is sealed, their lot is sure. Beautiful, holy souls, into whom entering, in every age, the Spirit of God has made of them saints of God and prophets,! They are the joy of heaven; they are the salt of the earth. We, every one of us, are better for them, as the dull clods of the earth are better for the snowy hills whence the rivers flow, as the stagnant air of earth is better for the pure winds which scatter the pestilence. Uh, what would the world be, what would England be, what would this great oppressive city be without them—without the ten righteous, the thirty, the forty, the fifty righteous, for whose sake the heavens do not burst to drown, with deluging rain, the feeble vassals of lust, and anger, and wine, the little hearts that know not how to forgive? What would this city be if it were nothing more than sin? greedy coil of jarring slanders, of reckless competition, of selfish luxury, of brutal vice? Many, we know, are the sinners, and few, we know, are the saints of God, and they are mostly poor, and very often despised; and yet it is they alone who save the world from corruption by the gangrene of its own vices, and from dissolution by the centrifugal forces of its own bane. Their gentle words break upon our wrangling with the balm of love. Their calm faces look in upon our troubles with peace and hope.

*"Ever their statues rise before us—
Our [unclear: loltier] brothers, but one in blood.
At bed and table they lord it o'er us.
With looks of beauty and words of good."*

A millionaire—a successful man—though the world may crawl at his' feet, is but as the small dust of the balance; but, O God, give us saints! About them we have no controversy. We know that they shall be happy. We know that God will treasure them in the day when He maketh up His jewels. We know that they hath not seen, ner ear heard, nor heart conceived what God shall give to them that love Him."

But if they, the unassailably secure, be eternally happy, what of the other extreme ? What of the reprobates ? We see sometimes an heroic virtue; would to God that we never saw also a brutal vice ! Not far from this place is a vast prison, holding some twelve hundred criminals. Every time the great clock of Westminster booms out its chimes to the tune—

*"Lord, through this hour be Thou ray Guide,
So through Thy power no foot shall slide,"*

those prisoners hear it. Among them are some who have got within the arm of the law, but are hardly criminal at all, and these might even be liberated. Others there are who have fallen into crime only from surrounding temptations, and from natures weak, but not depraved; these might be reclaimed. But some there are whom those who know them describe as filthy, cruel, brutal, irreclaimable, and whom society gives up. It is true, though I have been obliged greatly to suppress and soften his words, that one of the greatest of our living writers speaks of them:—"Miserable, distorted blockheads," he calls them, "with faces as of dogs or oxen—angry, sullen, degraded—sons of a greedy, mutinous darkness—basic-natured beings, on whom, in a maleficent life of London scoundrelism, the genius of darkness has visibly set his seal—who," he asks, "could ever command them by love? A collar round the neck, a cart-whip laid heavily on the back—these with an impartial and steady human hand? Or what shall be afforded them?" And he proposes, with all speed possible, to get rid of them at once. Well, my brethren, the punishment of all crime is just, and society has a right, by a stern punishment, to protect the innocent; and yet I rejoice with all my heart that the Savior of mankind never spake in terms like those. I rejoice that He rather said that He came to bring sinners to repentance—to seek and to save those that were lost. And if you ask me whether I must not believe in endless torments for these reprobates of earth, I answer, "Ay, for thorn, and for thee, and for me, too, until we have learned with all our hearts to love good and hate evil; but whether God, for Christ's sake, may not enable us to do this even beyond the grave, if we have failed to do so on this side the grave, I cannot say." I know that God hates sin because He loves the soul that it destroys. I know that the path of that hatred is as the path of a flaming sword, which he who hath eyes may see—Divinely beautiful and Divinely terrible—everywhere burning up, as with unquenchable fire, the false and death-worthy from the true and life-worthy. Yet I know also that for these reprobates Christ died. The bigot may judge their souls if he will; the Pharisee may consign them with orthodox equanimity to endless torments; but I cannot—will not. "Forbear to judge," said the wise and holy king by the awful deathbed of Cardinal Beaufort, when he died and made no sign—"

*Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all!
Close up his outs, and draw the curtain close;
And let us all to meditation."*

Born and bred as these have been, these have rounded as they have been with sights and sounds of degradation, what should we have been—what wouldst thou have been, O comfortable bigot? What wouldst thou have been, O prosperous Pharisee, if thou, in this world, hadst no more haiku than these? Pointing to a murderer as he went on his way to execution, "There," said a good and holy man—"there, but for the face of God, goes John Bradford." If, as we look into the abyss of our own hearts, we see infinite potentialities of guile and vice, so, as we look on these, we see in them, in spite of all their shame and stain, the infinite potentialities of virtue. Aids is it not almost blasphemous to suppose that He who creates human beings with such rich capacities as these, should throw them from Him forever into everlasting darkness? Not moue, at any rate, shall it be to close against them with impetuous recoil and jarring sound those gates of hell, lest they should be more justly closed upon me; but I commend them, with humblest hope, even after this life of hopelessness, to Him who did not loathe the whiteness of the leper, and who Buffered the woman who was a sinner to wash His feet with tears, I feel that without holiness none can see God; that every guilty deed of every sinner, if unrepeated of, must bring a just and awful retribution; that for every impure and for every cruel soul there remaineth, if it repent not, even behind the clouds of this world, the dark night—that I know; but when I remember that even these reprobates had been known to burst into tears at a mother's name; that even these have been known at times to dash out into high deeds of momentary heroism,—I say that God's Spirit has nowhere taught us that He who gave cannot give back; that He who once made them innocent children cannot restore their innocence again; that He who created them—He who wills them to be saved—cannot recreate them in His own image—cannot obliterate all their vileness in the blood of Christ and uncreate their sins. At any rate, no arrogant word, no theological dogma, up an acrid prejudice of mine, shall ever utter to them the language of despair, or stand between these and God's light and His love. The Good Shepherd Himself has told us—and must we not believe His words?—that He will not cease to search for these, the lost sheep, until He finds them. Here, again, the Christian poet teaches us far more truly than the hard theologian—

*"Still for all slips of her,
One of Eve's family;
Wipe those poor lips of her.
Oozing so clammily:
Cross her hands humbly,
As If praying dumbly,
Over her breast.*

*"Owning her weakness,
Her evil behavior,
And leaving with meekness
Her sins to her Savior."*

But, my brethren, lastly, the vast, vast mass of mankind belong to the third class; they are not utter reprobates; they are not perfect saints. They may rise to the one; they may sink to the other; but for the most part they arc, like all of us, undecided. They try to face both ways. They halt between two opinions. They are neither cold nor hot. They have not clothed heart and soul with good; they have not abandoned themselves utterly to evil. They want to be pardoned, yet they want to retain the offence. They shudder to be in a state of sin, yet they attain not to a state of grace. There is the tempter in them, and there is Christ. Now they sin with reckless abandonment. Now they repent in bitterest remorse. The angel has them by the hand, and the serpent by the heart. To how many of us here will these words apply? We break no law of man; to the eye of man it might seem that we broke no law of God; but, oh, what would be thought of us if we were all seen as we are—if our hearts were naked and open to each other as they are to God? And it is those who do try to be God's children who most realize their own exceeding sinfulness. This is way the cry of remorse and anguish which springs from the lips of a Fenelon or a Cowper is far bitterer than any confession which is ever wrung from a Richelieu or a Voltaire. Many, many of these better, and saintlier, and tendered souls have been, I believe, utterly and hopelessly made wretched, even to madness, as poor Cowper was, by that false view of God which is given by the pitiless anathemas of man. To all these comes the cry, "Comfort ye, comfort Nye, My people, saith our God." Your own holier instincts tell you so. Son, or brother, or friend, or father dies; we all have lost one. It may be that they were not holy—not even religious—perhaps not even moral men; and it may be that, after living the common life of men, they die quite suddenly, and with no space for repentance; and if a state of sin be not a state of grace, then, certainly, by all rules of man's theology, they had not repented & they were not saved. And yet, when you stood, O father, O brother, heavy-hearted by their open grave, when you drank in the sweet words of calm and hope which our Church utters over those poor remains; when you laid the white flowers on the coffin; when you heard the dull rattle of "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," you who, if you knew their sins and their failings, knew also something of all that was good, and sweet, and amiable, and true in them, dared you—did you, even in the inmost recesses of thought, consign them, as you are honestly bound to do, as you ought to do if you held the creed which you sometimes profess to hold—dared you, and did you consign them, even in your thoughts, to the unending anguish of the popular creed you teach? Or did your heart, your conscience, your sense of justice, your love of Christ, your faith in God, your belief in Him of whom you sing every Sunday, that "His mercy is everlasting," rise in revolt against your nominal profession then?

You can bear to think of them as you can bear to think of yourselves, suffering, as they never did on earth, the aching glow of God's revealing light, the willing agony of God's remedial fire. We should all desire—we should even pray for that—the natural consequence of our own alienation, meant not to torment us but to profit. An arbitrary infliction of burning torment, an endless agony, a material hell of worm and flame—a doom to everlasting sin, and all this with no prospect of amendment, with no hope of relief—the soul's transgressions of a few brief hours of struggling, tempted life, followed by billions of millenniums in scorching fire, and all this meant not to correct, but to harden—not to amend, but to torture and to degrade. Did you believe in that for any one whom you have ever loved? Again X say, God forbid! Again, I say, I fling from me with abhorrence such a creed as that. Let every Pharisee gnash his teeth if he will; let every dogmatist anathematise; but that I cannot and do not believe. Scripture will not let me; my conscience, my reason, my faith in Christ, the voice of the Spirit within my soul, will not let me. God will not let me. What I do believe is this: That for every willful sin which we commit, unless it be repented of, we shall hereafter, as we do now, feel the heavy and the merciful

wrath of God until He have purged the vile dross from us and made us as the fine gold for Himself. One has said—and it seems to me, and the highest authorities, too, have declared—that we, in this Church of England, may have and cherish this hope, that they who have had no chance here shall have one there; that they who have had a poor chance here shall have a better there; and they who have had a good chance here and lost it will get a new and severer chance; and even while they feel the inevitable results of their sin and folly, will feel also the hands that reach through darkness molding man. What, shall nature fill the hollows of her coarse, rough flints with purple amethysts!—shall she, out of the grimy coal, over which the shivering beggar crouches to warm his limbs, form the glittering diamond which trembles on the forehead of a queen!—shall man take the cast-off rubble and slag of the furnace, and educe from it his most lustrous and glowing dyes! and shall God—the God of nature, not be able to make anything of His ruined souls? And what! shall we be able to pity and to love, as we can, thank God, pity and love those who have wronged us; shall we be willing to pardon our prodigals and to call them home; and shall God not be willing, or, if willing, who shall dare to say that He is not able, even beyond the grave? Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall man be more just than his Maker? We made them not—these sinners. They are not the people of our pasture, or the sheen of our hand; and yet, if we can feel for them a sincere and yearning love, and a trembling pity, and if that love and pity spring from all that is holiest and most Christ-like in our souls, and if it would be wholly impossible for even us guilty creatures to be so remorseless as to condemn our very deadliest enemies to an eternal vengeance, are we to believe this of God; to believe that He who planteth mercy in us cannot be merciful; to believe that He will, in those words of a theologian which I quoted last Sunday, hold us up with one hand, and torment us with the other, though He knoweth our frame, and remembereth that we are but dust? Or, shall we not rather believe, as the wise woman of Tekoah said to David three thousand years ago, we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground; and God does not take away life, but devises devices that the wanderer may not for ever be expelled from Him?"

Yes, where sin aboundeth grace shall much more abound. If God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him, He sheweth mercy, not only unto thousands, as our version has it, but unto the thousandth and thousandth generation of them that love Him and keep His commandments; and so always in God's promises, though not in man's systems, in God's revelation, though not in man's belief, there is a vast overbalance of mercy above wrath, and therefore, my brethren, let us not fear. Have faith in God. Think noble things of God. Be sure that trust in the righteous God means the triumph of good over evil. Be sure that the Cross of Christ, and Christ's plenteous redemption, and Christ's infinite atonement, must, in some way, though we know not how, mean—or, at any rate, we may suppose it to mean—that the evil of this world shall be transformed into its good, and that earth's sinners—far off it may be—shall be transformed, far-off, yet at last, into God's saints.

*"I say to thee, Do thou repent
To the first man thou Mayest; meet
In lane, highway, or open street,
That we, and he, and all men, move
Under the canopy of love.
As tread as the blue sky above.
And ere thou leave him, say yet this,
This one word more. They only miss
The winning of that final bliss
Who will not count it true that love,
Blessing, not cursing, reign above.
And that in it we live and move.
And one thing further make him know,
That to believe these things are so.
This firm faith never to forego,
Despite of all it seems—that strife
And curses are with blessings rife—
That this is blessing; this is life."*

No. III. Sin and its Punishment.

"What shall we say, then? Shall we continue in sin that it grace may abound? God forbid."—Rum. vi., 1, 2.

We are, my brethren, poor blind creatures at the best—so one-sided, so imperfect, so liable to error, so easily led astray by the pride which apes humility—so apt to be puffed up by the ignorance which tanks itself for knowledge, that we constantly turn into bane what God intended for our richest book, and store the very manna of His love in such earthly vessels of frailty and presumption, that, in our keeping, it breeds worms and grows corrupt; aim hence even God's most holy truths become liable to dreadful perversion. It was so in the first ages, when there were ungodly men who turned the grace of God into lasciviousness. It was so again when Luther, at the Reformation, shook down the hollow structure of lies which men had accepted as their infallible faith. It may be so again, when we open to the despair of the guilty, even in the Valley of Achor, a door of hope, and ask men to take nobler and truer views of God than those which run counter to what the Scriptures tell us of His everlasting mercy—of His purpose in punishment being not to torture, but to redeem—of the day when Christ shall have triumphed forever, "and God shall be all in all.

I did not seek this topic, nor shall I pursue it. It came in the ordinary course of our meditations, and I could not, therefore, but strive to remove thoughts which, as I know, goad some men into recklessness, and into infidelity, and which embitter the hearts of others with a narrow, railing, Pharisaic dogmatism—a religion of cursing and bitterness against all which presumes to differ from itself. But there are deeper reasons for preaching what we believe to be the truth on this dim subject. The virtue which has no better basis than the fear of hell is simply no virtue at all. No virtue is in the least degree virtuous which springs only from a hope of profit, or fear of punishment. Although, for instance, "honesty is the best policy," yet it has been truly said that the man who is honest because it is the best policy is no better than a rogue. Would you think much of one who only did not commit murder because of the hangman, or who was not a scoundrel only from fear of being found out? Fear may cause the enforced obedience of the slave; love alone can win the devotion of the child; and that is why God hath sent to us who know the truth, and whom the truth has made free indeed, not the spirit of fear or of bondage, but the spirit of love and of a pure and of a sound mind. And this love is the sole, eternal basis of holiness. To preach that God willet all men to be saved—that is Gospel truth. To preach that it is not love of Christ, but the fear of hell, which constraineth us—that is (what they call) the soul-destroying error. What was the subject of the teaching of our blessed Lord? Was it "turn or burn," or was it "Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest?" Was it hell-fire that Ho preached to the rejoicing multitudes as He sat among the lilies over the silver lake, or was it the beatitudes of the meek and the merciful, and the message of a father who maketh His sun to shine on the evil and the good, and His rain to fall on the just and on the unjust? I know that He said, with awful solemnity, "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out. If thy hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee. It is better for thee to enter into life blind or maimed, than, having two eyes or two hands, to go into Gehenna—into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched;" and those words I shall strive presently to illustrate. But what childishness it is—childishness of mere vanity and Ignorance—to quote such texts without knowing anything whatever of the laws of their meaning and of their interpretation! It is just as childish as it is to quote the text, "This is My body," as though it were absolutely decisive of the truth of transubstantiation. I claim to speak with at least as much authority as anyone else when I say that there is not one word here about a necessary or an irreversible decree to endless torments at the moment of an impenitent sinner's death. The language of our blessed Lord and Master is no more literal in the second half of the verse than it is in the first. He speaks, as He did deliberately and habitually, in metaphors and parables; and the metaphor meant this awful truth—that the most painful physical agony and the worst physical mutilation is a less anguish and a more preferable loss than that shame and corruption which are the inevitable consequence of sin—the flame and remorse which will always burn so long as sin is practiced the worm of conscience which will always gnaw until sin is forgiven. Such a thought has no affinity with that repulsive and ill-disguised hatred which says, "Believe this, or you will find yourself in a lake of inextinguishable fire." What our Saviour taught—what, thank God, we all of us agree in teaching—is this: resist the evil which is in you, for it is your curse and ruin; and until you have learnt to forsake and hate it, you cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Resist it because God hates it, and because God loves you—because he desires to save you from it, and from its fearful consequences. Resist it, because it was; to seek the lost that our Saviour came, and to redeem the lost that our Saviour died. This is true; that is Divine teaching. So is the All-great, the All-loving true. So through the thunder comes a human voice, saying—

"O heart I made a heart beats here.

Trace my God's passion, see it in myself.

Thou hast no force, nor canst conceive of mine;

But love I gave thee with myself to love.

And thou must love Me who have died for thee."

That, then, my brethren, is the true motive for all holiness—Christ's redemption, God's love. We are dead with Christ unto sin, and we live with God unto holiness; and God created us—not to destroy, not to torment, not to take vengeance on us, but to save, and to save us to the uttermost from sin, from corruption, from that true Gahanna which is not a burning prison, but a polluted heart. Alienation from God, hatred of truth, hatred of purity; a bitter, railing, loveless spirit; mean, base, sensual desires—those are the elements of hell; and as long as any man, be he Pharisee or be he publican, is given to these, so long will he be made to feel with the evil spirit—*"Which way I fly Is hell; myself am hell."*

Hell is a temper, not a place. So long as we are evil and impure and unloving, so long where we are is hell, and where hell is there must we be; and when all the world dissolves, and every creature is purified whom God's love can purify, then all places shall be hell that are not heaven. How long and how far we, in our pride and obduracy and corruption, may harden ourselves, even beyond the grave, against the constraining love of God, we know not, and none knows. But, so long as we continue to harden ourselves, so long it is not God who is kindling for us His avenging tortures; but it is we who, by our own impenitence, are cutting ourselves oil from Him, and destroying and ruining ourselves. But let those men suspect their own hearts and their own purposes to whom this hideous doctrine of endless torture—for hideous it is, even if it be true—is so dear and so precious, and so comfortable that they never seem so happy as when they are denouncing it on others. They bid me tremble. It is not I who tremble. When I stand before the bar of my Maker, a humble, weeping, penitent sinner; when I cry that my sins may be covered with the white robe of my Saviour's merits as the snow falls upon a miry world; when I admit before Him, with shame and sorrow, that my very tears want washing and my repentance needs to be repented of, yet not on this account shall I ever fear. Man may denounce; Eliphaz, the Temanite; and Bildad, the Shuhite; and Zophar, the Naamathite, may all join in denouncing; but Thou, O Father, wilt not be angry with Thy child because he thought, and tried to lead others to think, just and noble things of Thee I And Thou, O Saviour, wilt not frown at him because he trusted in the infinitude of Thy compassion. And Thou, O Holy Spirit, whoso image is the soft stealing of the dove and the soft blowing of the wind—Thou wilt know that if he erred, it was because he would not fix his eyes upon the glaring and baleful meteors of an anathematising orthodoxy, but rather upon the Star of Bethlehem, and upon those clouds that even now begin to shine about the coming of the Lord. Thou wilt know that if led astray, the light that led astray was light from heaven. No, it is not I who tremble. Let the zeal of a damnatory religion tremble. Let them tremble who would turn the Gospel of salvation for most men into a threat of doom. Let those tremble who are distressed at the thought which sees room for hope for the miserable and guilty beyond the grave. If indeed they be in the right, still their tenet is so terrible that it should be only spoken with the mouth in to do dust. It should be uttered only with tears and with trembling pity—with bated breath; for if there be one thing which He must loathe whose name is Love, in is the hallelujah of exulting anathemas, of the thinly-disguised hatred, which rages in so fierce an ignorance against a trusting mercy founded only on these two broad, Scriptural doctrine?, which they profess to hold so dear—the doctrine of (Jurists infinite redemption; the doctrine of God's boundless love.

But I have said all that it seems my duty to say on this subject. I thank God from my heart that what I believe to be His truth, taught in His Word, confirmed by His Spirit, has been a source of relief and comfort to thousands of honest and noble hearts in England, and I do not think it necessary to enter on the endless take of repudiating misrepresentations, or deigning to notice mere abuse. My subject today will be a very different one. I visit to day to take away all excuse from those who, on the grounds of a possible hope beyond the grave, would wish to make light of sin; and, therefore, my brethren, and above all, you who are young and ignorant, I earnestly seek your whole attention while I bid you beware how you wrest God's mercy to your own ruin. Have any of you said, "Because we may never cease to hope, therefore we may go on in sin"? Ah ! if you have said that you must indeed be in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity from which it is very clear that no dread of an endless hell has saved you yet. "Let us continue in sin that grace may abound," said some in St. Paul's day. Dare you say it! Dare any of you turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, or count the blood of the covenant, whereby you were sanctified, an unholy thing; or say, "Because God loves me, therefore I will do that which He hates. Because Christ died for me, therefore unblushingly I will crucify Him afresh, and put Him to an open shame. Because it is His long-sundering which calls me to repentance, therefore He shall wait my time"? My brethren, there are two kinds of sin—willful sin, and willing sin. Willful sin is that into which—because of the frailty of our nature, because of the strength of passion and temptation, not loving but loathing it, not seeking but resisting it, not acquiescing in, but fighting and struggling against it—we all sometimes fall. This is the struggle in which God's Spirit strived with our spirits, and out of which we humbly

believe and hope that God will, at the last, grant unto U3 victory and forgiveness. But there is another kind of sin, far deadlier, far more heinous, far more incurable; it is willing sin. It is when we are content with sin, when we have sold ourselves under sin—when we no longer fight against sin—when we mean to continue in sin. This is the darkest, lowest, deadliest, most irredeemable level of sin; and it is well that the foolish soul should know that on it, if it has sunk to this, there has been already executed, and self-executed, the dread mandate, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." By that curse was not meant a physical but a spiritual death, and such a soul is dead—morally dead—spiritually dead; and such a man is a ghost far more awful than the soul which was once in a dead body, for he is a body bearing about with him a dead soul. Better—far, far better—for him to have cut off the right hand, or plucked out the right eye, than to have been cast, as he has been cast now in his lifetime, and as he must be cast hereafter, until he repent, into that Gehenna of *eternal* fire. It shall purify him—God grant it; but it shall aconite, because he has made himself, in fact, incapable of any other redemption. So that if any of you have thought in your hearts that God is even such an one as yourselves, that you may break with impunity God's awful commandments, that you may indulge with impunity one evil. Just, then recall in your hearts the warning of the first lesson of this morning—"Walk in the ways of thine heart and in the light of thine eyes; but know thou that, for all these things, God shall bring thee into judgment."

For first, my brethren, let us all learn this fact—that the consequences of sin are inevitable; in fact, that punishment is the extreme consequence of sin going on unchecked. There is in human nature—we all know it—an element of the gambler. There is a willingness to take the chances of things—a willingness to run a risk, however uncertain. There is no such element here. The punishment of sin is certain. All Scriptures tell us so. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "Be sure you're in shall find you out." "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished." "The way of transgressors is hard." All the world's proverbs tell us so. "A reckless youth; rueful age." "As he has made his bed, so he must lie in it." "He who will not be ruled by the rudder, must be ruled by the rock." Even Satan himself tells us so. In the old legend of Dr. Faustus, when he bids the devil lay aside his propensity for lying, and tell the truth, the devil answers, "The world does me injustice to tax me with lies. Let me ask their own conscience if I have ever deceived a single man into believing that a bad deed was a *good* one." Even wicked men admit it. They would gladly preach, if they could, that sin is a soft infirmity of the blood, not to be too severely visited; but the facts are too fatally against them, and those facts say, with unmistakable voice, "If any man destroy the temple of God, him shall God destroy." So that you see, my brethren, on the testimony alike of the deceiver and the deceived, that the punishment is, from the first, inevitable.

And then notice, secondly, that it is impartial. There is a form of self-deception common to us all, and especially in youth, by which we admit the general law, but try to shirk its personal, its individual, application. It is the old, old story of Eden over and over again in the case of every one of us—the serpent creeping up to us, all glitter and fascination—all dulcet whisper and sinuous lies, and saying to us, "See how fair the fruit is—how much to be desired. Be as God, knowing good and evil, Thou shalt not surely die." And so the boy and the youth—aye, and in his folly, the grown man, too, believes that it shall not be so with him; that he will repent; that he is the darling of Providence; that he is the favourite of heaven—he the one who shall sin and shall not suffer. If others handle pitch they shall be defiled. If others take fire into their bosoms they shall be burnt; but God will indulge him. And the very spirits of evil laugh at each one going as an ox to the slaughter, when they dupe him into the fancy that, out of special regard for him, that adamant chain of moral gravitation, more lasting and binding than that by which the stars are held in their spheres, will be snapped; that sin, for him only, will change its nature, and at his approach the Gehenna of punishment be transformed into a garden of delight. Is it so my brethren? Has there ever been any human being yet, since time began—however noble, however beautiful, however gifted, however bright with genius or radiant with fascination—who has signed with impunity? Ah no! God is a respecter of persons. Fire burns and water drowns, whether the sufferer is a worthless villain or whether it be a fair and gentle child. And so the moral law works, whether the sinner be a David or a Judas, whether he be a publican or a priest. In the physical world there is no forgiveness of sins. Sin and punishment, as Plato said, walk this world with their hands tied together, and the rivet by which they are linked is as a link of adamant. A writer has said that a man who cannot swim might as well walk into a river and hope that it is not a river, and will not drown, a man, seeing judgment, and not mercy, as denounced upon willing sin, hope that it will turn out to be mercy and not judgment, and so defy God's law. Will he escape? No. He who chooses sin must meet with retribution; must experience in his own individual person the *lex talionis* of offended nature—eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

You see, then, that the punishment of sin is inevitable, and that it is impartial. And now, why is it so? It is because the punishment of sin is not an arbitrary infliction, but it is a necessary law. I do not mean that God never directly interferes; He does. We see it daily in the history of crime. We see in the strange detections, in providential accidents, in the fatuations of penal stupidity which fall upon able men when they are bent on the

concealment of their wickedness. There is this interference. But, setting aside these obvious visitations, in which God's terrible and fiery finger shrivels the falsehoods from the souls of men, there is also besides this, generally, a dreadful resemblance which shews that penalty is not a direct interference, but a genuine child of the transgression. We receive the things that we have done. There is a dreadful coercion in our own iniquities. There is an inevitable congruity between the deed and its consequences. There is an awful germ of identity in the seed and in the fruit. We recognise the sown wind when we are raping the harvest whirlwind. We feel that it is we who have winged the very arrows that cat into our hearts like tire. It needs no gathered lightings—no Divine intervention—no miraculous messenger to avenge in us God's violated laws; they avenge themselves. You may laugh at Bibles, as many do; you may sneer at clergymen, as many do; you may keep away from churches, as many do; no penitence and no confessional; no priest ordains it; yet you are forced to sit amid the deep ashes of your mind years; and you will see coming after you with leaden footstep, with gathered force, and towering over you, and smiting you with the iron hand of its own revenge, the figure of your own past sin. I cannot pretend to work out the whole of this sacred Nemesis, or to read for you, on the wall of guilty hearts, this "MENE, MENEI, TEKEL, PERES," of reddening doom. It would need the voice which the sore of the Apocalypse heard cry aloud, "Woe to the inhabitants of earth;" but no one shall say that ye were not forewarned. No one shall shield himself under the plea that sin was robbed for him of one single element of its true awfulness. I will tell you of one or two ways in which God's love, if it avail not, roust then find terrors, which leave us in doubt as to what He hates. Sleep through it if you will, but at least let me try for a few moments to accentuate for you a syllable or two of that voice behind us, saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it," when we turn aside to the right hand or to the left.

Well, then, my brethren, take disease as one form of the working of this inevitable law—not always, of course, the direct result of sin; yet how much of disease is directly due to dirt, neglect, folly, ignorance—the infected blood, the inherited instincts of this sad world. But are there not some diseases, and those the most terrible which I have known, which do spring directly, immediately, exclusively, solely, from violence of God's law? Is not madness very often such a disease? Is there not at this moment many a degraded lunatic who never would have been such but for repeated transgressions of God's known will? Is there not in the very life blood of millions an hereditary taint blighting the healthy, poisoning, as with a fury's breath, the flower of their happiness, and breaking out afresh in new generations, which has its sole source and origin in uncleanness? La there not, too, an executioner of justice which God has toll off to wait upon drunkenness, which would cease if drunkenness ceased to exist? It is God's warning against that fearful intemperance against which senates will not fight, and against which they who love their fellows fight as yet in vain. Have you ever seen—if not, may you never see—a young man suffering from *delirium tremens*? Such as not even Dante ever imagined are the horrors that await upon him—the blood-red suffusion before the eyes quenched in sudden darkness—the myriads of burning, whirling rings of concentric lire—the millions of foul insects which seem to be weaving their damp, soft web about his face—the hideous, ever-changing visages which look upon him—the eyes which glare from wall and roof—the feeling as if the man were falling, falling, falling endlessly into a fathomless abyss. Why is all this? Because God inflicts it on man? No; but because man instincts it on himself, and because God, who loves us, wishing us to see how drunkenness blasts and scathes and debases and embraces, in order to save men all this horrible stain and agony and shame, has attached this law to the abuse of intoxicating liquors, as He has attached to lire a law that it should burn. Does God interfere? No; but He says, "Oh, My son whom I have made, this is the goal to which intemperance will lead thee. As thou lovest me, as thou lovest thine own soul, cut off the right hand; pluck out the right eye. It was better, far better, for there to enter into life blind or maimed, than to cast thyself into this Gehenna of *eternal* fire—this depth of shame and of corruption, where the worm of the drunkard dieth not, and his lire is not quenched."

Or, take one, not of the physical, but of the moral workings of this law of punishment. Head another syllable of this handwriting upon the wall. Take fear, for instance. You have all heard of haunted houses. Have you ever heard of haunted men? Are there not, perhaps, some here who may be groaning under the burden of an undetected sin? If so, will they not recognise themselves as suffering under this Nemesis of Fear? There are some sins which are open, going before to judgment, marshalling men in undisguised array before the Throne; but there are some which follow j after. There are men everywhere, and there I are, probably, men here at this moment. Who, as they walk through life, hear footsteps behind them—for whom the earth is made of glass—on whom the stars seem to look down as spies—men whose pulses shake at every sudden ringing of their bell; whose faces blanch if they are suddenly. Addressed; who tremble if a steady gaze be fixed upon them. Have not such men, subject to the dismay and the weakness to which sin has reduced them, thousands of times betrayed themselves by their own unreasonable fears, and by imagining that their sin was being spoken of when something quite different was being spoken of? I think, it is the ancient writer plutarch who, in a remarkable pamphlet on the delayed vengeance of the Deity, tells us of a youth who, on being reproached for his cruelty in fiercely wringing the necks of some young birds, exclaimed, and revealed, by exclaiming, his own hideous

crime, "It was their own fault. Why did they keep twittering at me 'Parricide! Parricide?'" Take the life even of David after he had sent that fatal letter to Joab about Uriah. Do you ever think he had a moment's peace afterwards? Was not his own servant his master because he knew his guilty secret? And if there be one here who has done deeds which he would give worlds to have undone; about his roof is heard the flapping of unclean wings; who never again in this world shall sleep the sleep of the innocent; for whom the furies have taken their seats upon the midnight pillow; on whose breast, through the dark hours, ill dreams ride heavily in the shape of their deadliest sin,—will they tell you that they were lucky not to have been caught?—happy in that they were not found out?—fortunate in that no stroke of detection or punishment arrested them before fruition or in mid career? Achan concealed hi? theft—never spent his wedge of gold—never wore his Babylonish garment; yet when discovery crept nearer and nearer to him, and at last touched him—when the lot fell, and the tribe of Judah was taken; and the lot fell again, and the family of the Zarbites was taken; and the lot fell again, and the household of Zabdi was taken; and the lot fell once more, and Achan, the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zebra, of the house of Judah was taken, and he was stoned and burnt, he and his family with the accursed stolen thing, in the valley of Anchor, did not Joshua indicate to him that detection might be a most blessed thing? Did he not, as I have done, open for the exposed criminal, even in the valley of Anchor, a door of hope, when he said to him, "My son, give, I pray thee, the glory to God, and tell me now what thou hast done. Hide it not from me?" And would not Achan, too, have cause to say that minds which verily repent are pardoned with impunity, and comforted without chastisement?

*"That punishment's the best to bear.
That follows soonest on the sin;
And guilt's gain where losers fare
Butter than those who seem to win"*

But you will say that there is many a sin whose commission involves no great fear. Yes, truly; but if the soul have any life left in it, when it is touched by one ray out of God's eternity, the shame and the agonizing loss of worth and self loathing come withal. When our first parents ate the fruit, then their eyes Wore miserably opened, and things which, as a veil, had shaded from knowing ill, had gone—chaste native righteousness, and honour—all about them naked—left to guilty shame. O, my brethren, have none of you, even, it may be, very early, felt the working of this part of the law? Is there any one of you, who, for one half hour, has been utterly, miserably, deplorably ashamed of himself? If so, he knows what it is to have been in that Gahanna of *eoneon* fire of which his Saviour speaks. It is the glare of illumination which conscience flings over the soul after a deed of darkness. It is the revulsion of feeling, on which we did not calculate when we had done with the sin and which shows that the sin has by no means done with us. It is the little grain of conscience within the very worst of us, which makes forbidden pleasures sour. It is the fact that none of us can be quite wicked enough really to enjoy iniquity. It is the aching crave, after the brief intoxication. It is the deadly apple shriveling into hideousness the moment it has been tasted. It is the horror of the murderer when his first rage of vengeance has been spent, and the cold grey dawn reveals the face of his murdered victim. It is the waking of the famished wretch who has dreamt of food and water; and he wakes, and lo ! he is sick of hunger and scorched with thirst. It is the cry of ten thousand biographies of Janos who have sinned :—

*When I received this volume small.
My years were barely seventeen.
When it was hoped I might be that
Which once, alas! I might have been.
And now my years are thirty five.
And every mother hopes her lamb.
And every happy child alive,
May never be what now I am."*

So, my brethren, you see—the very youngest of you—that if you choose sin, you must have sin your companion—sin in her own hideous presence, and with her, the death that ever dogs her footsteps. I cannot even pretend to show you all the workings of that inevitable, that impartial law which we, in our loneliness and alienation, call the heavy wrath of God. It is but as if I plucked one leaf, and asked you to look at it as a specimen of the boundless forest. It is as if I showed you one little wave, and told you that a whole ocean was behind. But I will only ask you to glance for one moment at one more feature of the law. There shall be, let us

suppose, this time no intervention, no sickness, no detection, no shame even, no fear, no outward and visible punishment of any kind. Conscience shall for a time be dead; life shall for years be prosperous. Does sin escape then ? Is the sinner happy then ? Ah, no; he is worse of then. "*Nulla pœna, quanta pœna*"—no punishment, how terrible a punishment. It is God's worst, severest punishment. "Ephraim is joined to idols." What then ? Arrest him with the punishment which we should give to some dear and pleasant child—make him sick with smiting him into repentance? No, worse than that. "Let him alone." Blind his eyes; put the scourge in his own hands. Let him sow to his confusion; let sin be the deadliest executioner—the most merciless avenger of sin. Let the acute pang become the chronic malady. Let the thought become the wish, and the wish the act, and the act the habit. Let the solitary become the frequent, and the frequent the habitual, and the habitual the all but necessary—the all but inevitable—transgression. Let sin, let crime overtake him. Let hatred become murder; let ambition become conspiracy; let greed become theft and swindling; let lust become some deadly impurity. Ah, when God sends forth a besetting sin, a guilty habit, to be its executioner, the case is most awful and most hopeless then, and God only, by Christ's redemption, can save from that body of death.

My brethren, will you now say, "I will go on in sin, and it does not matter"? Most terribly, most awfully, it does matter. You may be saved indeed, at last, if God will save, not from Him and from His wrath, but from yourself and your own self-destruction; but even then there is a sense in which it is awfully true that our millenniums may depend upon our moments; and though God's infinite love may be able to save you, yet, alas, it may be only as a brand is plucked, half-consumed, out of the burning—as a shepherd tears out of the mouth of a lion two legs and the piece of an ear. Do not think that repentance is easy, and do be sure that the longer repentance is delayed, I lie less easy it is, and the more terrible are the consequences of that delay. That spotless child sleeps on the flowering moss. It is well for him that a guilty man, envying such slumber, should desire to put his quilt away. Can he return to rest at once by lying there ? Our sires knew well the fitting course for such—dark cells, dim lamps, a stone floor, where they might writhe like a worm; no mossy pillow, blue with violets. The path of repentance may never be closed to us, and so, I believe, the Catholic Church of Christ has in most ages taught; but oh, how hard the path of repentances ! over what hard flints ! through what a scorch of fiery waves ! through what deep shame I what dread corruption ! pain of body ! misery and remorse I agony of soul. Were it not better, as our Lord said, to cut off the right hand, and to pluck out the right eye, than to go, of our own choice, into that Gehenna of *eoncon* fire, here and hereafter, such as I believe Christ Himself, and such as I have now in part only, in shadow and in outline, tried to describe for you ? God is indeed the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and of great mercy; forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and yet by no means clearing the guilty. Why ? Because He loves us not ? Not so, for God's severity is all love; but because sin is the one deadly enemy which He must destroy in us, lest it destroy us, and we, with it, destroy ourselves. As you will hear in one moment, set to very noble music, because God punishes us, the greatness of His mercy reached unto the heavens, and His truth unto the clouds.

Victorian Convention Resolutions, Proceedings, and Documents of the Victorian Convention,
Assembled in Melbourne, July 15 to August 6, 1857. Price Sixpence.

Melbourne: Published for the council of the convention by. J. J. Walsh, 239 Elizabeth Street,
Melbourne. 1857

THE COUNCIL of the CONVENTION have thought it well to publish, in the present shape, the Resolutions adopted by the Convention, together with a few papers which were considered of sufficient interest to be entered on the minutes of that Assembly: in order that the members of the several Land and Reform Leagues throughout the colony, associated with the Convention, may have these documents in a convenient form, and without the trouble of searching for them through newspapers.

Contents.

Victorian Convention.

Resolutions, &c.

Calling of the Convention.

THE following was the first paper issued suggesting the calling of the Convention. It met with a response of general approbation from all the parties to whom it was addressed:—

239 Elizabeth street, Melbourne,

20th June, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—As the danger of the Public Lands being handed over, in perpetuity, to the present occupants is imminent—the Bill for that purpose having passed its second reading—I am requested by the Committee of the VICTORIA LAND LEAGUE respectfully to ask your opinion and advice on the desirableness and practicability of holding, on an early day, in Melbourne, or some central place, a Congregational Assembly of Delegates chosen from every district and town in the colony, to deliberate and determine some plan of united action, by which this impending calamity may be averted, and immediate steps taken to adjust, on a comprehensive, liberal, and equitable basis, the all-important question of the Land, both as it regards the miner, the agriculturist, and the squatter.

I beg to assure you that any suggestions you may kindly offer will be duly appreciated and acknowledged by the Committee of the League. An early answer will oblige.

I have the honor to be, dear sir, your most obedient servant.

J. J. Walsh, Hon. Sec.

To _____

The following requisition was afterwards published in the public papers:—

Convention of Delegates.

The various districts and towns throughout Victoria are respectfully invited to elect Delegates to meet in Congress, in Melbourne, on 15th July, to deliberate and determine a plan of united action, by which the Land Bill now before the Legislature may be defeated; and steps taken to adjust, on a broad, liberal, and equitable basis, the all-important question of the Public Lands, as regards the miner, the agriculturist, and the squatter.

By order of the Committee of the Victoria Land League,

Melbourne,

22nd June, 1857.

J. J. Walsh, Hon. Sec.

Several letters having been received making inquiries, among other matters, as to the principles on which the Convention was expected to assemble, and whether it was to be considered as adhering to the views of the Land League, the following circular was forwarded in reply to the letters, and sent generally to all parties to whom the first circular had been addressed :—

239 Elizabeth street, Melbourne,

1st July, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—By desire of the Committee of the Land League, I have the honor to acquaint you that Wednesday, the 15th of July, has been fixed for the Delegates to meet in Convention in Melbourne; the place of meeting to be the Long Room of Kelley's Australasian Hotel, Lonsdale street; the hour, 6 o'clock p.m.

I beg to draw your particular attention to the necessity of having your district adequately represented on this occasion : and, with that view, I would most respectfully ask you to exert your influence in getting the people together with as little delay as possible, and urging the necessity of immediate action.

The Committee decline to assign any number of Delegates to any town or district: they prefer to leave this to the judgment and discretion of the residents themselves. It would, however, be exceedingly desirable that as influential a body as possible be deputed to join in the Convention.

We have received several letters inquiring whether the Conference is to be considered as connected with and adhering to the Land League. We beg to say that we do not consider that any Delegate who attends the meeting is bound to any principles, but to represent the opinions and sympathies of his district. The object of the meeting is to gather and concentrate the opinion of the country; to defeat the present Land Bill; and to

originate such a scheme as will be acceptable to the people and may fitly embody the future Land policy of the colony.

At the same time we wish respectfully to impress upon you that the country has already suffered deeply from vague ideas; and that the use of mere general expressions has opened wide the gate to political falsehood and betrayal. All our present members have been returned on the promise of a "liberal and comprehensive" land policy. We submit that what we now want is an "explicit and intelligible" policy, and that the members of the present Convention should be sent forward on principles sufficiently definite to shape a well-defined and decided scheme that the country shall demand as one man.

There are certain leading principles that will be brought for discussion before the Convention. They are already more or less familiar to the public mind. The Committee hope that they will be tested, and made the subject of discussion in the several districts, and that the delegates will come prepared to represent the opinion of the districts upon them. We beg to suggest the following principles for consideration:—

AS REGARDS THE AGRICULTURAL SETTLEMENT OF THE COLONY we beg leave to submit—

- That the actual cultivator should be allowed to select for himself, to the extent of a moderate-sized farm, the lands best suited to his purpose, wherever they may be found unalienated in the colony. We recognize the fact that some lands in the neighborhood of towns and settlements have already been so long withheld from sale that they have acquired an exceptional value, and will need to be specially dealt with; but for the general lands of the country, we submit that it is equally opposed to the interests of the individual and the interests of the State that the industry of the people should be directed to inferior lands while superior binds remain untitled.
- We submit that the actual cultivator should be enabled to enter upon his land the moment he has selected it, at a known uniform price, without auction. We submit that the auction system should be retained merely as a means of determining a preference when capitalist competes with capitalist.

AS REGARDS THE UNALIENATED GRASS LANDS OF THE COLONY, we submit—

That these should not be subject to any exclusive occupation. We submit that the best use that can be made of them, for the benefit of all, is have them open to all, as the gold fields are.

We hope that this latter point will engage the especial attention of the Delegates. This Committee begs respectfully to state that they are unanimously of opinion that there can be no effective land reform as long as the unalienated lands are the subject of any EXCLUSIVE OCCUPATION for pastoral purposes.

We believe that the opinion of the country is unanimous that the present system of squatting should not be permitted to endure. But ANOTHER QUESTION will be submitted to the Convention;—it is this: Ought another system of squatting be permitted to like its place that shall differ from it only in this, that the runs shall be let by auction, and the number of the runs be increased by breaking up some of the present larger ones. The doctrine begins to be mooted that this should form part of a liberal land scheme. The Convention will have to pronounce upon this question. We submit it respectfully now as the opinion of this Committee, that this suggestion should RECEIVE NO COUNTENANCE from the people; that to exchange 700 squatters, with runs averaging 60,000 acres each, for 1000 squatters, with runs averaging 10,000 acres each, would be to make our last state worse than our first. If an army of occupation, 700 strong, has been found difficult to dislodge, we submit that the country would have little chance in attempting to cope with an army 4000 strong.

As grass lands merely, we submit that the country should no more rent out its grass fields than its gold fields. But the unalienated Crown lands are more than mere grass fields; they are the fields for the future settlement of a population. Unless these lands REMAIN OPEN for the choice of the settler as long as they are unalienated, there can be NO FREE SETTLEMENT. If an exclusive grazing occupation is permitted to precede settlement, then the public must stand outside the fence, as now, until it is the pleasure of the Government Board, dominated as it will be by squatter influence, from time to time to go in and cut them a slice.

It is said that a large revenue could be realized by letting the runs by auction; but we submit that this should form no consideration to induce the people of the colony to perpetuate squatting in this shape. In this respect there is no parallelism between an individual proprietor and a State. An individual can make a revenue from his lands only by letting them; a State makes revenue out of its lands by settling them. If settlement is discouraged, every pound of RENT gained is several pounds of REVENUE lost: to a State, therefore, rent should not constitute even a temptation to thus obstructing the industry of its citizens.

We have dwelt thus long upon this idea—the introducing a new race of squatters by letting the unalienated Crown Lands by auction—because we believe it to be a coming danger, and one that ought to be forestalled by the Convention.

We do not pretend to enumerate all the subjects that are likely to be brought for discussion before the Convention, but we have been anxious to bring these leading topics early to your notice, that you might afford us the advantage of having them discussed in your neighborhood, and that your Delegates might come prepared to speak with confidence the opinion of the district they represent.

We ask, then, your particular attention to these points:—

- *Free selection for the actual settler at one uniform price, without auction.*
- *All unalienated Crown Lauds to constitute an open country of pasturage, free to the people.*
- *No new pastoral tenancies to be created when the lands are resumed from the present tenants.*

The further topics of PRE-EMPTIVE RIGHT, UPSET PRICE, TAXATION OF ALL PURCHASED LAND, &c., &c, we cannot touch within the compass of a circular.

I have the honor to be, dear Sir, your obedient servant,

J. J. Walsh, Hon. Sec.

Meeting of the Convention.

On the evening of the 15th of July, accordingly, a large number of Delegates, who had been appointed at public meetings in various districts of the colony, as-assembled in the Long Room of Keel's Parliamentary Hotel, Melbourne. On this, first evening, sixty-seven Delegates were present. This number was within a few days increased to eighty-eight.

The following are the names of the eighty-eight who ultimately assembled, and the places which they represented :

Names of Delegates.

- BALLARAT—Alfred Arthur O'Connor, Member of Local Court
- John Yates, Do.
- Duncan Gillies. Do.
- John Cathie
- BENDIGO—Robert Benson
- G. E. Thomson
- BEECHWORTH—R. F. Smyth, Member Local Court
- BACCHUS MARSH—James Watt
- Henry James
- James Crooke
- BRIGHTON—J. H. Thompson
- John Houston
- CASTLEMAINE—Michael Prendergast, Chairman of Municipal Council
- Dr. Davies
- William Hitchcock, Member of Municipal Council
- COLLINGWOOD—James Galloway
- J. R. Gibson
- James Cattach
- James Thomson Macminn
- Henry D. Riley
- John Harrison
- Pierce Joseph Murphy
- John Westhorpe
- COLAC—Joseph S. Miskin
- CARISBROOK—L. Laskie
- —Richardson
- DUNOLLY—W. H. Winfield, Member of Local Court
- Francis Quinlan
- EMERALD HILL—William H. Short
- Robt. Mills
- Allan Leitch
- FRYER'S CREEK—Samuel Scotson, Member of Local Court
- GEELONG—Thos. William
- William Clarson
- Theodore Hancock, Member of the Legislative Assembly.
- George Craib
- Henry Fyfe

- GISBORNE—J. Morris
- HEATHCOTE—James R. Sloane, Member of the Local Court
- HEIDLEBERG—D. A. McGregor, M.D.
- Robt. Pridham
- KYNETON—Archibald Chisholm
- Benjamin Kenworthy
- MELBOURNE—John Hood, Member of the Legislative Council
- Thomas Loader
- C. J. Don
- Wilson Gray, Barrister-at-Law
- J. J. Walsh
- Sir George Stephen, Barrister-at-Law
- Benjamin H. Dods
- Michael Keeley, City Councillor
- Peter Sherwin
- James Warman
- Henry Hayden
- John Patterson
- James Doyle
- Stephen Donovan, City Councillor
- NORTH MELBOURNE—Frederick Calvert
- William Richardson
- Robert Hayes
- Francis Strickland
- William Strickland
- MOUNT BLACKWOOD—Frederick H. James, Member of Local Court.
- J. B. Garland
- NINE-MILE, OVENS—George W. Kennedy
- PRAHBAN—J. B. Crews, Member of the Municipal Council
- William J. O'Hea
- George M'Kay, L.L.D., Barrister-at-Law
- RICHMOND—Christopher Cutter
- G.H. Batten
- Henry Johnson. Member of the Municipal Council
- Philip Johnson, Do.
- ST. KILDA—F. Spicer, Member of the Municipal Council
- A. E. Sutherland, Do.
- F. Quoin
- —Woolcott
- T. Hales, Member of the Municipal Council
- SEYMOUR—Peter Tiernan
- SOUTH BOURKE—Robert Hepburn
- T. Brooke
- H. Johnston
- SEBASTOPOL.—Thomas Mooney
- TARRANGOWER—John Ramsay, Member of the Local Court
- Thomas Gainford, Do.
- TEMPLESTOWE—William Malcolm
- WILLIAMSTOWN—M. Verdon, Chairman of Municipal Council
- William Whyte
- WOOLSHED, OVENS—John Strickland
- WANGARATTA—Henry Parfitt

On this first evening, Thomas Loader, Esq., as Chairman of the Committee of the Land League, the body which had been instrumental in calling the assembly together, took the Chair as preliminary to the inauguration of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that the meeting, for the present, would be considered as a Committee of the Land League. As Chairman of that Committee, he would lay before it a short report. The Committee would then disappear, and leave the Convention to organize itself, and shape its own proceedings.

The Chairman then read the following report :—

To the Delegates appointed by the several districts of Victoria to assemble in Convention at, Melbourne, on the 15th July, 1857.

GENTLEMEN,—The present Convention has been specially called into existence by the following advertisement and circular letter issued by direction of the Central Committee of the Victoria Land League.

[The circular and advertisement will be found above.]

The Committee of the Land League rejoice in their pleasant duty of receiving you upon this occasions, and unite in offering to you. Gentlemen Delegates, a hearty welcome to the city of Melbourne; and, further, respectfully tender their great admiration and satisfaction at the noble, unanimous, and energetic manner in which your several districts responded to the call from the Land League; and to you, Gentlemen, in particular, for your patriotic conduct in placing yourselves so punctually in personal communication with the League.

The Committee will furnish you with a short report of their past proceedings, preparatory to committing to your consideration the vast interests of the people in the public lands of Victoria.

The Land League, during the past eight months, has been acting within the immediate reach of a very large proportion of the population of the colony; and having communicated with, and endeavored to ascertain, as far as possible, the views of that population, the Committee have taken the liberty of inviting the several districts of the colony to send Delegates to Melbourne, in order that the judgment of the country might be pronounced upon the Land Bill which is now before the House of Assembly; and, also, that the opinions of the country might be collected, for the purpose of framing the outline of a Bill which would embody the experience and desires, and satisfy the rightful expectations, of the colonists in general.

The Committee, without presuming to do more than suggest, respectfully solicit the attention of the Convention to the principles which are advocated by the Victoria Land League.

The Committee, in conclusion, would suggest that the Convention should at once petition the House of Assembly to stay the further progress of the Land Bill now before the House, until the people are fairly represented in the Assembly.

Wishing you, Gentlemen, every success in your noble and most important mission,

We have the honor to remain, &c.,

Thomas Loader, Chairman.

One of the Delegates inquired whether it was understood that the Delegates came pledged to the principles of the Land League.

The CHAIRMAN said the Delegates came pledged to no principles, save as they might have pledged themselves to the districts from which they were delegated. He would now vacate the Chair, and this would become a meeting of the Convention.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY WINGFIELD, one of the Delegates from Donnelly, was then called to the Chair, and the Convention was declared opened. Mr. J. J. WALSH was appointed Secretary *pro tem*.

At this meeting the Convention organized itself in the following manner. It was resolved that it should meet in Committee of the whole every forenoon, at eleven o'clock, when all the business, to be afterwards presented to the Convention in its evening session, should be prepared : and, that the Convention should meet in session at seven o'clock each evening, to discuss and decide upon this business in full Convention.

Before the Convention separated this evening, the following resolution was submitted by Sir GEORGE STEPHEN, and unanimously adopted:—

That this meeting of Delegates represent the opinion of an immense majority of the inhabitants of the colony, and that such opinion is, that the Land Bill now before the House of Assembly is, in every respect, adverse to the best interests of the colony, and is so erroneous in principle that it is incapable of any amendment, so as to satisfy the just expectation of the colony; and, therefore, it must be at once and for ever abandoned.

On the next forenoon, Thursday, the Convention, at its meeting in Committee of the whole, elected the following gentlemen, whose names should be submitted to the full session to be officers of the Convention : Wilson Gray, Esq., as President; Sir George Stephen, and Michael Prendergast, Esq., as Vice-Presidents; Thomas Loader, Esq., and Michael Keeley, Esq., as Treasurers; and J. J. Walsh, Esq., as Honorary Secretary. These names were subsequently approved of by the full Convention.

It was also determined that the business of the first two evenings should be to call upon all the Delegates to express the opinion of their respective districts on the subject of the Land Bill then before Parliament—and the principles proper to be embodied in such a bill as would meet the wants and wishes of the people of the colony. And it was resolved; that the Convention should afterwards adopt a series of resolutions in accordance with the opinions then expressed, and embodying the principles on which a land law suited to the colony should be framed.

Opinions of the Districts.

Two evenings were accordingly spent in receiving the opinions of the Delegates.

Some of the Delegates came entrusted with resolutions expressing the views of their districts. A few of these will indicate the opinions which predominated in these districts. The Delegates from Ballaarta presented the following credentials:—

To all whom it may Concern.

The people of Ballaarat, in public meeting assembled, at the Victoria Theatae, on Saturday, the eleventh day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and lefty-seven, agreed to the following resolutions:—

RESOLVED—That the Victorian Crown lands are the property of the people, and that in order to secure the peace and future prosperity of the country, the following principles should form the basis of future legislation:—

1st. That the actual cultivator should be allowed to select tor himself a moderate-sized farm, 300 acres being the maximum, at the uniform price of one pound per acre, without auction.

2nd. That the actual cultivator should be enabled to enter upon his farm on payment of a deposit of ten per cent, on the purchase-money, the payment of the balance to extend over a period of five years—10 percent, the first year, and 90 per cent, the second, and each succeeding year, till the amount of the purchase-money is paid up.

3rd. That all lands in existing towns and their neighborhood which have obtained an exceptionable value should be specially dealt with, and not subject to the above conditions.

4th That all unalienated Crown lands should constitute an open country for pasturage, free to the people, and that the present system of squatting is unjust in principle, oppressive in practice, and opposed to the progress of the colony.

5th. That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is the duty of the Government to resume the Crown lands of the country from the pastoral tenants, and that, in no case, should any new tenancies be created when these lands are resumed filth.

6th. That all the gold fields of the colony, as well as all the known auriferous lands in their neighborhood, should be reserved from sale.

AND FURTHER—

That four Delegates be sent to attend the Melbourne Conference, and that a subscription be at once opened to defray the expenses of the delegation.

That the resolutions passed at this meeting be signed by the Chairman, and submitted to the Delegates for their guidance at the Melbourne Conference, to be held on the 15th instant.

And I hereby certify, that—

JOHN YATES, Member of the Local Court of Ballaarat,

ALFRED ARTHUR O'CONNOR, Member of the Local Court of Ballaarat,

DUNCAN GILLIES, Member of the Local Court of Ballaarat,

JOHN CATHIE, Merchant of Ballaarat,

Are declared by me to be duly elected as Delegates to represent Ballaarat at the National Congrass to be held at Melbourne.

JOSEPH HENRY DUNNE,

Chairman of the Meeting, Ballaarat.

Dated this 11th day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven.

Mr. Strickland, from the Ovens, presented the following solutions, adopted in his district:—

1st. That it is the opinion of this meeting that a bill for facilitating the selecting and settlement of the public lands should be passed as quickly as possible, but that they are of opinion that the proposed bill of the Government would be injurious to the interests of a large majority of the community, and will retard the progress of the colony.

2nd. That it is the opinion of this meeting, that, should the Government adopt the unwise policy of forcing these objectionable bills upon the country, it will be utterly impossible to carry them into operation, from their injurious tendency, and the general spirit of opposition manifested to them on the gold-fields.

3rd. That this meeting is of opinion that our delegate shall represent to the Melbourne Convention that 10s. per acre should be fixed as the upset price for all unalienated land. That the land should be open to free selection, at the upset price. Should any dispute arise as to who is the first occupant, it should be settled by four assessors. That the present system of squatting should be entirely abolished, and all unalienated lands should be open to all.

That the unalienated Crown Lands of the colony be open to the public for purchase by selection. That the cost price of agricultural land so selected shall not exceed 10s. per acre, payable in two installments; fifty per cent, on occupation, the balance in three years. That the maximum area that can be settled by any one person shall be 040 acres, but whatever the quantity, the water frontage shall in no case exceed the depth.

Mr. Mooney, of Sebastopol, presented, from that district, a document, from which the following is an extract:—

As respects the public lands, the condition upon which actual cultivating occupiers shall have portions of the public domain, we submit for consideration as follows :—

Farms of 160 acres up to 320 acres, the most that any one person can hold in his own right.

The farms to be open to selection; price ten shillings an acre : five shillings per acre cash on taking possession, the remaining five shillings to be paid at the end of three years. When any fraud is practiced by persons holding more land, in contravention of this law, such lands' may be "jumped." that is, taken possession of by the first person electing the fraud. All lands, when sold, to bear a public tax per acre towards the public revenue, and especially towards public roads and schools. The unsold portion of the public domain to be considered a common, open to all, but a suitable tax to be levied yearly per head upon all grazing stock of every kind found on the public domain, whether they belong to squatter, miner, merchant, or farmer. New townships to be suffered to gather and grow by the presence and necessities of immigrants. All mines and minerals of every kind to be reserved in all sales for the benefit of the whole people, to whom, in common, they belong. The right to mine upon property already purchased to be fully recognized.

To extract from the speeches delivered by Delegates would exceed the space of this paper. They were generally in accordance with the views expressed in the above documents. The condemnation of the present land bill was universal.

Having elicited the opinions of the Delegates, the Convention proceeded to frame resolutions which would embody the general views that had been expressed, and which would receive the assent of the Delegates, and of the districts they represented.

Contemporaneously with this business, the Convention arranged an interview with the Chief Secretary, Mr. Haines, and with the minority who were opposed to the Land Bill in the House of Assembly, memorialized the House of Assembly, and adopted a protest against the bill.

RESOLUTIONS FINALLY ADOPTED AS THE BASIS OF A LAND BILL LIKELY TO SATISFY THE COUNTRY.

The following were the resolutions which, after much careful and anxious consideration, and after discussion protracted through several evenings, were ultimately adopted by the Convention, as embodying the principles on which a bill that would satisfy the wants and wishes of the country should be based. These resolutions were submitted for discussion one by one; and, in many instances, each resolution was divided into several propositions, and these propositions separately considered, debated, and voted on.

- Resolution—That all exclusive occupation of unalienated Crown lands for pastoral purposes should cease, and such lands should be open as free pasturage for the public.
- Resolution—That every adult person in the colony should have a right to select a claim of land not exceeding—acres, at a uniform price, without auction; such right of selection to extend over all the unalienated lands of the colony, surveyed or unsurveyed: this right, however, to be subject to the following conditions and qualifications:—
 - condition—Substantial occupation.
 - condition—Payment of ten per cent, of the purchase-money on entering into occupation. The time of paying the subsequent installments left an open question, to be determined at a future time.
 - condition—All persons taking up their claims beyond the State survey, to take them subject to having the boundaries of such claims adjusted to the boundaries of the lots as afterwards run by the survey.
 - condition—Certain lands that have been long withheld from sale, lying in the neighborhood of settlements, and which have thus acquired an exceptional value, to be exempt from this right of selection, and to be specially dealt with.
 - condition—All the gold-fields of the colony, as well as all auriferous land in their neighborhood, to be exempt from such selection : the Crown, in disposing of all waste lands, whether by selection or other

mode of sale, to reserve all gold and minerals in such lands, retaining the right to resume such lands, and to permit mining upon them under certain regulations.

• condition—All waters and water frontages with convenient rights-of-way thereto, to be reserved from selection, as more generally provided for in resolution No. 3, hereafter following.

• condition—Price: The amount of the uniform price to be hereafter fixed, but not to exceed £1 per acre. Opinions in the Convention varied between 10s. and £1.

The Convention recognized that a question will arise hereafter as to the restriction of this right, as well as the general right of purchasing land, to races of certain extraction, but they consider the question to be one of detail, on which it is not now necessary for them to adopt any resolution.

The Convention decided by a considerable majority that the number of acres be, for the present, left blank in the above resolution, leaving the number to future opinion to determine; but they also directed it to be made public, that opinion in the Convention ranged from a maximum of 160 to a maximum of 320—preponderating in favor of 320.

- resolution—That in all sales of land the Government should reserve all waters and water frontages, with rights-of-way leading thereto at convenient intervals, as easements for the public.
- resolution—That all lands alienated from the Crown, whether cultivated or uncultivated, should be subjected to equal taxation for municipal and local purposes; and that uncultivated lands should be further subjected to a special State tax.
- resolution—That, in surveying the lands of the colony, all discretion and all possible favoritism by surveyors, as to the size and boundaries of lots, be excluded, by making all lots of one uniform size, and running the boundaries by right lines.

PURCHASERS FOR MONEY MERELY, WITHOUT CONDITION OF CULTIVATION OR OCCUPANCY.

Resolved—That while this Convention recommends that the actual cultivator be invested with the special rights set forth in the foregoing resolutions, they are of opinion that persons who may find it inconvenient or impossible to proceed to cultivate at once should not, therefore, be wholly debarred from purchasing from the State; but they are of opinion that this right of purchase should be controlled by such reasonable regulations as may discourage monopoly without shackling enterprise or obstructing fair investment. Resolved—That this Convention will not at present attempt to define the exact restrictions by which such purchasers should be controlled; but, holding in view that practical legislation on this subject must still be at least some months distant, they will only suggest certain general principles on which they think those restrictions might be based, leaving the closer definition of them to the result of public discussion and the further ripening of opinion.

Resolved—That, as principles likely to be effective in framing such restrictions, they suggest—

- That the purchaser for money merely, should not, like the actual cultivator, have access to all the lands of the colony, but only to lands brought into market district by district, as the course of previous settlement by the free selection of actual cultivators advances and thus indicates the districts suitably to be brought in.
- That such purchasers be permitted to buy for ready money only.
- That, as provided in a foregoing resolution, No. 4, purchased lands remaining uncultivated be subject to a special State taxation.
- That, as provided for in a foregoing resolution, No. 5, no discretion or possibility of favoritism be left to surveyors in determining the size or boundaries of lots, but that all lots be surveyed by right lines and made of uniform size, such size as may be considered the unit of a reasonably small farm, so that purchasers for money merely, if desirous of having larger tracts of land, shall not, as hitherto, be protected from general competition, but shall encounter, lot by lot, the competition of the small purchaser, besides being preceded by the free selector.

DISCUSSIONS AND DIVISIONS ON THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS

As the best means of indicating the opinions prevailing in the Convention, and the degree of unanimity which existed as to the several principles embodied in these resolutions, some of the principal divisions that took place are here recorded.

On Tuesday evening, July 21st, (Fifth day)—the first resolution was discussed:—

That all exclusive occupation of unalienated Crown Lands for pastoral purposes should cease, and such lands should be open as free pasturage for the public.

After a lengthened discussion, or rather a lengthened expression of opinion, for opinion proved to be nearly unanimous,

The following was the Division List:—

Ayes, 52.—Ballarat—Messrs. O'Connor, Cathie, Yates. Bendigo—Messrs. Benson, Thompson.

Brighton—Messrs. Houston, Thomson. Bacchus Marsh—Mr. James. Colac—Mr. Miskin. Collingwood—Messrs. Galloway, Gibson, Cattach. M'Minn, Riley, Murphy, Capt. Harrison. Carisbrooke—Messrs. Laskie, Richardson. Dunolly—Messrs. Quinlan. Wingfield. Emerald Hill—Messrs. Short, Leitch. Geelong—Messrs. Whinam, Clarson. Kyneton—Mr. Kenworthy. Mount Blackwood—Messrs. James, Garland. Melbourne—Messrs. Don, J. J. Walsh, Dodds, Sherwin, Warman, Hayden, Patterson. North Melbourne—Messrs. Calvert, Richardson, Hayes, Strickland, Schultz. Ovens—Messrs. Strickland, Smith, Mooney. Prahran—Messrs. Crews, O'Hea. Richmond—Messrs. Batten, Cutter, Philip Johnson. Seymour—Mr. Tiernan. South Bourke—Messrs. Johnson, Brooke. Tarrengower—Messrs. Ramsay, Gainsford.

Noes, 1.—Richmond—Councillor Henry Johnson.

The second resolution, which embodied several principles was divided into separate propositions for convenience of discussion. The resolution stands as follows:—

2nd resolution—That every adult person in the colony should have a right to select a claim of land not exceeding _____ acres, at a uniform price, without auction; such right of selection to extend over all the unalienated lands of the colony, surveyed or unsurveyed : this right, however, to be subject to certain conditions and qualifications mentioned in pp. 6, 7.

The first proposition submitted to discussion, was a resolution to the effect:—

That every adult person should have a right to select a claim of land not exceeding _____ acres, at a uniform price, without auction.

This discussion was taken on Wednesday evening, July 22nd. (Sixth day.)

Mr. HEPBURN, of South Bourke, moved the following amendment:—

That inasmuch as the unsold lands of the colony are the property of the people of Great Britain, as well as the inhabitants of the colony, it would be both impolitic and highly injudicious to dispose of the public lands, otherwise than at a fair valuation, to be fixed upon by valuers, or by auction.

Mr. JOHNSON, of South Bourke, seconded this amendment.

After a very full expression of opinion there appeared at the close of the evening, For the amendment:

2.—Messrs. Hepburn, South Bourke; T. Johnson, South Bourke.

For the original resolution :

52.—Messrs. Benson, Bendigo; Chisholm, Kinetin; Kennedy, "Nine-Mile," Ovens; John Strickland, Woolshed; Ramsay, Tarrengower; Watt, Bacchus Marsh; Sloane, Heathcoat; Dods, Melbourne; Carson, Geelong; Sherwin, Melbourne; Smyth, Ovens; Doyle, Melbourne; Malcolm, Temples owe; Hayden, Melbourne; Tie man, Seymour; F. Strickland, North Mel boxing; Garland, Mount Blackwood; Cutter, Richmond; Patterson, Melbourne; Don, Melbourne; Gain ford, Tarrengower; O'Hea, Parham; Hayes, Parkside; Mooney, Sebastopol; Walsh, Melbourne; War man, Melbourne; Gibson, Collingwood; McMinn, Collingwood; Houston, Brighton; Thomson, Brighton; Richardson, North Melbourne; "Culvert, North Melbourne; Cattach, Collingwood; Galloway, Collingwood; Riley, Collingwood; Quinlan, Dunolly; Murphy, Collingwood; James, Mount Blackwood; Cathie, Ballaarat; Scotson, Fryer's Creek; P. Johnson, Richmond; Wingfield, Dunolly; Yates, Ballaarat; C. W. Thompson, Sandhurst; Leith, Emerald Hill; Crews. Prahran; Short, Emerald Hill; Keeley, Melbourne; O'Connor, Ballaarat; Batten, Richmond; Whinnam, Geelong; and Kenworthy, Kyneton.

The next proposition submitted for discussion was a resolution to the effect that the right of free selection to be exercised by the actual cultivator should not be confined within the surveys, but should extend over all unalienated lands, surveyed or unsurveyed. This proposition produced a longer debate than any other that came before the Convention. It was debated for two nights. It also developed, when first submitted, more difference of views than any other question that was debated. On the first night of its discussion an amendment was submitted "that the right should be confined to surveyed lands." On that night a division took place on the amendment. It obtained the support of a minority of 12. It was negatived by a majority of 32. The division list was as follows :—

For the amendment—

Ayes, 12.—Messrs. Cattach, Collingwood; Patterson, Melbourne; Leitch, Emerald Hill; Short, Emerald Hill; Benson, Bendigo; Scotson, Fryer's Creek; Smyth, Beechworth; John Strickland, Woolshed; Whinham, Geelong; Tiernan, Seymour; Donovan, Melbourne; Sloane, Heathcote.

Against it—

Noes, 31.—Messrs. Warman, Melbourne; Hitchcock, Castlemaine; Dr. M'Kay, Prahran; Gibson, Collingwood; Garland, Mount Blackwood; Ramsay, Tarrengower; M'Minn, Collingwood; J. W. Thomson, Brighton; O'Connor, Ballaarat; James, Mount Blackwood; Cutter, Richmond; Murphy, Collingwood; Houston, Brighton; Quinlan, Dunolly; Dods, Melbourne; Walsh, Melbourne; Clarson, Geelong; Wingfield, Dunolly; Mooney, Sebastopol, Ovens; Schultz, North Melbourne; Gainford, Tarrengower; Hayes, North Melbourne; Keeley, Melbourne; Batten, Richmond; Harrison, Collingwood; F. Strickland, North Melbourne; Malcolm, Ballan and Templestowe; Sherwin, Melbourne; O'Hea, Prahran; Calvert, North Melbourne; Hayden,

Melbourne.

On the next evening the discussion was continued on the original motion, the result of which was that the original motion was adopted without any division, in a larger house than had been in attendance on the previous night, the result of the protracted discussion being to bring the Convention nearly to unanimity.

On this night some papers were read illustrative of the question under discussion, which the Council directed to be inserted on its minutes, and which are thought sufficiently interesting to be recorded in this brief account of the resolutions adopted by the Convention.

The following extract was read from Gibbon Wakefield's book on colonisation. The delegate who read it explained that Gibbon Wakefield had laid down several valuable principles in relation to that sort of colonisation for which he (Mr. Wakefield) wrote—a class-colonisation for the benefit of capitalists. Many of these principles were equally good for the colonisation of the people. Wakefield strenuously advocated a system of a perfectly free selection for his colonists, uncontrolled by officials, and therefore necessarily unconfined by surveys. The extract read was as follows:—

Free Selection. (Extract from Gibbon Wakefield.)

There is no business more entirely a man's own business than that of a settler picking new land for his own purpose; and the truism of our time, that in matters of private business the parties interested are sure to judge better than any Government can judge for them, is an error, if the best of Governments could determine, as well as the settler himself, the quality and position of land the most suitable to his objects. He is deeply interested in making the best possible choice. He alone can know precisely what the objects are for which he wants the land. The Government choosing for him, either a particular lot of land, or the district in which he should be allowed to choose for himself, would have no private interest in choosing well; and the private interest of the officials employed by the Government would be to save themselves trouble by choosing carelessly. In most cases they would be utterly ignorant of the purposes for which new land was in demand. Their highest object as officials (except in those rare instances where love of duty is as strong a motive as self-interest) would be to perform their duty so as to avoid reproach; and this motive is notoriously weak in comparison with self-interest. But, indeed, they could not by any means avoid reproach. For supposing (though but for argument's sake) that the surveyor-general of a colony, in marking out districts to be opened to purchasers, made an absolutely perfect selection with a view to the purchasers' interest, the intending purchasers would not think so. Every man is fond of his own judgment, especially in matters which deeply concern himself. If the Government said to intending purchasers—"Take your land hereabouts," they would reply, "No, we wish to take it thereabouts:" they would reproach the Surveyor-General with having opened a bad district to settlers, and left a good one closed against them. Again, even if any were not dissatisfied at the moment of taking their land, it is certain that if they failed as settlers, and from whatever cause, they would lay the blame of their failure upon the Government, complaining that, if they had been allowed to take land where they liked best, their undertaking would undoubtedly have prospered. For all these reasons (and more might be urged), I would if possible open the whole of the waste land of a colony to intending purchasers; and I hereby declare, that as perfect a liberty of choice for settlers, as the nature of things in each case would allow, is an essential condition of the well-working of the sufficient price.

* * * * *

*The Colonial Secretary, or the Private Secretary, thinks that in such a settlement the colonists ought to be "discouraged" from spreading to the east or west, because it will be more for their advantage to spread northward or southward. So individual judgment is controlled, and colonisation forcibly diverted from its natural course, by a great "reserve" in the "improper" direction. The officials of the Land Office have friends—or, perhaps, secret partners, who would like to acquire this or that spot by purchase, but not at present: either their funds are not ready, or they would like to keep their money for use at colonial interest, till the spread of colonisation beyond the coveted spot shall have given it a position value, when, by means of the rogueries of the auction system, or some other mode of benefitting by official favor, they hope to get it for less than its value; so it is "reserved" for their convenience and profit. * * * * * According to the whole plan of colonisation which I am developing, there would indeed be no liberty of appropriation for the dogs, small or great; but there would be absolute liberty for the cows, and because all the dogs would be effectually kept out of the manger.*

The same delegate read, in support of the same principle of selection unconfined by surveys, an extract from a paper of Mr. Westgarth, read by that gentleman before the Chamber of Commerce, Melbourne, in January of this year (1857). The extract from Mr. Westgarth's paper was as follows :—

Free Selection. (Extract from Mr. Westgarth.)

What we require is a higher step in settlement, and a more productive use of the lands. It is to these steps,

and these higher uses, that the squatting must at once give way, and be dealt with in effect as if it had no existence. Our great error in the past has arisen from the great power of the squatting interest in practically defeating this view, and even raising up an argument to question the necessity for further land sales. If every enterprise of society depended, as a preliminary, on a successful argument, with others than those interested as to its prospects, our enterprises would, I fear, be very few and far between. Allowing every man to make his own calculations for himself, let him also have free scope to carry out his plans. If a man finds a spot that will suit his views, and he desires to settle upon and cultivate it, let him have the power to do so at once, even although the squatter he is displacing, and the whole world beside, are entirely convinced that he has only ruin before him.

And now, as to the condition of our country for the purpose, let us first examine the state of the surveys. The total quantity of land yet sold is 2,200,000 acres. The quantity open for selection is 140,000 acres; besides which, there is a smaller quantity, the most of which is partially, but not yet completely, surveyed. The whole surveyed portion, sold and unsold, is less than two and a half millions of acres, of which I believe that not more than a quarter of a million of acres, partially or wholly surveyed, is in advance of the sales. The great desideratum of our colony, therefore—an open choice of its public lands—cannot be obtained within the surveyed territory, nor can we await the long future of such an attainment.

That some future inconvenience may result from the formation of permanent settlements in an unsurveyed country, cannot be doubted,—but in some recent inquiries, I have been agreeably surprised to learn how small is the practical difficulty in this respect, a difficulty, if in this urgent case it can be so called, that should not for a moment be weighed against the benefit to which it is opposed. The following are the views I have been able to arrive at:—

The colony is now sub-divided into surveyors' districts, each of which has a resident surveyor and staff. There are ten or twelve of such separate districts. * * * * * An intending settler having made his selection under the approval of the surveyor might settle at once, and have his bounds marked out in connexion with local features, the Government reserving only the right to make roads, if necessary, through the ground. Lands surveyed and open for selection are paid for in full on application. This is our present system, but lands unsurveyed might be paid for by deposit of one-half, or 10s. per acre, the remainder at a fixed rate, in the case of 20s. per acre being payable when the locality is brought to sale.

* * * * *

In some such manner I think we might arrive at the great desideratum of opening up the country without the loss of awaiting the surveys.

A still more important paper on this subject was read on the same evening. The subject had engaged the attention of the Convention in Committee on that forenoon, and they instituted an inquiry into the practice of the United States of America in this respect. Several of their own delegates were personally acquainted with the land system of that country. One of them (Mr. William Henry Wingfield, of Dunolly) was particularly familiar with it. Mr. Wingfield was examined before the Committee. His evidence was reported to the full Convention on the evening in question. This evidence as at first reported was confined to the practice of the United States as regards the right of free selection exercised in that country by the actual cultivator, and the limits within which this selection was permitted to range. Mr. Wingfield stated that the right extended over all the unalienated lands of the United States, surveyed or unsurveyed, and explained in detail how the boundaries of farms came to be ultimately adjusted. This evidence when reported was considered so valuable that Mr. Wingfield was requested to submit himself to a further examination comprising a more extended view of the whole land system of the United States; and it was directed that the report of this more extended examination should be entered on the minutes of the Convention.

Mr. WING FIELD'S evidence was as follows :—

Mr. Wingfield's Evidence as to the Land System of the United States.

In the year 1850 and 1851 witness was employed as a Topographical Engineer in the Civil Service of the United States, attached to the military department. Was engaged during these years in the topographical survey of the territories in the Far West. His duty was principally to define positions astronomically, to ascertain elevations barometrically, and to determine base lines for the future land surveys. He had also to report botanically, metallurgically, and geologically as to the character of the regions in which he acted; and on some occasions of pressure he took part in the land survey. These duties made him familiar with the land surveying system of the United States and generally with the circumstances under which immigrants settle into the new countries of the West. In the course of these duties he has been all over the Western regions from Utah to Minnesota.

'Free Selection' for the Actual Cultivator.

Witness is familiar with the system of free selection and pre-emptive rights which prevails in the United States. By this system the actual settler is entitled to enter upon any land that has not yet been brought into market, select a claim of 160 acres wherever he chooses, and occupy it without any payment until the district is brought into market. When the district is afterwards about to be brought into market, he is entitled at any moment before it is actually brought in, to purchase this claim at the upset price of 1¼ dollars an acre without any auction or competition. The only condition is that he must show by affidavit that he has occupied it as his homestead for at least six months immediately previous. In exercising this right the settler has not to ask permission nor license of any kind.

The settler is not bound in selecting his claim to keep within the surveys, but may select as freely beyond them as within them. But this very circumstance is itself the cause of the surveys being rapidly extended in every direction towards which the stream of population flows. No person has anything to gain by retarding them, because retarding them could not stop the settler nor hold the lands back for any unfair purpose; therefore no sinister influences are used to retard surveys, and they are not retarded, but are pushed rapidly forward wherever the movement of population indicates the direction. They are generally kept well a head of population, but occasionally where some inviting lands lie far out, it will happen that settlers go beyond them. To this subject witness will revert again. Witness considers this right of free selection for the actual cultivator over all the unalienated lands of the colony, coupled as it is with the right of unrestricted pasturage over all unsold lands, as the key-stone of the American system of settlement. It is the first stage of settlement, and influences and regulates all the succeeding stages. At this stage the actual settler is free from any competition of the capitalist. No person can get land at this stage without actually tilling and cultivating; unless one actually settles and cultivates he must wait until the next stage at which the lands are "brought into market." This right of the actual settler is, as already stated, confined to a claim of 100 acres for any one person, but when the district in which he has settled is afterwards "brought into market," an operation which witness will presently explain, he may add to his farm, to any extent, by purchasing at that stage on the same terms with the general public.

The surveys are always very far a head of the land that has been "brought into market," and afford the most ample scope for a free selection of the actual cultivator within the surveyed lands, before the district comes to market, and before any of it can be sold for money merely.

The Pasturage of all Unsold Lands Free to the Whole Public;

Before passing on to speak of the stage at which the lands are "brought to market," witness wished to advert more particularly to a matter already alluded to, viz., the rights of the settler with regard to the grass of the unsold lands. This he conceived to be an important consideration at all stages of settlement, as in a new country large tracts of inferior land will remain for very long periods unsold, affording to the settlers on the purchased lands valuable rights of pasturage if these lands are left free to them for that purpose. But in the early stages of settlement this consideration is one of paramount importance. At that stage a very large proportion of the land is still unsold and unoccupied. The quantity of natural grass land is very great, and the privilege of pasturage affords to the settler not only what he most stands in need of—provender for the cattle necessary to his farming operations, and milk, butter, cheese, wool, and meat for his family—but also, at a time when he is yet distant from markets for agricultural productions, it gives him in the stock themselves, and in wool, a produce which is capable of being carried to any market, however remote.

In the United States all the unsold lands are the open pasturage of all the settlers.

Except the pre-emptive claim of the settlers (160 acres each) there is no exclusive occupation of any land until it is sold. No such persons as squatters are known or thought of in the sense in which that term is used here—persons holding the public lands in their exclusive occupation for pastoral purposes before they are sold. Without the right of open pasturage, settlement could not pour over the country as it does in the United States. Witness would not say that the people of the States carefully guarded this right, because that would intimate that some different state of things had ever been presented to their conception; but he would say that they had never thought of a state of things in which any set or class of persons should take the exclusive use of the public lands while they were still the property of the whole people. The value of this right of pasturage to the settler, Mr. Wingfield proceeded to say, could only be understood by those who had lived in a country where it was denied to them. He never knew any difficulties arise from the intermingling of the cattle of different settlers, in these open wastes. There is more than grass enough for all; every man naturally feeds his cattle in the neighborhood of his own homestead, and the 160 acres which he has occupied as his pre-emptive claim. The consequence of this open pasturage is: to the settler, that he has not only abundance of milk, butter, cheese, meat, and wool, for his family, but a large surplus for the market, besides feed for his working stock, all without

cost; the result to the general public is that cattle are very abundant, and meat and all grass produce are plentiful and cheap in the towns and cities supplied by those settlers. Beef of prime quality is to be had at from 1½d. to 2½d. a-pound; milk and butter are abundant; fresh butter can be had at from 4d. to yd. a-pound. This abundance is the manifest consequence of the grass of the unsold land being open to all. Every man has feed for cattle in any numbers that he desires to keep them. The farmers of the Western States look upon the produce and increase of their stock as so much clear profit over and above the proceeds of their agricultural land. This cheapness of the materials of life co-exists with a comparatively high rate of wages; the wages of a laboring man in those regions being a dollar to a dollar and a quarter, that is 4s. to 5s. a day; and a good mechanic, from 1¾ dollars to 2½ dollars, that is from 7s. 6d. to 10s.

The general features of the country of which witness has been speaking much resemble those of Victoria. All the United States territory west of Ohio is in great part an open country; tracts of timbered land alternating with open grassy plains, unincumbered with a tree. These plains are called prairies. They are sometimes flat, sometimes high undulating uplands. The farther we proceed west through Illinois, Iowa, &c., the larger are the prairies, and the scarcer the timber. Besides timbered and prairie land, there is also a good deal of land of an intermediate character, called Oakopening land, lightly interspersed with dropping trees, and park-like in its scenery. It would be quite as profitable to a race of great pastoral squatters to occupy for pastoral purposes these territories of the United States in advance of settlement, and keeping settlement back, as the like occupation has proved to this class of persons in Australia. Indeed, the profits would be of a more certain and permanent character in proportion to the greater population of the United States, as such squatters would have the monopoly of supplying meat to a large proportion of a population now numbering nearly thirty million of people. So, too, if the people of the United States wanted to make a revenue out of their lands by giving them in exclusive occupation to a class of great grazier tenants until they were taken up for exclusively agricultural purposes, they could receive a great rent from them; but any person proposing such a policy would, witness believes, be regarded, there, as scarcely sound in intellect. It would kill out the working settler, prohibit the pioneer, make a country of master and servants, and effectually stop the progress of civilisation and settlement over the continent. In a word, it would produce what we have in Victoria.

Witness has also been in California, and knows that the unsold lands of the United States in California are the open pasturage of the public in that country as well as in the Atlantic States, and there also this free pasturage is the means of great facilities and great profits to the independent settler as well as of great abundance and comparative cheapness of meat, milk, butter, and all grass produce, and indirectly of agricultural produce too, to the rest of the community.

[Since Mr. Wingfield left town, he has written to the Council of the Convention, calling their attention to the following passage in a recent commercial article of the Argus, shewing, on the authority of an American writer, why agriculture has been profitable in California, with prices lower and wages at least quite as high as in Victoria:—It will be found in the Argus of August 20, 1857, Commercial Intelligence. The Argus says:—

"In California the fanners complain of their prospects, but without much reason as yet. The pursuit has been a profitable one for them hitherto, and they should not grumble if they have short crops one season, after several years of abundance. They have one great advantage which is denied to the farmers here, and that is the opportunity of keeping stock on the public lands at little or no expense. In all other respects they have the same disadvantages to contend with as agriculturists in Victoria have: labor there is quite as high, and prices have been usually lower: still the pursuit is allowed to be profitable. The following paragraph is taken from the letter of a correspondent to one of the New York journals:—

"For the past two seasons farming here has been highly remunerative. No class of our population better deserved, and none met with, greater success. The thrifty industrious tiller of the soil has made money, and is making it. To be enabled to chronicle this is most gratifying to me as a Californian. But why should not the farmers do well? Our soil is among the richest, easiest cultivated, and most productive in the world. The expense of keeping cattle or horses is next to nothing, for the plains—on which there is provender during the whole year, with no frost or snow to render it inaccessible—are open to all."]

The matter of which witness has just spoken—the right of open pasturage over the unsold lands—is a matter of very important consideration in all the stages of settlement. Witness has specially spoken of this right of free pasturage in connexion with the earliest stage of American settlement, because at that stage its value to the settler is so great that without it he could not settle; but it is a matter of the greatest importance at all stages of settlement,—in fact, until the country is filled up.

Bringing the Lands "into Market."

The second stage of American settlement is when the lands "are brought into market." "Bringing the lands into market" may be said in a general way to mean in the United States the same thing that the like term would signify in Australia. It means offering the land in exchange for money. In the United States, however, this is

done under arrangements very different from the arrangements in Australia, and all the American arrangements tend to make favoritism impossible, to discourage the monopoly of the capitalist, and to facilitate settlement. The waste lands belong not to the several states in which they are situate, but to the Federal Government. When lands are about to be "brought into market" :—In the first place, they are not brought in by scattered or isolated lots, nor in an irregular or capricious manner. It is advertised for six months beforehand in the Government Gazette, published at Washington, not that certain lots, but that a certain district of country is about to be brought to market on a certain day. The whole district—generally a district of say 20 miles by 20 or 30, that is, from 400 to 600 square miles—is brought into market on this occasion without a single lot of it being excepted or withheld from sale save for a few specified purposes. Again, this district is all surveyed into uniform lots: first, into square miles, or sections of 640 acres, then by right lines into quarter sections of 100 acres, and these again are divided each into two 80 acre lots. The sale takes place at a land office near the spot. The whole district being thus brought into market, all at once, on a given day, it is a great public event in the region of country in which it takes place. It takes no one by surprise, but it has been long known beforehand. Not only has it been advertised for six months in the Washington Gazette, but long before the sale has been determined on, and advertised, it has been the subject of public debate and consideration.

The district about to be "brought to market" is about the size, and very frequently has already acquired the organisation of a county, a considerable population being already settled there or pre-emptive claims. The whole district, and not a lot here and there, is what is to be dealt with. The event therefore is one of common interest, affecting all the inhabitants. These inhabitants are in a position to influence the event, accelerating or retarding it through the senators and representatives of their state, and of their Congressional districts in Congress. It is therefore an event not merely; known by means of the Gazette six months before hand, but anticipated and agitated in the district long before it is announced in the Gazette. It may be safely stated that the people of the district itself, and the districts about it, have at least twelve months actual notice of an approaching sale. Before the given day, all persons who have settled on pre-emptive claims, if they would avail themselves of their rights, must file an affidavit at the land office (near the spot), that they have occupied their claim for at least six months before the day of sale as their homestead; and that they have made certain stated improvements, being just enough to constitute a test of actual and bona fide occupation. This affidavit being filed, they pay the upset price of dollars an acre into the office, and the land is then theirs. This must be done before the day of sale. On the day of sale the whole district, excepting those pre-emptive claims, is put up for sale in eighty acre lots, and offered lot by lot at auction. If any one wants a larger tract than eighty acres, say eight hundred acres, he must buy ten eighty acre lots. It will be seen at once that at this sale the land can scarcely be pushed by auction to a price materially exceeding the upset price, inasmuch as any one who may [have thought any lot of 100 acres desirable enough to induce him to go and settle on it six months before hand, for the purpose of securing it at upset price, was free to do so. The result is that the auction produces no material enhancement of the upset price. It appears by statistical returns extending over all the lands that were sold in ten years that it has not enhanced the average price more than 1½d. or 2d. an acre on the upset price of 5s. 2½d. The whole district lot by lot, having been rapidly passed under the hammer, all the lots that remain unsold are thenceforth open to be purchased at the land office at upset price by the first comer. Very commonly ¾-this of the lots remain unsold. They are all open for selection at the upset price once the auction is over. Often when there is much inferior land in the district, as much as 7/8-ths or 9-10ths of the whole surface of the district remains unsold, and is thenceforth open to selection to the first comer, who pays his money into the land office. Those who have settled on pre-emptive claims are of course, as already stated, equally free to purchase at the auction, and to select after the auction as any other parties. In this manner they can enlarge their original 160 acre farms to any extent that their means permits them. Until the district has thus been brought into market, they cannot secure more than 100 acres, and this consideration is always the efficient one in determining whether the first pre-emptive settlers will use their influence in promoting or retarding the bringing of their district into market. Of course capitalists who up to that period are themselves shut out are always anxious to have the land brought to market. In the early settlement the pre-emptive settlers are anxious to have the district kept out of market, for until they have been a year or two settled they are scarcely prepared to buy even their 100 acre claims. But after a few years great numbers of them are prepared not only to secure their pre-emptive claims, but to enlarge their farms by purchasing a further extent of land, either at the auction, or by selection after the auction. In time, therefore, the pre-emptive settlers who have put some money together become anxious to have the opportunity of making these purchases, and are desirous to have the district brought into market. This expression of "bringing the land into market" is, it will be observed, a very appropriate and significant one. A thing may be said to be "in the market," when it is to be had for money. None of the land of the United States can be had for money until the Government has proclaimed and brought it "into market" in this manner. Thenceforth it can be had for money merely. Before that period any inhabitant of the state can have the choicest 100 acres of the public lands by settling on it, but no man can have an acre of it

for money.

To recapitulate:—In the United States Land System there are three stages. First, before the land is brought to market the actual cultivator, and he alone, can choose 100 acres, not more, where he wills, over all the unalienated territory of the Union. He can occupy this without payment until the district is brought to market. When the district is brought to market he has the pre-emptive right to buy this claim without auction at the upset price of 1¼ dollars, that is 5s. 2½d. per acre. Secondly, the day that the land is brought to market; this is the first day on which any person can buy land for money. This day may be considered a second stage, though a very short one. On this day there must need be many persons who have been waiting for the opportunity to buy lots in the district that is brought in, and several may have an eye on the same lot. The preference is decided by auction; all the lots of the whole district, except the lots already taken by preemption, being put one by one through the auction on that day. It seldom happens, however, that more than a small proportion of them are then sold. The great bulk of them still remain. And then comes the third stage. All the lots which remain are from that day forward open to the free selection of the first comer who chooses to pay the upset price for them. Any man can then take as many lots as he finds vacant and is able to pay for; the check upon inordinate purchases being that, the moment land is purchased from the Government, it becomes subject to taxation.

Settlers Going Beyond Surveys.—the Great Advantages of the Right to do so.—the Slight Inconveniencies in so Doing.

The pre-emptive settlers often go beyond the surveys. Witness wishes it to be understood, however, that in his experience the result of allowing the settlers to go beyond the surveys has been that they generally have no need to go beyond them, as the surveys are, under such circumstances, sure to be pushed rapidly forward. There is nothing to be gained by holding them back, as holding them back would not prevent the people from going on, and could not, therefore, be practised with the effect of reserving any special region for friends or favorites to have early information of the survey, and to seize the first opportunity. Witness has, within his personal experience, known several cases, however, in which the settlers did take their pre-emptive claims beyond the surveys. No inconvenience worth considering resulted. Such settlers find it necessary, as already stated, to adjust their boundaries to the lines of the surveyed allotments when the survey reaches them, as the Crown grant which they ultimately obtain describes the allotment by the Government lines. Witness has frequently, in the course of his own surveys, seen these settlers re-adjust their boundaries when the survey overtook them, and it gave very little trouble. It will be observed that the uniform character of the United States survey—all the lots being of uniform size—gives the settler a facility for anticipating where the boundaries of allotments will run, if he is within a few miles of any existing survey.

Generally speaking, in taking up a land claim, the settler so endeavors to arrange his boundaries that they may coincide as nearly as possible with the subsequent lines of the survey. He is not always able, however, to succeed in this; the greater or less accuracy with which he does it will, of course, depend upon the distance which he is in advance of the survey. If he has gone far in advance, it is not possible for him to pay any regard to the future survey; he is, in fact, too far a-head of it to do so. If he is within five or six miles of the survey, he may be able to form a tolerably correct idea of the future lines: at all events, accurate enough for all general purposes in settling the boundaries of his 80 or 100 acre allotment. In forming the survey, the American surveyors adapt themselves to circumstances. In a level country, the lines of the survey are run by the cardinal points. In such a country, the settler even at a considerable distance from the survey can anticipate by private survey where the boundaries of his pre-emptive claim are likely to run, with sufficient accuracy for all practical purposes. In regions that are greatly broken by mountain and valley, however, the surveys are of necessity topographically adjusted to these difficult features of the country, and the settler cannot anticipate what circumstances may guide the surveyors in the direction of their lines. Thus it often happens, either from the great remoteness of a settler's location from all surveys, or from the location being in a broken country where the future discretion of the surveyor cannot be anticipated, that a settler chooses his pre-emptive claim without being able to select it in reference to existing surveys. But this creates no difficulty of any account. If the settler can approximate the boundaries of his claim to the future survey, he does so. He builds his log-house as near the supposed centre as possible. He erects his permanent fences near the centre, and makes but a snake fence round the presumed exterior boundaries. This snake fence is of a purely temporary character, and is easily removed in accordance with the lines of the survey when ultimately determined. In localities remote from the survey, great aberrations from its future lines take place—it is, in fact, impossible that it could be otherwise; the subsequent adjustment, however, is effected without trouble. Witness has seen instances where a whole valley had been taken up by pioneer settlers, and where the boundaries of each man's allotment had to be removed from 100 to 200 yards each. He has seen instances where the lines of a survey ran through the temporary log cabin; nevertheless, there was no complaint. The instances which he has in memory at this moment occurred in Pyke County, Missouri State, but they occur everywhere. Their permanent houses were not

put up by the settlers until the surveys were completed and the boundaries settled; and the removal of the temporary log cabin, or the removal of the temporary snake fence, was not regarded in any way as a hardship. It was taken as a matter of course. In fact, on these occasions of the removal of boundaries or huts, the pioneer settlers, instead of complaining, just turned to and helped to put one another right. It is common throughout all the Western Districts of the United States to find pioneer settlers established in the far interior for many years, on locations of their own selection, before the survey of the district was made. He had known instances where these pioneer settlers had cropped the land, season after season, prior to the survey coming up with them; and yet, when the survey did reach them, the boundaries of their allotments were adjusted to the lines of the survey without contention or any serious inconvenience, though a patch of ground which had grown wheat for one settler for many seasons was incorporated in the location of a neighboring settler,—he getting the land on the other side in lieu of it. Each of the parties had taken up the ground subject to the condition of this subsequent removal of boundary, and the nature and character of their improvements were adapted to it.

Facilities for Making Rapid Surveys in Victoria, and the Possible Cost of Such.

Mr. Wingfield was further examined as to the possibility of accelerating the surveys, so as to afford every facility for allowing settlement to proceed at once with freedom and convenience.

Mr Wingfield's evidence on this subject was to the following effect:—

He knew there were ample materials in the colony for pushing forward the surveys with any degree of rapidity that might be desired. There were abundance of qualified surveyors in the colony. In making a survey of a country, the first thing to be done would be to make a topographical survey of it, defining by astronomical observation the true position of the most prominent features, and its highest elevations. According as this was done the sections could be laid off by the land surveyors with great rapidity; in fact, with efficient surveyors and assistants, the land could be surveyed almost as fast as the surveyors could walk. It would be only marking out the ground which the astronomical surveyors had already marked out on paper. He presumed that the colony must be already topographically surveyed. It seemed hardly possible, after the country had maintained such a numerous staff of surveyors for so many years, that the true position of the prominent features of it should not be already defined. At all events, great part of the work must be already done; and even if it had all to be done, if nothing were yet done, two staffs of topographical surveyors, of nine men each, ought to make a topographical survey of the whole colony in a year, at an expense of about 10,000, and this allowing for a geologist, a botanist, and a draughtsman, at a salary of £500 each, to be attached to each staff. As each portion of the topographical survey was done, the land survey would proceed with great rapidity. The rapidity of the survey would depend on the minuteness of the sub-divisions. A staff of twenty-five men, properly organised in five parties of five men each, surveying on a plain, could lay off over 20,000 acres a-week, in allotments as small as 100 acres each. Twenty-five men in five parties of five each, each party walking over four miles in one day, would give 20,400 acres in six days. Making allowance for the defining of hills, rivers, &c., 20,000 acres could, with this number of men, be surveyed in that time, which would give about 1,000,000 of acres in a year. If the sub-division did not proceed lower than a mile square, and this would be sufficient for the first survey if it were necessary to proceed with great despatch, a staff of twenty-five men (making the same proportionate allowances as in the last case) could survey 1,750,000 acres in the year, in sections of a mile square. Six such staffs, consisting in all of 150 men, could survey over 10,000,000 of acres in such sections, in a year. Allowing each party of five to consist of one chief surveyor, at £400 a-year, two assistant surveyors, each at £300 a-year, and two chain men, at £100 a-year each, the salaries of each party of five would only cost £1300 a year, less than £7000 a-year for each staff of twenty-five. Six such staffs would be £42,000 a-year. Make the most liberal allowance for supplying each staff with tent, provisions, and modes of conveyance as they passed along; and add any large allowance within reason for the expenses of the department and the staff necessary to the department, together with the due proportion of the cost of the topographical survey, and then spread the total sum over 10,000,000 of acres, and the result will be an insignificant sum per acre for a survey into sections of a mile square. If the exigencies of settlement in any direction made it necessary to proceed with greater rapidity in that quarter, the speed could be accelerated to almost any degree, without an increased staff, by running the sections, say two miles square, or even four miles square, leaving the settlers for the present to make rough approximations to their boundaries by the aid of private surveyors until such time as the Government surveyor had leisure to fill up the detailed survey down to 100 acres, or even down to 80 acre lots. Approximate calculations are easily made both as to the expense and the rapidity with which the country could be surveyed, and the result in each respect will show that the settlers may be permitted to settle where they like beyond the surveys without any fear that the surveys need lag far behind them. The expense of survey in the United States is $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. an acre, sub-dividing down to 80 acre lots. It need not much, if it at all, exceed that sum here.

Sites of Towns and Cities.

Mr. Wingfield was further questioned as to the practice of the American Government in laying out towns. His evidence was that the Government never does anything of the sort; at least, he never saw such a thing done by Government, though he has seen towns and cities growing up of themselves by hundreds. In a country where settlement is unobstructed in every direction, towns grow up naturally in the currents and cross-currents of traffic; on the ports of great waters, and on convenient points along the course, or at the junction of rivers. He has never seen the Government interfere in founding them, nor attempt to make a profit by withholding the presumed sites of them from the earliest use that the public could put them to. He has always understood that the sites of the great cities of the West were originally purchased from the Government at the upset price of 1¼ dollars an acre, or some insignificant advance upon it.

While witness has spoken throughout this evidence of an uniform upset price of 1¼ dollar an acre, he is aware that the United States Government has occasionally reserved certain tracts of land for the benefit of railroads, or the improvement of river navigation, which they have held until the lands fetched 2½ dollars an acre, but these are exceptional cases, not interfering in any appreciable degree with the general principle on which that Government acts in the disposal of its public lands.

Mr. Wingfield's statements respecting the system of selling lands in the United States, and the advantages thence resulting to the settlement of the country, were confirmed by Mr. Gray of Melbourne, Mr. Patrick Hayes of North Melbourne, Mr. Mooney of Sebastopol; Mr. Gibson of Collingwood, Mr. Riley of Collingwood, and others,—all of them Delegates, who had resided for some time in the States

Ample confirmation of Mr. Wingfield's statements as to the rapidity and cheapness with which the colony might be surveyed was tendered by actual surveyors, but the Convention thought it unnecessary to accumulate further evidence on the subject.

The Council of the Convention have had their attention called, in one of their recent meetings, to a passage in a book, published by a well known English gentleman, descriptive of the United States as a location for emigrants. The author is Mr. Sydney Smith, at one time Secretary to the English Corn Law League. The book is entitled "The Settler : New Home, or the Emigrants' Location." It was published in London in 1849. Under the head "Farming in the Prairies (the open untimbered grass lands)" occurs the following passage, which, as briefly descriptive of the advantages derived from freedom of pasturage over the unsold public lands, the Council have thought worth publishing here. It occurs on page 141.

Free Pasturage (Extract from Mr. Sydney Smith's Book).

The farms are generally made on the prairie, near to the timbered land (for convenience of firewood, fencing-stuff, &c.) The abundance of grass growing on the prairie, and the quantity of wild vegetable food for animals, offer an ample subsistence for horses and cattle, sheep and hogs, during the summer months. (The ground is covered with snow through the winter months.)

The number of these animals that a farmer keeps is only limited by the amount of winter food that he can raise on his farm. The actual farm is enclosed land, used for the sole purpose of growing the grain, or grass for hay; but not for summer pasturage. The great pasture is all outside—open to everybody, and to everybody's cattle; and the abundance and extent of the range is one of the resources of a new country. The cattle thus let loose on the wide world do not run away as people who have kept them only in houses and enclosures are apt to suppose. Why should they? There is abundance of food everywhere.

The animals like to come to their home where they have been wintered, and a little salt given to them every time they return will generally circumscribe their range within a mile or two from home.

In the autumn or early winter we bring them into the farm, and feed them night and morning. In the day, during the moderate weather of winter, they browse about the woods, and the skirts of the prairie. Thus are cattle and horses raised in great numbers.

In the same publication, and almost on the same page, are numerous letters from settlers, showing the prices of meat and other articles of provision in these regions. These letters make it sufficiently evident that cheap beef can be raised without the aid of monster squatters; and that, in fact, the way to raise beef cheap is to do away with the monster squatting of this country. The letter says:—"I will give you the price of various articles of food in English money, that you may understand it better : Beef 1½d. a pound, mutton 1½d. a pound, pork 1½d. a pound, flour 20s. per barrel of 195 lbs., veal 1½d. per lb., a turkey 1s. 6d., hens 6d. each butter 6d. per lb., sugar 3½d. per lb., tea 2s. per lb., &c., &c."

The same letter shows that these low prices did not produce low wages, for concurrently with them wages averaged from a dollar to a dollar and a quarter a day for the mere laborer, that is from 4s. 2d. to 5s. 3d., and this in a country that had no gold mines, and depended for its wealth and wages fund solely on the free access opened for its population to its best virgin soils, and its natural pastures.

The above extracts present a succinct epitome of the grounds on which the two cardinal resolutions—the first and second—were based.

The first and second resolutions having been adopted, the other resolutions, down to those which relate to "purchasers for money merely," were adopted after much consideration, but, except the fourth resolution, without any division of opinion.

As to the fourth, which relates to the taxation of all lands, once they are alienated from the State, and by which it is resolved that uncultivated lands ought to be subjected to a special State tax, there was some diversity of opinion. Several Delegates thought that it would sufficiently discourage the monopoly of speculators if all lands were subject to equal taxation, but the resolution was ultimately carried in its present shape by a large majority.

The next resolution that gave rise to any diversity of opinion was the first resolution, under the head of "purchasers for money merely." This resolution was discussed on Friday evening, the 31st July. The resolution is as follows :—

That while this Convention recommends that the actual cultivator be invested with the special lights set forth in the foregoing resolutions, they are of opinion that persons who may find it inconvenient or impossible to proceed to cultivate at once, should not, therefore, be wholly debarred from purchasing from the State; but they are of opinion, that this right of purchase should be controlled by such reasonable regulations as may discourage monopoly without shackling enterprise, or obstructing fair investment.

Mr. O'CONNOR, of Ballarat, moved, and Mr. MOONEY, of Sebastopol, seconded the following amendment:—

That this Convention cannot recognise the right of the Suite (which is merely the trustee for the people) to alienate any portion of the waste lands, except on the terms stipulated heretofore by the Convention, viz., "substantial occupation."

After a protracted discussion, a division was called for. There were 46 members in the room. Of these, 6 voted for the amendment, 2 declined to vote, and 38 voted for the original resolution.

All the other land resolutions were carried after much consideration and debate, but without giving rise to any difference of opinion in the Convention.

It will be observed that, on those resolutions which gave rise to any diversity of opinion, the dissentients were so few in number that it may be safely stated that these land resolutions were unanimously adopted by that great mass of opinion which was represented at the Convention.

Interview with Mr. Haines.

While the Convention was engaged in discussing these land resolutions, it was contemporaneously performing other work.

Immediately after its assembling, it appointed, as already stated, a Select Committee to arrange an interview with the Chief Secretary, Mr. Haines; also to arrange an interview with the Parliamentary minority who opposed the Bill.

This Committee reported to the Convention a short address to Mr. Haines, requesting the withdrawal of the Bill, recommending the request to be presented to that gentleman by a deputation.

The request to Mr. Haines was as follows:—

Melbourne,

July, 1857.

To the Honorable the Chief Secretary.

Honorable Sir,—At public meetings held at the towns and districts hereinafter mentioned, it was determined that the persons whose signatures are attached to this request should meet in Melbourne, for the purpose of using all lawful means in order to obtain the withdrawal of the land bill, at present before the Legislative Assembly.

The requisitionists represent the metropolis, the metropolitan suburbs, the agricultural, and the mining districts of the colony.

Having assembled, the requisitionists have come to the unanimous conclusion to request the Administration to withdraw the land bill at present before the House, and hereby do earnestly request its withdrawal.

This request was presented by a deputation of twelve members of the Convention. Mr. Haines declined to withdraw the Bill; but, at the close of his interview with the deputation, he gave them to understand that no bill should be passed that any future legislature might not repeal. This promise stands so much in contrast with the subsequent conduct of Mr. Haines and his Government, that the Council of the Convention desire to record it here, as it was recorded next day in the respective journals by the several representatives of the daily press of

Melbourne who were then present.

The Age reports Mr. Haines thus :—

He could not admit that the intentions of the Government were otherwise than to frame a bill which would be acceptable to the people, and to the whole community, and he could by no means accede to the request of the deputation, and pledge himself either to postpone or withdraw the bill, because he honestly believed that it might be so modified and amended in its progress through committee as to become acceptable to the community. If it should prove otherwise, they must bear in mind that finality did not attach to any act of the present Legislature. They were wishful indeed to pass a law which the people would not be desirous to alter by means of any future Legislature, but if the present measure was found in its operation to be injurious and not acceptable to the country, as it owed its temporary validity to the act of the Legislature, it might hereafter be repealed at the instance of a decided expression of the will of the country to that effect. The Government could have no wish to adopt a law which, instead of settling this question—a settlement admitted by all sides of the House to be necessary and desirable—would require to be altered or repealed by a succeeding Legislature : and he was so well assured that this was not the case, and that the bill could be satisfactorily framed, that he could not consent to its withdrawal.

The Herald—

He thought it was the case, that no ten men in the community, who opposed the Government Land Bill, could concur in the details they would recommend. Indeed, there were things in the bill he did not approve of himself: and as this was so, the Government being, as he had before said, actuated by an honest desire to meet the requirements of the people of the colony, were desirous of at once settling the question. Should any reformed Parliament object to the details proposed, it was a question quite open to them to deal with, and the acts of the present Assembly were not final.

The Argus—

He begged to call the attention of the gentlemen who addressed him to the fact that the present measure was by no means one which need be binding upon any future Parliament: there was no finality in it. All parties of gentlemen in the House concurred in the belief that there was a strong necessity for a speedy settlement of this question, and this being so, he could not promise on the part of the Government that they would withdraw this measure. He was quite willing to admit that the agricultural interest should be considered. He was an agriculturist himself until within the last year or two, and was quite ready to admit that it was necessary to the well-being of that interest that some of the pastoral lands of the colony should be placed at their disposal, but there were many other details which the opponents of this measure had insisted on, and to which he could not agree. He thought it was the case that no ten men in the community who opposed the Government Land Bill could concur in the details they would recommend; indeed, there were things in the bill he did not approve of himself; and, as this was so, the Government being, as he had before said, actuated by an honest desire to meet the requirements of the people of the colony were desirous of at once settling the question. Should any reformed Parliament object to the details proposed, it was a question quite open to them to deal with, and the acts of the present Assembly were not final.

In contrast with this undertaking, the Council desire to record that, on the third reading of the Bill in the House of Assembly, on the evening of the 3rd of September, Mr. Ireland, the member for Castlemaine, desiring to have this principle of the right of any future legislature to deal with the subject, as if this Bill had not been passed, recognised in the bill itself, moved the following resolution :—

That notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the Legislature may, from time to time, amend, alter, or repeal the whole or any part of the provisions of the Act, so as to authorise the alienation or disposition in fee simple, or for any lesser estate or interest of the whole or any part of the lands comprised on any run, for any purpose calculated to facilitate the settlement of the country; and to alter the terms and conditions provided by this Act in relation to the resumption of lands by the Governor in Council, or to substitute such new terms and conditions in lieu of those already provided as may be deemed advisable for effecting the purpose aforesaid."

This resolution was opposed by the whole force of the Government, and negatived by a majority of 28 to 17, Mr. Haines voting with his ministry in the majority. The following are the names of this Parliamentary majority :—

Noes—28.

- Mr Moore
- Mr Ebdon
- Mr Haines
- Mr Michie
- Mr Adamson

- Mr Goodman
- Mr C. Campbell
- Mr M'Culloch
- Mr Sargood
- Mr Heales
- Mr Service
- Mr Smith
- Mr Rutledge
- Mr Lalor
- Mr Sladen
- Mr Wills
- Mr Beaver
- Mr D. S. Campbell
- Mr Henty
- Mr Langlands
- Mr Snodgrass
- Mr Griffith
- Mr Sitwell
- Mr Johnson
- Capt. Clarke
- Mr Ware
- Mr Quarterman
- Mr Davis

Interview with the Parliamentary Minority.

The same Committee also reported a resolution expressing the thanks of the Convention to the Parliamentary minority, requesting the minority to persevere in their opposition to the Bill, and promising them the support of the country in such opposition; this resolution to be presented to the minority by the full Convention.

The resolution was as follows :—

Convention of Delegates

Assembled at Melbourne, in the Colony of Victoria, in the year of our Lord, 1857.

At a meeting of the Convention, held on the twentieth day of July, 1857, the following resolution was unanimously adopted :—

Resolved,—That inasmuch as the present Land Bill, introduced into Parliament by the Executive Council, is utterly subversive of the best rights and interests of the great body of the people of this colony, this Convention records its hearty approval of the determined and patriotic stand taken by the Minority in the Legislative Assembly in its opposition to the Government Land Bill; and, in tendering this expression of its thanks, this Convention would urge, in case the bill be persevered with, the necessity of further opposition by every means which the forms of Parliament allow; and this Convention declares, that the course thus suggested will receive the concurrence and support of the great mass of the community, whose opinions, on the present occasion, this Convention has the honor to represent.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. J. Walsh, Honorary Secretary.

WILSON GRAY, President.

The Convention desired to pay the minority the respect of waiting on them in full body, to present them with this resolution, but owing to the smallness of the room in which the minority had to receive them in the Parliament House, the minority conveyed to the Convention their regret that they were thus prevented from receiving more than a deputation, and that not to exceed thirty.

Accordingly, on the evening of the 29th July, a deputation of thirty waited on the minority in one of the committee rooms of the House of Assembly.

The following is the report of this interview which appeared next morning in the *Age* newspaper:—

Deputation to the Minority.

On Wednesday, between seven and eight o'clock, a deputation from the National Convention waited upon

the members of the Minority in the Assembly who opposed the Land Bill. The objects of the deputation were to present a resolution passed by the Convention expressive of their hearty approval of the course of opposition pursued by the minority, and to entrust—for presentation to the House—a remonstrance against the further prosecution of the Land Bill by the Government. The deputation comprised thirty gentlemen. The members of the minority present were—Messrs Myles, Hughes, Evans, O'Brien, Brooke, Read, Humffray, O'Shanassy, Syme, Duffy, and Baragwanath.

The reception took place in the committee room belonging to the Assembly.

Mr. WILSON GRAY, president of the Convention, opened the proceedings in the following terms :—Gentlemen of the Minority,—I have been deputed by the deputation of the Convention now sitting in Melbourne,—the gentlemen you see are the deputation,—to present you with a resolution which was adopted at a full meeting of that assembly. I beg now to do so. The resolution is addressed:—

To the Honorables B. C. Aspinall, D. Blair, H. Brooke, C. Gavan Duffy, G. S. Evans, J.V.F.L. Foster, A. Fyfe, J. M. Grant, G. Harker, G. S. W. Home, D. A. Hughes, J. B. Humffray, J. Myles, P. O'Brien, J. O'Shanassy, J. D. Owens, P. Phelan, C. Read, T. Baragwanath, P. Snodgrass, E. Syme, and J. D. Wood—who voted in the minority on the second reading of the Government Land Bill, in the House of Assembly, on the 10th day of June, 1857.

(Here Mr. Gray read the resolution.)

It is directed to the minority by name, taking the minority in alphabetical order; and I presume I shall be following the strict letter by handing it to the gentleman whose name—among those present—is first on the list. (He then handed the document to Mr Brooke.) Another resolution was passed expressive of the wish of the Convention to wait upon you in a manner the most respectful, as well as to show most emphatically its approval of your conduct, and it was intended that the whole Convention should attend. It is only the capacity of the room in which you receive it that has prevented the whole Convention from attending. There are, however, thirty present. It is almost impossible to introduce the deputation personally, but I may remark that there is a delegate from each of the following places :—Ballaarat, Bacchus Marsh, Beechworth, Bendigo, Brighton, Carisbrook, Castlemaine, Collingwood, Colac, Dunolly, Emerald Hill, Fryer's Creek, Geelong, Gisborne, Heathcote, Heidelberg, Kyneton, Melbourne, Mount Blackwood, North Melbourne, Ovens, Prahran, Richmond, Sebastopol, St. Kilda, Seymour, Tarrengower, Templestowe, Williamstown, and Wangaratta. From the variety of the places represented, and the numbers that have come here, and who have sat for weeks, away from their business at great personal inconvenience, you can estimate the strength and force of opinion represented. I have nothing to do but to introduce the body to you, gentlemen. There are one or two of the delegates who wish to address a few words to you.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ballaarat) said there was no part of the duties of the Convention they could more heartily perform, or with greater sincerity, than to record the opinions of the people in reference to the conduct of the minority. (Hear.) He could speak of the district from which he had come, and the unanimous approval which the people had shown to the minority since the introduction of the Land Bill. They were perfectly satisfied that the opposition was made, not from any factious motives, but simply because they (the minority) thought that the bill, if passed, would be entirely subversive of the best rights of the people, and he could inform the minority that they would have, for the future, the unanimous approval of the people to bear them out in their opposition to the bill, which was intended to upset the rights of the colony at large. (Hear, hear.) He begged to express his own and the thanks of the community he had the honor to represent to them (the minority) for their conduct.

Mr. BENSON (Bendigo) said, they appeared there for the purpose of giving the minority a vote of thanks for the stand they had made against that measure, which they considered injurious to the best interests of the community. The Convention had met for the purposes of patriotism and the good of this country, and they considered the minority had the same feelings on behalf of the country; and, therefore, they respectfully thanked the minority for the stand they had made in the cause of freedom, and the future happiness of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) He concluded by thanking the minority: and expressing his anticipation that the result of their, and the Convention's labor, would be beneficial not only to the district which he represented, but would tend to the general welfare of the land of their adoption.

Mr. QUINLAN (Dunolly) said, believing their (the minority's) time to be very valuable and very limited, and believing that the resolution just read expressed the unanimous opinion of the Convention, he would only say that what was therein expressed was fully re-echoed by the people he represented—the inhabitants of Dunolly.

Mr. SMYTH (Ovens) said, on the part of the people he represented, that the whole of that district—the Municipal Council, the freeholders, the miners, to the number of 20,000—with one voice acknowledged themselves, and their children, and their children's children, under a debt of gratitude to the minority. (Hear.)

Mr. BROOKE said : Gentlemen of the Convention, I much regret that any alphabetical arrangement should have made me the respondent on this occasion, because there are so many other members of the minority who have occupied a long and distinguished position in this country, and in the eyes of other countries to whom this

country will naturally look for approval in this emergency. But I may be allowed to say that a common sentiment actuates every member of the minority who thought proper to oppose this Land Bill. I am quite sure that there is no member who sits on that (the opposition) side of the House but opposed it on the most conscientious grounds possible, feeling it was his duty. (Hear, hear.) After the discussion of the bill which had already occupied so many days, and which will yet occupy many more, it is a source of gratification to me, and to every one holding the same views, to find that we are supported out of doors; to find the members of the Convention, representing political opinion so largely, were with us; and to find that our efforts meet with their approval. For myself, and on behalf of the minority, I have the honor to thank you.

Mr. O'SHANASSY said, as he stood next to his friend Mr. Brooke, he would take that opportunity of accepting in the most grateful manner the compliment paid not only to himself but to all the members of the minority. He differed from Mr. Brooke in this: — that he rejoiced that the Convention had addressed them in alphabetical order, as clearly showing that they were not supposed—as was said by one of the speakers—to be acting from factious motives, but opposing this bill for the simple reason that it was not conducive to the interests of the people; and that the minority on this occasion were acting upon their individual opinions, although unanimous in their opposition. (Hear.) He begged to state that no organisation of any character did exist in the arrangements of the minority; and, consequently, no greater compliment could be paid than to give them an opportunity of stating publicly that no combination existed in the minority. (Hear.) As one living a long time in this country, he rejoiced to see the meeting by convention, and the petitioning of the people; it was an earnest to him, an old resident, that public spirit was at length awakened. He expressed that he was willing to serve the people still; and he hoped they were determined to assert their rights. He would not detain them, as the time for re-entering on the discussion of this measure was drawing nigh. He could only reiterate his thanks for the acknowledgment of their (the minority's) services, and he trusted that the objects they had in view in defeating the measure would succeed. He did not think the gentlemen forming the majority in this session would concede to them all that they required; but he trusted that they might reasonably expect, at all events, that, if the Government would not defer to the opinions of the people and withdraw the Land Bill, they might rest sure of this—that no new rights should be created. (Hear.) To effect this, he pledged himself to attend and to vote most systematically against any clause that created any new right. In conclusion, he said he trusted the time was not far off when the Government would be in accordance with the opinions of the people of the country.

Mr. HUMFFRAY joined with his hon. friend in expressing his deep sympathy with the great work they (the Convention) had undertaken; and he believed the time was not very far distant when—if they only did their duty—instead of coming there as petitioners, they would have an opportunity of addressing them (the minority) on terms of equality. (Hear.) He thanked them and urged them strongly to continue their support; so long as they did their duty out of doors, they would find a party in doors, however small, ready to do theirs. (Hear.)

Mr. DUFFY said he thought they (the Convention) had done very wisely in presenting this recognition of the efforts of the members who opposed this bill; because, it must be remembered that those resisting the aggression on the people had to bear the slanders of their enemies—(hear, hear); that the men who had endeavoured to oppose this bill had been habitually misrepresented by the journals representing the Government and the squatters. (Hear.) He thought, therefore, that this would serve to clear those misrepresentations. He had more confidence than some of his friends had expressed that this bill would be defeated. (Hear, hear.) Since it had been under the consideration of the House the elections had made a marked change in sides. (Hear, hear.) If it were defeated, it was not to be forgotten that they had not only to stop this bill, but to carry an efficient bill. (Hear.) The only road to that was to reform the Parliament. And they must not forget in their habitual earnestness and zeal on this question, that there was another. He reminded them that the question of State aid was taken up with great zeal, and many were returned to the Assembly simply on the ground of advocating it: they had been returned to that House—they had advocated it—and they had betrayed the people on every other measure. (Hear, hear.) But when returning men to that House, they must not be content that they be right on the Land Bill; they must take care that they be right on the question of Reform. (Hear, hear.) At all events, when this present measure was disposed of, the Assembly and the Convention must turn their attention to get the Reform Bill passed; to get the Government of this country carried out by the people of this country. When that was done, there would be no need of Conventions. There would be those in the House who were wanted in it. We should have the mind and earnestness of the country represented by those who had the confidence of the people. (Applause.) He thanked them.

Dr. EVANS begged, with his friends who had already addressed them, in acknowledgement of the very great honor they (the deputation,) had conferred upon them in the way in which they bore testimony to their (the minority's), sincerity of conduct in opposing this land bill, to thank them. He begged leave to express his entire concurrence in everything that had been said by his colleagues. He begged to state, however, that the bill was still in committee, that they had retarded the progress of the bill, the bill was still before the House, and every prospect of its being carried by what they, (the Minority,) had termed "a tyrannical majority." (Hear, hear.) But

they would still endeavor to oppose it and strike out every bad clause. This was certain that as the people were determined to oppose this bill, so were the Government determined to carry it out. It was to their (the Convention's) exertions out of doors, and the elections, that he looked for help. When their labors were ended in Melbourne, he looked to them to have what they had not now—a people's representation in this colony. He assured them that the minority would continue to do, as they had done already, their duty to the public on perfectly conscientious and disinterested grounds. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WILSON GRAY then handed to Mr. Brook "the Protest (or Remonstrance), against the Land Bill, from the Convention," to be presented to the Legislative Assembly. He said it was respectfully worded, and he had no reason to doubt that it would be received. All the members of the Convention had not signed it, because there was not time for their so doing; it was, however, signed by above sixty Delegates.

Mr. BROOKE said he felt much pleasure in accepting it to present to the House. But he was afraid that, it being a protest or remonstrance, he would be debarred by the the usages of Parliament.

Mr. WILSON GRAY said, that though called a "protest," the body of the document would be found an ordinary petition. It was presented with a request that all the gentlemen of the minority should support it.

Memorial to the House of Assembly.

The Convention adopted the following memorial to the House of Assembly, (the same that was alluded to above), which was signed by all the delegates, and was presented to the House by Mr. Brooke :—

To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly.

The Petition of the undersigned, forming a Convention, now sitting in Melbourne, having been elected by a large majority of the people of this colony, for the purpose of opposing the Land Bill, now before your honorable House,

Shews that we approach your honorable body with every feeling of respect, for the purpose of expressing through this document our firm, but respectful, conviction that the said Land Bill not only does not accord with the opinions of the people whom your honorable House purports to represent, but that the said Bill is in every way calculated to retard the prosperity of the whole community.

We do, therefore, hereby respectfully and solemnly record our opinions that the passing of the aforesaid Bill by your honorable House, as at present constituted, will not be accepted by the country as an equitable settlement of the Land Question.

We therefore humbly pray that your honorable House will, in its wisdom, suspend all legislation upon this subject until an alteration in the Electoral Law shall give a more full and fair representation of all classes in the community.

And we, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Protest Against the Bill.

At the same time that the Convention took these proceedings it also adopted the following protest against the bill, intended more especially as a warning to capitalists and others whom it might concern, that no public faith was pledged to the recognition of any interests that the bill might pretend to vest in the pastoral tenants, and that such interests, if created by it, would be annulled by the first Parliament in which the people of the Colony should find themselves represented.

Protest

Of the Convention now assembled in Melbourne against the Land Bill at present before the Legislative Assembly of Victoria.

We, the Delegates, assembled in full convention in reference to the Bill now before the

Legislative Assembly, for disposing of the Crown Lands, declare that the said Bill is, in the opinion of this Convention, objectionable and unconstitutional, for the following among other reasons:—

- Because it is framed in contravention of the manifest intention and spirit of the Constitution Act sanctioned by her Majesty the Queen, conceding the lands and mines of the colony to the Legislature in the capacity of trustees, for the disposal of the same in a manner just and satisfactory to the people.
- Because the said bill concedes exclusive rights over the public domain to seven hundred and twenty persons to the manifest wrong and the grievous injury of all the other inhabitants.
- Because, in a vote of 32 to 22, twelve of the persons interested in thus possessing themselves of vast tracts of the public land have been suffered to vote in the majority on this bill, which concedes the lands to themselves for indefinite periods, and for nominal rents, a proceeding utterly repugnant to justice and

to the genius and usage of the British Constitution.

- Because several other members of the majority on this bill have broken their pledges to their constituents, and their faith to the public, and have voted on this bill contrary to those pledges and the repeated remonstrances of their constituents.
- Because the members of the House of Assembly generally, under the present Electoral Act, represent but a small minority of the people, whilst the great majority of the colony, whose interests are most deeply involved, have no voice whatever, by representation or otherwise, in the framing of this bill.
- Because petitions, bearing the signatures of more than seventy thousand adult males, have been presented against this bill, and not one petition has been presented in its favor : because these petitions have not only been disregarded, but have been treated by the majority with contumely and derision; and, moreover, because the bill itself has been indecently forced forward against the usual forms of Parliamentary proceedings, in defiance of the protest of the minority, and with the declared intention of passing it into law before public meetings of the people of the colony could have an opportunity of expressing upon it their deliberate opinion.
- Because, on the admission of the present advisers of the Crown, the House of Assembly needs, and is to receive, a thorough reform : and it must, therefore, be considered incapable at present to legislate upon a bill that will convey away the public property of the people before the people themselves are permitted a voice in the matter.
- For these and for other reasons, we declare that no public faith is pledged to the recognition of any pretended rights that may be hereafter claimed under this bill, should it become law; that the people of this colony are no parties to the compact; that the Act (if the bill is ever passed) will be a fraudulent enactment for the confiscation of the public lands; and that so far as it may purport to vest any rights it will be repudiated by the people, and repealed by the first Parliament in which they find themselves represented.

To give effect to this protest the following resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

- That the protest now adopted by this Convention be printed, and that each delegate be requested to send copies of it to the district from which he has been delegated.
- That the several delegates be requested on their return to their several districts from this Convention, to submit this protest for the approbation of a public meeting convened for the purpose, and that they report the result to such central body as may remain in Melbourne.
- That the several delegates pledge themselves to use every effort in their localities to organise such localities, both locally and in connection with a central organization, for the purpose of carrying out the object of this Convention, and among other objects to give effect to this protest and declaration.
- That a copy of this protest and declaration and of those resolutions, be forwarded to the principal mercantile houses and to all the banks in this and the mother country; also to the members of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly; and to the members of the Cabinet and of both Houses of Parliament at home.

Immigration at the Public Expense.

The Convention adopted the following resolutions, on the subject of Immigration conducted at the public expense:—

That, while this Convention desires to see this country rendered so attractive that a tide of voluntary emigration shall pour into it, similar to that which is now setting into America and creating an empire on that continent, it is of opinion that all immigration at the public expense is, in the present stage of these Colonies, a violation at once of the true principles of colonization and of political justice, for the following among other reasons:—

- —Because the system of immigration at the public expense is an integral part of the present land system—a land system constructed to create a country of masters and servants,—and can have no place in a land system constructed for a free people.
- —Because such system of immigration taxes all for the benefit of a few.
- —Because the money so raised is avowedly applied to reduce the wages of the laborer, the mechanic, and others of that numerous class who work for wages.
- —Because, under a proper land system, such a system of immigration would be wholly unnecessary, even for the ostensible object of its promoters—an abundant supply of labor.
- —Because such a system gives to parties in the United Kingdom the power to send to this country a worse class of immigrants than would be likely to come here at their own expense.

Parliamentary Reform.

The Convention adopted the following Report on the subject of Parliamentary Reform :—

This Convention begs to impress it on each delegate, and on the district he represents, that, having given expression to public opinion on the present Land Bill, and, it is hoped, contributed largely to the defeat of it, and having also collected opinion as to the general provisions of the land bill which the people should hereafter demand, the next, subject indispensable to the accomplishment of their object is, the consideration of the means by which this "People's land bill," and every other good legislation, can be secured.

The one effective means of achieving good legislation, and making future conventions unnecessary, is thorough Parliamentary Reform.

The Parliament itself must be made the convention of the people.

The Convention reminds the people that on Parliamentary Reform, as on the Land Bill, attempts will be made to blind them by vague and illusory promises, if they do not themselves adopt some leading principles as indispensable, and by these principles test every candidate who presents himself at the hustings.

As such leading principles, the Convention suggest the following:—

1st. Manhood suffrage, without any special privilege to property.

2nd. Equal electoral districts, based on population, and to be re-adjusted by every new census.

3rd. The same qualification—simple manhood qualification—for the electors of both Houses of Parliament.

4th. The duration of the House of Assembly not to exceed two years. The duration of the Legislative Council not to exceed three years.

5th. No property qualification for members of either House.

6th. The abolition of all preliminary registration of voters as tending to the disfranchisement of the people. The security for the right and identity of the elector to be the oath of the party himself, that he is 21 years of age, a British subject, born or naturalised, a resident of the district for two months, and that he has not voted before at the same election; a security of the same nature as, that on which property and life are daily disposed of in courts of justice.

7thly. The number of members of the Assembly to be increased—say to 100.

8thly. There is another principle which the Convention have reserved to the last, because there is no other that they deem so important at present to impress upon the popular mind. They have reserved it in order to give to their recommendation of it a special emphasis and force.

This principle is the PAYMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

The sacrifices required from a Member of Parliament in this colony are very great. He removes himself from his home and his private affairs; he lives in Melbourne at considerable cost; and, if he discharges his duties honorably and efficiently, his labors are most onerous. It is idle to suppose that such duties will be well discharged without at least sufficient remuneration to indemnify him from loss or expenditure. By a few persons, and for a short time, they may be so discharged; but by the mass of members, or even by a few continuously, they cannot and will not be. If members are not paid, the people must be content to be represented by persons, who, having other business besides the people's business to transact in Parliament, will not only accept the duties to discharge them gratuitously, but will be very happy even to pay considerable sums for the profitable privilege of being entrusted with them. The history of the present Land Bill proves that it has been a very dear bargain for the people to have accepted for nothing the services of gentlemen who ultimately propose to pay themselves by confiscating the public lands to themselves and their friends.

The Convention submit that the experience of the colony is, that the services of men known and trusted in the several districts cannot generally be secured, unless these men are paid at least such a reasonable sum as may cover their expenditure, and save them from direct loss.

The Convention, while they request the attention of the people to all the foregoing points, solicit it especially to the following three—equal electoral districts; the abolition of registration; and the payment of members of Parliament.

The other points of Parliamentary Reform are, more or less, conceded, and the struggle will not be upon them. The efforts of the enemies of Reform will not be open, but disguised. Their endeavor will be to keep the promise to the ear, but to break it to the sense.

They will profess to give manhood suffrage, but they will endeavor to arrange the districts so as to make one man in certain districts equivalent to five or ten men in others.

They will profess to make the right of voting universal, but they will so embarrass it with regulations, and choke it with impossible conditions of continuous residence, as to make it unattainable in practice to a fourth of those whom they promise to enfranchise.

Professedly, they will enable the people to select any representative they choose, unrestrained by property

qualification; but they will make the trust so expensive that few will accept it to do the people's business, and it will, in the majority of cases, be continuously held only by persons who retain it for the purpose of furthering transactions of their own.

The Convention, therefore, urge upon the several delegates that, in all local organisation, Parliamentary Reform, embracing all the principles herein enumerated, and, especially, equal electoral districts; the abolition of registration; and the payment of members of Parliament; be made a prominent subject for discussion, and a test for candidates presenting themselves on popular principles.

Mining on Private Property.

The Convention adopted the following Report on the subject of Mining on Private Property:—

The first clause of the bill is objectionable—

1st. Because the words "Mining District" will confine the provisions of the Act to the present Gold-fields' Districts, and not extend beyond them.

2nd. And because it proposes to invest a judge of the court of Mines (who is not competent to decide on mining matters) with the power to determine whether, or not, mining shall be permitted on private lands; of deciding what compensation should be paid to the owner of such land. And further, of imposing on the miner whatever conditions he may think proper.

Clause 2 is objectionable—Inasmuch as it is quite unnecessary.

Clause 4 is objectionable—As it requires the forwarding of documents to the Chief Secretary.

Clause 5 is objectionable—On account of the decision of arbitrators, so appointed, being likely to be slow and unsatisfactory.

Clauses 8 and 9 are objectionable—Because they increase the difficulties of access to private property, by encouraging litigation and vexatious delays.

Clauses 10 and 11 are objectionable—Because the miner is compelled to pay costs whether he gains or loses the suit.

Clause 15 is objectionable—As it does not give power to mine, when the depth would be so great as to prevent any injury to the surface or buildings.

Clause 16 is objectionable—As it legalises unjust contracts already entered into, in opposition to the regulations of the Local Courts of the districts, thereby conferring on individuals a monopoly of certain auriferous lands.

Clause 17 is objectionable—As it confers on the Governor and Council the power of deciding when auriferous lands are worked out.

Finally: the bill is objectionable *in toto*—As it does not give, as it purports, increased facilities of access to private property—and because it is expensive, slow, and litigious.

The Chinese.

The Convention adopted the following Report respecting the Chinese:—

"1st. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the introduction of more Chinese into this colony is an evil of great magnitude.

"2nd. That this Committee suggest the necessity of petitioning the Government to enact a law to prevent the further influx of Chinese to this colony.

"3rd. That this Committee request the Legislature to enact a law making it imperative upon the Chinese to leave the colony before the end of six months from the passing of said act, and that no protection tickets be granted for a longer period. And that we are urgent on this subject, as we believe the miners are restrained from summarily dealing with the Chinese by the belief entertained that the question is likely to be satisfactorily arranged by the Executive.

4th. That Mr. Quinlan be requested to draw up a memorial embodying the foregoing resolutions, and the opinions as expressed by the members of this Committee."

Report of Finance Committee.

The Convention adopted the following Report of their Finance Committee :—

Report of the Sub-Committee Appointed to form a Scheme of Finance to Sustain the Operations of the Convention.

The first element of power which can be wielded by an associated body such as ours is TRUTH, the second

the PRESS to disseminate the Truth, and the third FUNDS to defray the expenses attendant on its dissemination.

A well organised subscription is invariably the most successful; by becoming general, it is more cheerfully paid, and enlists a greater amount of sympathy.

We submit, therefore, that cards of "Association with the Convention" be prepared, with a suitable motto, and on the reverse side of the Card the heads of the Convention Land Bill be printed, which will thus afford a means of circulating the principles of the Convention among the people, whilst teaching them to think and act in unity.

For the Delegates of the Convention the Card might be somewhat varied, and the price fixed 20s.; for supporters of the Convention, probably 5s. might be considered enough.

A third class of collections might be monthly payments of One Shilling, from those whose limited means forbid a greater contribution.

A fourth mode would be, that merchants, professional gentlemen, tradesmen, and others who are friendly to the people's cause, be applied to for donations and subscriptions towards the Convention Fund.

A fifth mode of raising Funds might be by Public Lectures and Public Entertainments, &c., where the principles of the Convention may be explained. The operation of raising Funds and the discussing of the great questions which these Funds are to support produce a double action of utility, informing the public mind on the one hand, and raising necessary Funds to sustain the movement on the other.

The Victorian Convention has it in its power to emancipate the country and open the lands, if the people support it with Funds—already two responsible Treasurers and a permanent Finance Committee have been appointed, and we now recommend that the work be forthwith commenced in the Convention; and that Collectors for the City and Suburban Districts be appointed as one of the most pressing duties of the Convention; when the Gold Fields' and Country Delegates return to their constituencies, they will put the same machinery into motion and remit the proceeds to the Central Committee.

That a monthly Balance Sheet be furnished and printed.

Finally—In making this appeal to the people, it is necessary to remind them that, as they are the basis of power, they are likewise the only legitimate source from whence Funds can be obtained to sustain a National movement of this character. Their willingness to contribute the necessary Funds towards its support is at once a proof of their adhesion to the principles, and a means of disseminating them over the whole community.

And also the following Report, supplementary to the above:—

Supplementary Report of Sub-Committee on Finance.

Your committee would suggest the advisability of forming a common fund of at least £1,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Executive Council to carry out the great objects for which this Convention has been convened.

With regard to the appointment of a permanent Finance Committee, your committee recommend the appointment of such body to be left to the Council of the Convention.

In bringing up this report, your committee would earnestly impress on the gentlemen composing the Convention the great importance of bringing under the notice of the people of their various districts the urgent necessity of contributing promptly and liberally to the general funds of the Convention.

But, as a means of meeting expenses already incurred, your committee would respectfully urge that remittances be forwarded from each locality with as little delay as possible.

Council of the Convention.

The Convention, before adjourning, adopted the following resolutions authorising a Council to sit in Melbourne:—

Resolution as to a Council of Twenty-One.

That this Convention, before adjourning, do appoint a Committee of twenty-one of its members as a Council of correspondence and administration, to sit in Melbourne, and meet, from time to time, as they shall deem expedient. Such Council to consist of six members from the gold-fields, three from the country districts, and twelve from the metropolitan and suburban districts; and the officers of the Convention to be ex-officio members.

Resolutions Amending the Above.

That the resolution heretofore adopted by this Convention, appointing a Council of twenty-one members to act as a council of correspondence and administration in Melbourne, be so far rescinded that the Council shall not be limited in number, but shall consist of as many members of the Convention as find themselves able to

attend. That seven constitute a quorum, provided these seven include one of the officers of the Convention, that is to say, the President, Secretary, or one of the Vice-Presidents, or Treasurers.

That in matters coming before such council, and being of sufficient importance to justify the expense of the necessary circulars and postages, all the members of the Convention be communicated with before any decision in such matters be arrived at. And that such members be at liberty to vote on such questions by proxy, and that their letters in reply to the circulars be accepted as their proxies.

Local Leagues in Connection with the Convention.

Before the Convention adjourned, they adopted a resolution to the following effect:—

That the delegates be requested, on returning to their several localities, to establish local leagues, holding themselves in correspondence and connection with the Convention Council of Melbourne, and that these Leagues be requested to use a common card, and style themselves by a common name, varied only by the name of the place in which they may be established, thus—"The Convention Land and Reform League of Ballaarat," "The Convention Land and Reform League of Bendigo," &c., &c.

In accordance with this resolution, numerous local leagues have been established, and cards have been struck by the Council and circulated to these several leagues.

Adjournment of the Convention.

The Convention having sat from the 15th of July to the 6th of August, on the latter day adjourned *sine die*.

Postscript.

Melbourne,

1st October, 1857.

The publication of the foregoing pages having been unexpectedly delayed, the Council is now able to add to them the final result of the opposition to the Land Bill. This Bill passed its third reading in the House of Assembly, on the 3rd of September, by a majority of 30 to 23. A few of its clauses had been modified, but in substance it was not materially altered. It still gave the public lands to the squatters on pastoral leases, for protracted periods, and on such terms as would have made it easy for them gradually to acquire a title on fee simple; and, as already stated, ministers and their supporters refused to recognise the right of any future Parliament to alter "arrangements" thus made by this Bill. The division on the third reading was as follows :—

On Tuesday, the 8th of September, the Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council, and read a first time. Faithful to the course they had pursued in the Lower House, ministers proposed to rush it through the Council as they would fain have done through the Assembly, and to make the second reading an order of the day for that day week. But Mr. Fawkner met the proposal with an amendment postponing the second reading for a fortnight, and to this amendment ministers were compelled to yield. The country immediately began to rouse it to a new effort. Public meetings were held in all parts of the colony, and petitions to the Legislative Council determined on. It was known that the Bill would encounter a strenuous opposition in the Council, and it was thought that the debate would be more than once adjourned. It was resolved, therefore, not to hurry down the petitions before they were largely signed, but to prove by the number of signatures that the hostility of the country had increased, not abated, since the Bill had passed the Lower House. But the fate of the Bill was decided more summarily than the country expected.

For the reasons just stated, scarcely any petitions from the country districts were presented on the night that the second reading was moved. Melbourne, and two of its suburbs—Richmond and Prahran—sent in petitions which numbered over eight thousand signatures, intending to follow them up with supplementary petitions, to be presented on the next night of the discussion. Collingwood and Emerald Hill had petitions already signed by nearly three thousand petitioners, but deferred forwarding them until they were signed more largely. If the discussion had proceeded, Melbourne and its suburbs would have mustered 20,000 petitioners, being about double the number that had petitioned the Lower House from the metropolitan district. The Secretary of one of the Convention Leagues (Ararat) had communicated to the Secretary of the Convention Council that it was their intention not to send down their petition for the first night, but to give the people full opportunity of signing it. He added that there was every likelihood of 20,000 signatures being attached, from Ararat and Pleasant Creek. The Ballaarat gold field had been districted for the purpose of forming Convention Leagues. Ballaarat had furnished 14,000 petitioners to the Legislative Assembly; the petitioners from Ballaarat to the

Legislative Council would probably have been still more numerous. On the whole, there was every ground for expecting that the 70,000 petitioners of the Legislative Assembly would have swelled to 90,000 or perhaps 100,000 petitioners of the Legislative Council. But the bill was destined to no such pomp of obsequies. It met a speedier and more ignominious fate.

On Tuesday, the 22nd of September, Mr. Mitchell moved that the bill be now read a second time. Mr. John Pascoe Fawkner moved, as an amendment, that it be read a second time that day six months. Mr. Keogh seconded the amendment. After a debate of some hours, the amendment was put, and the Legislative Council, without even waiting to hear the country, summarily ejected the bill by a vote of 21 to 6. The division was as follows :

For the Amendment—21.

- Mr. Hodgson
- Mr Keogh
- Mr Urquhart
- Mr Henty, J.
- Mr Clarke
- Mr Miller
- Mr Bennett
- Mr. Power
- Mr Henty, S. G.
- Mr M'Combie
- Mr Vaughan
- Mr Kennedy
- Mr Cruikshank
- Dr. Tierney
- Mr. Cowie
- Mr Williams
- Mr Hood
- Mr Fawkner
- Mr Stewart
- Mr Guthridge
- Mr Allen

For the Bill—6.

- Mr. Strachan
- Mr Patterson
- Mr. Mitchell
- Mr Hope
- Mr. Roope
- Mr Highett

The Council of the Convention, whilst they acknowledge that there is cause for rejoicing in this result, desire not to lose time in exulting over it, nor to lose force by overrating this popular success. Only one step has been gained—a bad bill has been defeated; the main battle has still to be fought and won—a good bill has to be carried. This can only be accomplished by organising the opinion of the country. The Council therefore urge it on the people to organise. And, in organising now, the Council submit that they must organise, not only for a good Land Law, but also for that great Reform, which is the only effective instrument of this and all other reforms. The popular agitation must now proceed upon a more extended basis. A "People's Land Law" and "Parliamentary Reform" must be demanded together.

Appendix.

Speech of Mr. Haines in the Year 1852, at Geelong.

The Council desires to record the following speech of present Chief Secretary, Mr.

Haines, delivered in the year 1852, at Geelong. They think the document worth preserving, as a monument of the inconsistency and bad faith of the authors of the Government Land Bill. Mr. Haines said he should first of all proceed to read a few extracts from the Orders in Council bearing upon this important question, and as doubts might arise in the minds of some persons as to their real purport, it became highly necessary that every individual in the country should be made thoroughly acquainted with their import. Time would not allow him to

read the whole of these Orders in Council, but in selecting some which bore more particularly upon the question, he should take care that the meaning should not be garbled by means of his not quoting their context both before and after. Mr. Haines then proceeded to read to the meeting the sixth section of these Orders in Council, and observed that by that ordinance the Crown lands of the colony in the unsettled districts were effectually locked up from the public, and only made available to a certain exclusive class for the lengthened period of fourteen years. In the intermediate districts the time was limited to eight years, but in both instances it might be again renewed, to the exclusion of the public generally, and to the advantage of one particular class of the people. The effect of these orders would be to prevent any person coming into competition with the lessee. He was under the impression at the time they were framed, that is five years ago, the supposition was that the Crown Lands in the interior of the colony would not be required for occupation like those situated nearer to the sea coast. Such indeed might have been the case formerly, but the late discovery of gold had considerably altered the case. (Cheers.) These lands were about to be thrown open, it was true, but not thrown open to public competition, but merely to a distinct body of men, who are to have the unjust privilege of purchasing the most choice spots at the minimum price of 20s. per acre, (cries of "shame, shame.") He would ask is this fair dealing? (Cries of "no, no.") The favored few were not people who were merely in struggling circumstances, or poor; oh no, they were the individuals who enjoyed more wealth than any other section of the community. The squatters waited until the most favorable opportunity for their raising corn and the other necessities of life had arrived, and most assuredly, if they obtain the advantages they now seek, they will secure the monopoly in corn as completely as they have that of wool. (Cheers.) The public lands adjacent to the gold-fields were of the utmost importance to the colonists at large, and if put up for sale would meet with ready purchasers from the agricultural and laboring classes. From their proximity to the immense population at the various diggings, they would be preferred to any other for the purpose of laying out small farms, and so reduce the exorbitant rates now paid by the diggers for almost every necessary of life. (Cheers.) If the various provisions of these orders were calculated to act fairly on all branches of the community, without great alteration, there would be an end to the matter. He was not antagonistic to the welfare of the squatters, some of whom he counted among his most intimate friends, but he could not remain inactive when he saw the Government of the country disposed to secure their particular interest at the expense of all others. (Cheers.) The pre-emptive right of these gentlemen, of which we have heard so much, and which is a monstrous invasion of the British Constitution, has already been acted upon even before the leases have been issued. He was no lawyer, but could safely say that such gentlemen who had exercised a pre-emptive right before obtaining their respective leases, have purchased an imaginative property which has never been legally vested in them, and which is not worth a farthing's purchase. They have certainly anticipated their position. The Governor may be called upon by the Orders in Council to assess the value of the Crown Lands, but no provision has been framed rendering it compulsory on him to do so. With respect to the purchasing of lands in the intermediate districts, he would simply make the remark, that, before such land, according to the obnoxious orders, can be exposed to public competition, the lessee, or in other words, the squatter, is to have the chance of picking the best portions, at 20s. the acre. (Cries of "Shame, shame.") In the face of this one great disadvantage, the people would have the option afterwards of securing the inferior portions, by a spirited competition, at perhaps from three to four times the amount paid by the favorite lessee. (Groans.) The number of persons present on this occasion convinced him of the great interest that was felt on this subject. He could have wished, however, the serious consideration of so momentous a question had been delayed for a day or two longer. He had only had intimation on the previous afternoon, and had hardly time to bring more decisive arguments against the iniquity of issuing the leases. At the present day the squatter grew his mutton and wool upon land contiguous to the more humble farmer, and this upon land which cost him nominally a fraction of half a farthing an acre. Now, at the very least, the farmer has paid 20s. per acre for his land, or was living upon a tenancy at the rate of 2s. per acre per annum. It is to be wondered, then, that these two divided interests should regard one another with a jealous and suspicious eye? This is the case unfortunately in most instances, and though the agriculturist has purchased and paid for his land at so much disadvantage, he cannot, unless his ground is well and securely fenced in, impound the squatter's stock when found trespassing; but the squatter, in his turn, who has obtained the run at so moderate a rate, can do this, and has but too frequently used his power, to the great annoyance of his neighbors; and this has been more frequently done from vindictive motives than from the legitimate desire of preventing trespass. As regards manuring or improving land, the squatter would have a great advantage in turning stock on the ground, whilst the farmer would have to feed his stock upon artificial food. He could adopt no alteration of crops, and would be reduced to the necessity of turning his agricultural land into pastoral. He would ask, what advantage would he be likely to derive under present circumstances from his doing so? (Cheers.) He felt no hesitation in affirming that if the leases were issued to the squatters, and the privileges which they are anticipating granted, then it would cause the ruin of the agricultural farms, and afford a monopoly in grain similar to that which has so long been enjoyed by that class in the article of wool. With regard to the only real argument or objection that

he considered worth while attending to against suspending the Orders in Council, the alleged breach of faith involved, he would say, in answer to those who affirmed that promises ought to be held sacred, that they should in the abstract, but should they, in the particular instance now before them, when the carrying such promises into execution would involve disastrous and unhappy consequences upon a whole people? (Cheers, and no, no.) It must be remembered, also, that these promises had been extorted from the British Government by misrepresentation. On the same principle, it might be said he was bound to pay a promissory note which had been surreptitiously obtained from him. Before he (Mr. Haines) took his seat in the Legislative Council as a nominee, his first inquiry of Government was regarding the issuing of the leases; and the information from that quarter was that they would not be issued. Upon this condition alone did he take his seat in the House; but, since the commencement of the present session, he found that Government had altered their views upon the subject, and they were determined to issue the obnoxious leases, upon ascertaining which, it became his duty to vacate his seat. (Hear, and cheers.) Previous to the gold discovery, neither the squatter nor the Government were anxious to have the leases issued, or the lands put up for sale. A short time ago, a certain gentleman of his acquaintance requested his assistance in the purchasing of land in the intermediate district; on application to the Government, he was plainly informed that no lands could be disposed of until they had been offered to the squatter. But from the altered condition of the colony, and its accumulating population, the squatters perceive that, if they do not at once get their leases, they never will. A few months more, and the Government dare not issue them. With respect to the returns relative to the squatting question called for by the elective members of the Assembly, their non-production has been attributed to the inefficiency of the printing department. He would not hesitate to say that, when they do come forth, such a budget of corruption will be presented to the public gaze, as will astonish the most indifferent and careless observer. The people have only to resist this measure for two or three months longer, and the day will be their own, and this without any violent commotion. They should remember that, if this great object is achieved now, it may be done peacefully, but if not, he prayed to heaven he may not be present to witness the result. (Loud cheers.) He would now propose the first resolution, "That this meeting considers the Orders in Council, which have been framed under the authority of the Act IX. and X. Victoria, opposed to the advancement of the colony and the welfare of the vast majority of the community."

W. H. WILLIAMS, Printer, 94 Bourke street East, Melbourne.

A Treatise on Friendly Societies, with Tables

Constructed from the Sickness and Mortality experienced by Members of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows in passing through 1,821,048 years of life, being the largest experience hitherto collected of Friendly Societies in the United Kingdom.

By William Hatton, ACTUARY, Brunswick Lodge, No. 118, M.U.O.F., and Court Little John, No. 2,682, A.O.F. London: Charles and Edwin Layton, 150 Fleet Street, And to be obtained at the Offices of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, Grosvenor Street, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester. 1874

Preface.

THE following Report of the liability of each Lodge in the Brighton District of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows will explain the origin and the object of this Treatise, which is published in a separate form in the hope that it may be useful to and supply a want which has long been felt by Friendly Societies for their assistance and guidance:—

TO THE VALUATION COMMITTEE OF THE BRIGHTON DISTRICT OF THE MANCHESTER UNITY OF ODD FELLOWS. SIRS AND BRETHREN,

Agreeably to your instructions, I have made a valuation of the liabilities of each Lodge in the Brighton District, as on the 31st December, 1878, from a return from each Lodge in the District, showing the name of the Lodge; the number of members at each year of age; the contributions payable at each age to the sick and funeral fund; the amount of the sick and funeral fund; and the rate of interest realised on each investment.

The oldest Lodge in the District is the Brunswick Lodge, established on the 7th December, 1822. This Lodge, originally held at the Brunswick Arms, Brighton, for many years dispensed only sick *gifts* and funeral *donations*, each brother paying one penny per week to any sick brother, and one shilling towards any brother "that it may please God to call from our earthly Lodge." These collections proving financially inconvenient, a fixed equal, or rather unequal, contribution of four pence, and ultimately five pence per week per member, and fixed sick and funeral benefits were adopted. It was under this primitive plan of the mother Lodge of the same contribution for all ages that nineteen out of the twenty-seven Lodges in the District were afterwards established—viz., two in 1842, two in 1814, six in 1845, four in 1846, three in 1847, and two in 1853. When, however, the inadequacy and injustice of a low equal contribution for all ages were manifest, there was

supplemented in 1853 a plan of additional annual contributions for *new* members exceeding twenty two years of age. Lastly, chiefly in consequence of the publication in 1850 and 1862 of the Sickness and Mortality Experience of the Order, contributions graduated according to age at entry became imperative for members admitted since the 1st August, 1866, by a General Rule, which also provided that Districts "shall have power to fix" the contributions of members admitted previous to that date. The Brighton District, and other Districts, having made this alteration in the contributions apply only to *new* members, the words *have power to* were struck out of the 38th General Rule at the Richmond A. M. C., 1874, thus making the alteration thereafter apply also to *oll* members.

At the present time, therefore, there are, so far as contributions are concerned, three distinct classes of members in the District: (1) members who still pay, generally, five pence per week; (2) members who pay five pence per week and additional annual contributions; (8) members who pay contributions graduated according to age at entry.

The benefits assured to members in the District are generally 12s. 6d. per week in the first twelve months' sickness, 6s. 3d. per week in a continuance of the same sickness, £12 at the death of a member, and £8 at the death of a member's wife, being the same benefits as those assured when all members paid equally only five pence per week.

Before showing the net liability in expectation of each Lodge for sick and funeral benefits, it is necessary to say a few words with reference to the funeral liabilities.

The assurance of £12 payable at the death of a member, and the assurance of £8 payable at the death of a member's wife, called the funeral money, are liabilities not undertaken by the Lodge but by the District, in the following manner :—The twenty-seven Lodges comprising the Brighton District join together in paying the funeral claims of the District, thus spreading these claims over a larger number. The amount required is charged to each Lodge according to the number of its members, regardless of their ages at entry, by an unwise rule of the District. Thus, the youngest member admitted is made to contribute as much as the oldest member, which, of course, is not equitable, nor in accordance with the improved system of contributions graduated according to age at entry, as a member admitted at age 18 should contribute only about one half of what should be contributed by a member admitted at age 45. But with the present practice of the District with regard to the funeral money, I have nothing more to do than to deal with the facts as I find them, and to value the liabilities of each Lodge accordingly.

The amount of the funeral claims of the District being, then, contributed by each Lodge in the District, according to the number of its members, regardless of their ages at entry, the value of £12 payable at the death of a member does not depend on the ages of the members of each Lodge, but on the average age of the members of the District. The age of the members of the District, one with another, being 34 years, the value of an assurance of £12, payable at the death of a person now aged 84, at 4 per cent., according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70, is £4.08552. Therefore, multiplying £4.08552 by 293, the number of members in the first Lodge—the Brunswick Lodge, in Class I., gives £1197.05786=£1,197 Is. 2d., the value of all the members' funeral benefits in that class; and so on for the other classes and Lodges.

The value of all the wives' funeral benefits depends, in addition to the above, on (1) the number of wives and (2) the proportion of the age of the wife to that of the husband. With regard to the number of wives, the last reliable return to 31st December, 1871, shows that more than one-fourth of the members of the District were unmarried. Assuming, then, that three-fourths of the members are married, and that every member is of the same age with his wife, the value of an assurance of £3, payable at (he death of a person now aged 34, at 4 per cent., according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70, is £2.72368. Therefore, multiplying £2.72368 by 220, the number of wives in the Brunswick Lodge, in Class I., gives £599.2096=£599 4s. 2d., the value of all the wives' funeral benefits in that class; and so on for the other classes and Lodges.

These Values of the average funeral benefits being liabilities undertaken by the District for corresponding amounts contributed by the Lodge out of the members' contributions, the actual funeral benefits of the Lodge may be greater or less, but these are the amounts expected to be charged to the Lodge by the District for paying all the funeral claims of the District.

With these explanations, I will now proceed to show the net liability and amount of the sick and funeral fund of each Lodge in the District as on the 31st December, 1873:—

Name of Lodge.	Estab-lished.	Net Liability.	Sick & Funeral Fund.	Surplus.	Deficiency.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
£ s. d. Brunswick	1822	7,375 14 0	3,451 1 7	3,924 12 5	Western Star.....	1842	5,534 16 1	
3,858 7 4	1,676 8 9	Duke of Norfolk.....	3,735 16 7	1,616 0 0	2,119 16 7	Weald of Sussex....	1844	1982 16
1 1,589 16 5	392 19 8	Pri e of West Sussex	2,068 0 10	1904 12 9	163 8 1	Tilgate Forest	1845	1,693 15 4
1,960 11 8	266 16 4	City	5,049 3 5	3930 4 0	1,118 19 5	Victoria	2,920	18 1
3,794 14 10	873 16 9	Mountain.....	727 8 7	359 8 3	368 0 4	Saint Peter's.....	1,716	10 4 938
5 5 778 4 11	Benlah	4,017 13 6	2,923 9 3	1094 4 3	Waterloo.....	1846	1,865 10 4	

531 4 7 1334 5 9 Oak and Ivy 1,181 17 5 1,120 18 3 60 19 2 Bee Hive..... 2,151 19 2
2.303 1 0 151 1 10 Myrtle..... 1,761 17 9 796 5 3 965 12 6 Hall of Justice 1847 835 5 2
639 6 5 195 18 9 Olive Branch.....2,382 18 2 1,323 2 11 1059 15 3 Castle 2,832 2 10
1.763 3 0 1,068 19 10 Hayward's Heath 1853 1,688 15 7 1,210 14 1 11 14 478 1 6
Cliftonville.....758 9 5 770 3 8 3 York 1859 620 5 8 639 10 6 19 4 10
Hanover..... 1861 411 10 7 275 3 9 136 6 10 Star of Hope.....1,031 0 7 382 15 9 648 4 10
Deerswood..... 1864 837 4 7 337 0 1 500 4 6 Rose..... 1865 724 18 1 517 0 2 207 17 11
Albert Victor.....173 10 10 133 3 2 40 7 8 Prince Alfred..... 1866 300 1 2 251 5 7 48 15 7 56,380
0 2 39,320 9 8 1,322 14 0 18,382 4 6

This valuation, in order to determine as to the solvency of each Lodge in the District, has been made on the basis of the Sickness and Mortality Experience of the Manchester Unity for 1866-70, at the average rate of interest realised by each Lodge, up to per cent. No less than twenty-one out of the twenty-seven Lodges in the District—in fact all the older Lodges, with but one exception, a country Lodge—realise, on an average, a higher rate of interest than 3 per cent., and the investments on Mortgages, Town Debentures, &c., are such as are most likely to realise the same rates of interest in the future.

The above total deficiency of £18,882 4s. 6d. in some of the Lodges in the District has arisen from the inadequacy of the weekly contributions of the members admitted previous to the 1st August, 1866, as will be seen by comparing, in the valuation, the value of each class of members' contributions to each Lodge in the District with the value of each class of members' sick and funeral benefits.

It being now compulsory, by the 88th General Rule, for the District to fix the amount of contributions to be paid by the members of each Lodge in the District, admitted previous to the 1st August, 1866, the good sense and right feelings of the District Officers and Deputies will doubtless guide this difficult affair to a satisfactory solution.

As there is no good text-book to which I could refer the District Officers and Deputies for assistance in the matter, I have drawn up a brief Treatise on Friendly Societies, explaining the modern methods of constructing tables of life and health contingencies, which I have added by way of supplement to this Report.

The Preparatory Tables, involving the rate of interest as well as the rates of sickness and mortality, were constructed by the aid of logarithms. They could have been constructed by actual multiplication, but the process would have been more laborious and the risk of error greater. For the purposes of Friendly Societies five figures of the tabular values being sufficient, I have used Bremiker's table of five figures of numbers to six of logarithms. This work, uniform with this Treatise, may be procured through Messrs. C. and E. Layton, 150 Fleet Street, at the low price of two shillings per copy in paper cover.

In the following Treatise, which is complete as far as it goes, I have endeavoured to make the language accurate and the computations free from errors, typographical or otherwise.

By means of this Treatise may be constructed tables of weekly contributions by simple multiplication and division.

EXAMPLE 1. Weekly contribution, at age 18, for an assurance of 12s. 6d. per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life, 6s. 3d. per week in a continuance of the same sickness, £12 at the death of a member, and £8 at the death of a member's wife.

Mathematical equation

This example shows that the early contribution of 5d. per week for an assurance of these benefits was an inadequate one, even at the youngest age at entry, under the plan of the same contribution for all ages, from age 18 to 36.

EXAMPLE 2. Weekly contribution, at age 36, for an assurance of 12s. 6d. per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life, 6s. 3d. per week in a continuance of the same sickness, £12 at the death of a member, and £8 at the death of a member's wife.

Mathematical equation

This example shows that the early contribution of 5d. per week for an assurance of these benefits was exactly only half the sum which should have been paid at the oldest age, under the plan of the same contribution for all ages, from age 18 to 36.

It being then clear, both from the valuation and the supplementary Treatise, that the contributions of the old members have been long inadequate, the old members cannot object to escaping, should the District Officers and Deputies decide on their paying only for the future, what they should have paid during the whole time of their membership.

Yours truly and fraternally,

William Hatton, ACTUARY,

A Treatise on Friendly Societies.

I. Probability and the Average Duration of Life.

1. If a be the number of ways in which an event can happen, and b the number of ways in which it can fail, and all these ways are equally possible, the probability of the event happening is Mathematical equation, and the probability of its failing is Mathematical equation

2. The probability of the continuance of life of one person is very uncertain, and differs under different circumstances in persons of the same age. It is greater in healthy than in unhealthy persons; in persons living in a healthy climate or locality than in persons living in an unhealthy one; in persons living in the country than in persons living in a large town or city; in persons following healthy or safe occupations than in persons following unhealthy or dangerous ones; in females than in males; and in married persons than in single persons. For general purposes it is sufficient to find the average probability out of a large number of unselected persons of the same age. This average probability is found by a Table of Mortality showing, from experience, out of a large number of unselected persons of the same age, the number dying in each succeeding year of age, and, consequently, the number living at each successive age. It is necessary to assume, that out of any other equal number of persons of the same age and class the number living at each age would be nearly the same, if they live under similar circumstances.

3. The Tables of Mortality of the members of Friendly Societies are not very numerous. They comprise:
- The Friendly Societies' Table, constructed by Mr. Ansell, from returns obtained by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge from Friendly Societies in England for 1823-27, embracing the experience of 24,323 years of life.
A Treatise on Friendly Societies. By Charles Ansell, Esq., F.R.S., 1835, p. 119.
 - The Friendly Societies' Table, constructed by Mr. Finlaison, from the returns of Friendly Societies in England and Wales for 1836-40, sent to the Registrar, embracing the experience of 1,147,143 years of life.
Contributions to Vital Statistics. By F. G. P. Neison, F.L.S., 1845, p. 28.
 - The Odd Fellows', Manchester Unity Table, constructed by Mr. Ratcliffe, from returns of the Lodges composing the Unity for 1846-48, embracing the experience of 621,561 years of life.
Observations on the Rate of Mortality and Sickness existing amongst Friendly Societies. By Henry Ratcliffe, 1850, p. 24.
 - The Friendly Societies' Table, constructed by Mr. Finlaison, from the returns of Friendly Societies in England and Wales for 1846-50, sent to the Registrar, embracing the experience of 793,759 years of life.
Return of the Friendly Societies' Sickness and Mortality. Mr. Alexander Glen Finlaison's Report. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th August, 1853, p. 3.
 - The Odd Fellows', Manchester Unity Table, constructed by Mr. Ratcliffe, from returns of the Lodges composing the Unity for 1856-60, embracing the experience of 1,006,272 years of life.
Observations on the Rate of Mortality and Sickness existing amongst Friendly Societies. By Henry Ratcliffe, 1862, p. 25.
 - The Odd Fellows', Manchester Unity Table, constructed by Mr. Ratcliffe, from returns of the Lodges composing the Unity for 1866-70 (see Table I., page 5), embracing the experience of 1,321,048 years of life, being the largest experience hitherto collected of Friendly Societies in the United Kingdom.
Supplementary Report, July 1st. 1872, of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Manchester Unity Friendly Society, p. 20.

4. A comparative view of these tables would be useful, but would be foreign to the object of this Treatise.

5. Let l_x denote the number of persons living at the age x according to any mortality table, nl_x the number living at the age n years older than x , and $-nl_x$ the number living at the age n years younger than x ; then, by Art. I, the probability of a person whose age is x living n years is Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 1. Probability of a person aged 18 living 7 years, or attaining the age of 25, according to the

Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

Mathematical equation

6. Of l_x persons living at the age x , $l_x - n l_x$ is the number dying between the ages x and $x+n$, or within n years; then, by Art. 1, the probability of a person whose age is x dying within n years is Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 2. Probability of a person aged 18 dying within 7 years, or before attaining the age of 25, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

Mathematical equation

7. The ratio of the number of persons dying within a year to the number living at the beginning of the year is called the *yearly rate of mortality*. Thus, of 100,000 persons living at the age 18, 560 die within a year. Therefore $560 \div 100000 \times 100 = .5600$, is the yearly mortality per cent., according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

The number dying in each year of age being expressed in the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality by a whole number, decimal omitted, the correct number, including decimal, may be found by multiplying the mortality per cent. for each age by the number living at each age, and then dividing by 100. Thus the number dying in the 20th year of age is $5817 \times 99440 / 100 = 578.442480$, and so on. The decimal must be supplied as in column d of Table I. in calculating the rate of mortality per cent, for each age.

8. The average number of years which persons of the same age, one with another, live according to the given mortality table, is called the *expectation, or average duration, of life*.

Let e_x denote the expectation, or average duration, of life of a person of the age x , z the number of years from age x to the oldest age attained by any life according to the table, and let us suppose that the persons dying in each year die at equal intervals therein. Then of l_x persons living at the age x , $l_x - 1 l_x$ die in the first year, living among them $\frac{1}{2}(l_x - 1 l_x)$ years, while those who attain the age $x+1$ live $1 l_x$ whole years; therefore the l_x persons live in the first year, $\frac{1}{2}(l_x - 1 l_x) + 1 l_x = \frac{1}{2}(l_x + 1 l_x)$ years. Similarly l_x persons live through life $\frac{1}{2}(l_x + 1 l_x) + \frac{1}{2}(1 l_x + 2 l_x) + \dots + \frac{1}{2}(z - 1 l_x + z l_x) = \frac{1}{2} z l_x = \frac{1}{2} z l_x + 1 l_x + \dots + z l_x$ years, which divided by l_x , gives Mathematical equation

This demonstrates the form of the rule.

The rule is, *divide the sum of the numbers living at all the older ages by the number living at the given age, and then add half a year to the quotient.*

The number in column L of Table I., opposite each age, is the sum of the numbers living at all the older ages; thus

$L_x = 1 l_x + 2 l_x + 3 l_x \dots$ to the last tabular age;

$L_x = 1 l_x + 1 L_x$;

therefore Mathematical equation

By means of column L we are now enabled to compute the average duration of life by simple division.

EXAMPLE 3. Average duration of life of a person aged 18, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

Mathematical equation

TABLE I. Rate of Mortality and the Average Duration of Lip among the Members of the Independent Order of Odd Fellow, Manchester Unity Friendly Society for 1866-70, in the Rural, Town, and City Districts combined.

Age.	Living.	Dying.	Mortality per Cent.	Sum of the Numbers Living at all the older Ages.	Average
Duration of Life.	X	lx	dx	Lx	o ex
18	100000	560.000000	.5600	4237040	42.87
19	99440	578.442480	.5817		
41	37600	42.11	20	98862	596.533308
		.6084	40	38738	41.35
21	98266	614.260766	.6251	3940472	40.60
22	97652	631.222528	.6464	3842820	39.85
23	97021	647.518154	.6674	3745799	39.11
24	96374	663.053120	.6880	3649425	38.37
25	95711	678.016724	.7081	8553714	37.63
26	95033	692.125339	.7283	3458681	36.89
27	94341	705.010293	.7473	3361340	36.16
28	93636	716.596308	.7653	3270704	35.43
29	92920	727.099000	.7825	3177784	34.70
30	92193	736.345491	.7987	3085591	33.97
31	91457	744.368523	.8139	2991134	33.24
32	90713	756.546420	.8340	2903421	32.51
33	89957	772.910544	.8592	2813464	31.78
34	89181	793.113312	.8893	2724280	31.05
35	88391	817.174795	.9245	2635389	30.32
36	87574	814.738804	.9646	2548315	29.60
37	86729	871.799908	1.0052	2461586	28.88
38	85558	897.387816	1.0152	2375728	28.17
39	81960				
922.580640	10859	2290768	27.16	40	84037
946.760842	1.1266	2206731	26.76	41	83090
970.075750	1.1675				
2123611	26.06	42	82119	993.968376	1.2104
2041522	25.36	43	81125	1018.413250	1.2554
1960397	24.67	44			
80107	1043.313568	1.3021	1880290	23.97	45
79064	1068.549960	1.3515	1801226	23.28	46
77996					

1093.971896 1.4026 1723230 22.59 47 76902 1125.691476 1.4638 1646328 21.91 48 75777 1163.252727
 1.5351 1570551 21.23 49 71614 1206.135310 1.6165 1495937 20.55 50 73408 1253.735232 1.7079 1422529
 19.88 51 72154 1305.482322 1.8093 1350375 19.22 52 70849 1357.821085 1.9165 1279526 18.56 53 69191
 1410.111372 2.0292 1210035 17.91 54 68081 1462.243718 2.1478 1141954 17.27 55 66619 1513.583680
 2.2720 1075335 16.64 56 65106 1563.715908 2.4018 1010229 16.02 57 63542 1625.785612 2.5586 946687
 15.40 58 61916 1697.860552 2.7422 881771 14.79 59 60218 1778.117104 2.9528 824553 14.19

Age. Living. Dying. Mortality per Cent. Sum of the Numbers Living at all the older Ages. Average
 Duration of Life. $X \ l_x \ d_x \ L_x \ o \ e_x$ 60 58440 1864.352880 3.1902 766113 13 61 61 56576 1954.361344 3.4544
 709537 13.04 62 54622 2032 102266 3.7203 654915 12.49 63 52589 2097.196731 3.9879 602326 11.95 64
 50192 2149.545424 4 2572 551834 11.43 65 48343 2189.116069 4.5283 503191 10.91 66 46154 2215.853510
 4.8010 457337 10.41 67 43938 2261.400984 5.1468 413399 9.91 68 41677 2319 533435 5.5655 371722 9.42
 69 39358 2383.992776 6.0572 332364 8.94 70 36974 2148.011566 6.6209 295390 8.49 71 34526 2506 414970
 7.2595 260864 8.06 72 32020 2510 656180 7.8109 228844 7.65 73 29510 2527 029830 8.5633 199334 7.25 74
 26983 2490.503917 9.2299 172351 6.89 75 21493 2426.227594 9.9058 147858 6.54 76 22067 2337 160104
 10.5912 125791 6 20 77 19730 2236 790100 11.3370 106061 5.88 78 17493 2124.209976 12 1432 88568 5.56
 79 15369 1999.476162 13.0098 73199 5 26 80 13374 1863 921006 13.9369 59825 4 97 81 11510 1717 798440
 14.9244 48315 4.70 82 9792 3565.799552 15.9906 38523 4.43 83 8226 1409.574156 17.1356 30297 4.18 84
 6817 1257.013898 18.4394 23480 3.94 85 5560 1093 207200 19.6620 17920 3.72 86 4467 940 004211
 21.0433 13453 3.51 87 3527 792 135984 22 4592 9926 3.31 88 2735 653.943970 23.9102 7191 3.13 89 2081
 528.486598 25.3958 5110 2.96 90 1553 418 007033 26.9161 3557 2.79 91 1135 323 146985 28.4711 2422
 2.63 92 812 244.233360 30.0780 1610 2.48 93 568 180.265024 31.7368 1042 2. 33 94 388 129.776688
 33.4476 654 2.19 95 258 90.842574 35.2103 396 2.03 96 167 61.831583 37.0249 229 1.87 97 105 40.833765
 38 8893 124 1.68 98 64 26 113216 40.8019 60 1.44 99 38 16 163791 42.5363 22 1.08 100 22 9.850032
 44.7731 .50 As the returns for 1860-70 include few members after age 83, from that ago the rate of mortality
 for England and "Wales, according to the 12th Report of the Registrar General, pages 75 and 79, with slight
 modifications for locality, has been adopted in the Supplementary Report.

II. Life Annuities.

9. When an annuity (or annual payment) is payable during life, it is called a *life annuity*.

10. *To find the value of an endowment of £1 payable in n years if x be then alive.*

By Art. 5, the probability of a person whose age is x living n years is Mathematical equation

Let Mathematical equation denote the present value of £1 due n years hence; then the present value of £1 payable in n years if x be then alive is

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 1. Value of an endowment of £10 payable if a person aged 18 attain the age of 25, at 3 per cent., according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1860-70.

Mathematical equation

In formula (1) the numerator of the fraction is the present value of the number of pounds payable in n years, and the denominator the number now living to contribute equally the present fund.

If (1) be transformed by multiplying both numerator and denominator by tx , by which the value of the fraction is not altered, it becomes Mathematical equation which is a more convenient formula for constructing tables of the values of annuities (presently to be explained) than formula (1).

The number in column D of Table II., opposite each age, is the product of the number living at that age into the present value of £1 due as many years hence as are equal to that age, so that in (2) the numerator of the fraction is equal to D_{x+n} , and the denominator to D_x . Hence the formula becomes finally Mathematical equation

By means of colum D we are now enabled to compute the values of endowments by simple division.

For example, as above: Value of an endowment of £10 payable if a person aged 18 attain the age of 25, at 3 per cent.

Mathematical equation

11. *To find the value of an annuity of £1 due at the end of every year through which x shall live.*

The value of the annuity is the sum of the present values of £1 due at the end of 1, 2, 3, ... years, to the last tabular age, if x shall live so long.

Let ax denote the present value of an annuity of £1 due at the end of every year through which x shall live; then, by Art, 10, Mathematical equation

In formula 4 the numerator of the fraction is the sum of the present values of the number of pounds due at the end of 1,2,3,... years, to the last tabular age, and the denominator the number now living to contribute

equally the present fund.

If (4) be transformed by multiplying both numerator and denominator by v_x , by which the value of the fraction is not altered, the equation becomes Mathematical equation

The number in column N of Table II., opposite each age, is the sum of the numbers in column D opposite all the older ages;

The method employed in the construction of the columns D and N of Table II. is described in the Appendix.

thus

$N_x = D_x + I + D_{x+2} + D_{x+3} + \dots$ to the last tabular age;

$N_x = D_{x+1} + N_{x+1}$;

therefore Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 2.—Value of an annuity of £1 on the life aged 18.

Mathematical equation

By this method may be constructed columns 2 and 7 of Table 3, showing the value of an immediate annuity of £1 during life, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

12. *To find the value of an annuity of £1 deferred n years and then to continue so long as x shall live.*

The value of the annuity is the sum of the present values of £1 due at the end of $n+1$, $n+2$, $n+3$,... years, to the last tabular age, if x shall live so long.

Let $n|ax$ denote the present value of an annuity of £1 deferred n years and then to continue so long as x shall live; then Mathematical equation

The number in column N of Table II., opposite the age $x+n$, is, by Art. 11, the numerator of the fraction, and the number in column D, opposite the age x , is, by Art. 10, the denominator;

therefore Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 3. Value of an annuity of £1 to be entered upon at the expiration of 47 years on the life aged 18.

Mathematical equation

By this method may be constructed column 4 of Table III., showing the value of a deferred annuity of £1, to commence after age 65 and then to continue during life, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

13. *To find the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for the next n years if x shall live so long.*

The value of the annuity is the sum of the present values of £1 due at the end of 1, 2, 3,... n years if x shall live so long.

Let $n|_{max}$ denote the present value of a temporary annuity of £1 for the next n years if x shall live so long; then since the value of a temporary annuity for the next n years, together with that of an annuity deferred n years, is equal to the value of an annuity during life,

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 4. Value of an annuity of £1 for the next 47 years on the life aged 18.

Mathematical equation

This added to 1.004, the value of an annuity of £1 to be entered upon at the expiration of 47 years on the life aged 18 (Example 3), gives 22.235, the value of an annuity of £1 on the life aged 18 (Example 2).

By this method may be constructed column 3 of Table III., showing the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for a term of years if the life shall be in existence so long, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

14. *To find the annual premium for an annuity of £1 deferred n years and then to continue so long as x shall live.*

The first annual premium made by members of Friendly Societies is generally completed at the end of the year, and the remaining premiums at the end of 2, 3,... n years: so that if the annual premium be £1, the present value of it, at yearly interest, will be $n|_{max}$, the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for the next n years on the life x .

Let $Pn|ax$ denote the annual premium for an annuity of £1 deferred n years on the life x ; then the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for n years on the life x is to £1 as the value of an annuity of £1 deferred n years on the life x is to its annual premium, or Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 5. Annual premium for an annuity of £1 to be entered upon at the expiration of 47 years on the life aged 18.

Mathematical equation

By this method may be constructed column 5 of Table III., showing the annual premium for a deferred annuity of £1, to commence after age 65 and then to continue during life, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

Age. Dx Nx Age. Dx Nx 18 58739 1306028 60 9919.2 99879.5 19 56709 1249319 61 9323.1 90550.4 62 8739.0 81817.4 20 54738 1194581 63 8168.6 73048.8 21 52823 1141758 64 7614.5 66034.3 22 50964 1090794 28 49160 1041634 65 7078.1 58956.2 24 47410 994224 66 6560.7 52395.5 67 6063.8 40331.7 25 45712 948512 68 5584.3 40747.4 26 44066 904446 69 5119.9 35627.5 27 42471 861975 28 40926 821049 70 4669.7 30957.8 29 39430 781619 71 4233.5 26724.3 72 3811.9 22912.4 30 37982 743637 73 3110.8 19501.6 31 86582 707055 74 3027.9 16473.7 82 35227 671828 83 33916 637912 75 2668.4 13805.3 84 32645 605267 76 2334.1 11471.2 77 2026.1 9445.1 35 31413 573854 78 1744.1 7701.0 36 30216 543638 79 1487.7 0213.3 37 29053 514585 38 27923 486662 80 1256.8 4956.5 39 26826 459836 81 1050.2 3906.3 82 867.40 3038.90 40 25762 434074 83 707.46 2331.44 41 24730 409344 84 569.20 1762.24 42 23729 885615 43 22759 362856 85 450.72 1311.52 44 21819 341037 86 351.57 959.95 87 269.50 690.45 45 20908 320129 88 202.90 487.55 46 20024 300105 89 149.89 837.66 47 19169 280936 48 18338 262598 90 108.60 229.06 49 17531 245067 91 77.057 152.003 50 92 53.522 98.481 16745 228322 93 30.348 62.133 51 15979 212343 94 24.106 88.027 52 15233 197110 53 14506 182604 95 15.563 22.4644 54 13798 168806 96 9.7801 12.6843 55 97 5.9701 6.7142 13108 155698 98 3.5329 3.1813 56 12138 143260 99 2.0366 1.1447 57 11785 131475 58 11149 120326 100 1.1447 59 10527 1097987

Immediate. Temporary. Deferred. Immediate. Age. During Life. To continue until Age 65. To commence after Age 65. Annual Premium. Age. During Life. £ £ £ £ £ 18 22.234 21.231 1.004 .04728 60 10.069 19 22.030 20.991 1.040 .04953 61 9.713 20 21.824 20.747 1.077 .05192 62 63 9.362 9.016 21 21.615 20.499 1.116 .05145 64 8.672 22 21.403 20.246 1.157 .05714 23 21.189 19.989 1.199 .06000 65 8.329 21 20.971 19.727 1.244 .06304 66 7.986 25 20.750 19.460 1.290 .06628 67 68 7.641 7.297 26 20.525 19.187 1.338 .06973 69 6.959 27 20.296 18.907 1.388 .07342 28 20.062 18.621 1.441 .07736 70 6.630 29 19.823 18.328 1.195 .08158 71 6.313 30 19.579 18.026 1.552 086 11 72 73 6.011 5.718 31 19.328 17.716 1.612 .09097 74 5.441 32 19.071 17.398 1.674 .09620 33 18.809 17.070 1.738 .10183 75 5.174 31 18.541 16.735 1.806 .10792 76 4.915 35 18.268 16.391 1.877 .11450 77 78 4.662 4 415 36 17.992 16.041 1.951 .12161 79 4.176 37 17.712 15.683 2.029 .12910 38 17.429 15.317 2.111 .13784 80 3.914 39 17.141 14.914 2.198 .14707 81 3.720 40 16.819 14.561 2.288 .15717 82 83 3.503 3.296 41 16.553 14.169 2.381 .16826 84 3.096 42 16.251 13.766 2.485 .18048 43 15.943 13.353 2.590 .19400 85 2.910 44 15.630 12.928 2.702 .20900 86 2.730 45 15.311 12 492 2.820 .22574 87 88 2.562 2.403 46 14.987 12.043 2.944 .24448 89 2.253 47 14.656 11.580 3.076 .26559 48 14.320 11.105 8.215 .28951 90 2.109 49 13.979 10.616 3.363 .31678 91 1.973 50 13.635 92 1.840 10114 3.521 .31810 93 1.709 51 13.289 9.599 3.690 .38436 94 1.577 52 12.940 9.069 3.870 .42674 53 12.588 8.524 4.064 .47681 95 1.443 54 12.234 7.961 4.273 .53670 96 1.297 55 11.878 97 1.125 7.380 4.498 .60912 98 .900 56 11.518 99 .562 57 11.156 58 10.793 59 10.430

15. A contract to secure a sum of money payable on the death of a person is called a life assurance.
16. *To find the value of an endowment assurance of £1, payable at the end of n years if x shall die in the n th year.*

EXAMPLE 1. Value of an endowment assurance of £10, payable at the end of 7 years if a person now aged 30 shall die on his 37th year, at 3 per cent., according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70.

Mathematical equation

In formula (1) the numerator of the fraction is the present value of the number of pounds falling due at the

end of n years, and the denominator the number now living to contribute equally the present fund.

If (1) be transformed by multiplying both numerator and denominator by tx , by which the value of the fraction is not altered, it becomes Mathematical equation which is a more convenient formula for constructing tables of the values of assurances (presently to be explained) than formula (1).

The number in column C of Table IV., opposite each age, is the product of the number dying in the year following that age into the present value of £1 due as many years hence as are equal to that age increased by unity, so that in (2) the numerator of the fraction is equal to $Cx+n\#1$ and the denominator to Dx . Hence the formula becomes finally Mathematical equation

By means of columns C and D we are now enabled to compute the values of endowment assurances by simple division.

For example, as above: Value of an endowment assurance of £10, payable at the end of seven years if a person now aged 30 shall die in his 87th year, at 3 per cent.

Mathematical equation

17. *To find, the value of an assurance of £1, payable at the end of the year in which x shall die.*

The value of the assurance is the sum of the present values of £1 payable at the end of 1, 2, 3,... years, to the last tabular age, if x shall die in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd,... years.

Let Ax denote the present value of an assurance of £1, payable at the end of the year in which x shall die; then, by Art. 16,

Mathematical equation

In formula (4) the numerator of the fraction is the sum of the present values of the number of pounds falling due at the end of 1, 2, 3,... years, to the last tabular age, and the denominator the number now living to contribute equally the present fund.

If (4) be transformed by multiplying both numerator and denominator by vx , by which the value of the fraction is not altered, the equation becomes Mathematical equation

The number in column M of Table IV., opposite each age, is the sum of the numbers in column C opposite that and all the older ages;

The method employed in the construction of the columns C and M of Table IV. is described in the Appendix.

thus

$Mx = Cx + Cx+1 + Cx+2 + \dots$ to the last tabular age;

$Mx = Cx + Mx+1$;

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 2. Value of an assurance of £1 on the life aged 30.

Mathematical equation

18. *To find the annual premium for an assurance of £1, payable at the end of the year in which x shall die.*

If the annual premium completed at the end of the year be £1, the present value of it, at yearly interest, will be ax , the value of an annuity of £1 on the life x .

Let Px denote the annual premium for an assurance of £1 on the life x ; then the value of an annuity of £1 on the life x is to £1 as the value of an assurance of £1 on the life x is to its annual premium, or

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 3. Annual premium for an assurance of £1 on the life aged 30.

Mathematical equation

TABLE IV. *Preparatory Table for finding the Values of Assurance, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70. Interest 3 per Cent.*

Age.	Cx	Mx	Age.	cx	Mx	18	319.36	18991.35	60	307.23	6721.48	19	320.27	18671.99	61	312.68	6414.25		
62	315.65	6101.57	20	320.66	18351.72	63	316.27	5785.92	21	320.58	18031.06	64	314.71	5469.65	22	319.83	17710.48		
23	318.54	17390.65	65	311.18	5154.94	24	316.68	17072.11	66	305.81	4843.76	67	303.00	4537.95	25	314.39	16755.43		
68	301.73	4234.95	26	311.59	16441.04	69	301.09	3933.22	27	308.14	16129.45	28	301.09	15821.31	70	300.17	3632.13		
29	299.56	15517.22	71	298.38	3331.96	72	290.19	3033.58	30	294.53	15217.66	73	283.56	2743.39	31	289.07	14923.13		
74	271.33	2459.83	32	285.24	14634.06	33	282.92	14348.82	75	256.62	2188.50	34	281.86	14065.90	76	240.01	1931.88		
77	22301	1691.87	35	281.95	13784.04	78	205.61	1468.86	36	282.97	13502.09	79	187.91	1263.25	37	283.53	13219.12		
38	283.35	12935.59	80	170.06	1075.34	39	282.82	12652.24	81	15217	905.28	82	134.66	753.11	40	281.78	12369.42		
83	117.70	618.45	41	280.31	12087.64	84	101.90	500.75	42	278.85	11807.33	43	277.38	11528.48	85	86.040	398.853		
44	275.89	11251.10	86	71.827	312.813	87	58.766	240.986	45	274.32	10975.21	88	47.100	182.220	46	272.69	10700.89		
89	36.956	135.120	47	272.42	10428.20	48	273.32	10155.78	90	28.379	98.164	49	275	12	9882.46	91	21.300	69.785	
92	15.629	48.485	50	277.65	9607.34	93	11.200	32.856	280.70	9329.69	94	7.8284	21.6564	51	283.44	9048.99	53	285.79	8765.55
95	5.3201	13.8280	54	287.71	8479.76	96	3.5156	8.5079	97	2.2541	4.9923	55	289.15	8192.05	98	1.3995	2.7382		

56 290.02 7902.90 99 .84106 1.33866 57 292.76 7612.88 58 296.84 732012 100 .49760 .49760 59 301.80 7023.28

TABLE V. *Value of an Assurance of £1, according to the Manchester Unity Table of Mortality for 1866-70. Interest 3 per Cent.*

Age.	Single Premium.	Annual Premium.	Age.	Single Premium.	Annual Premium.	£	£	£	£	18	.32332	.01454																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
60	.67762	.06730	19	.32926	.01495	61	.08800	.07083	62	.09820	.07458	20	.33526	.01536	63	.70831	.07856	21	.34135	.01579	64	.71832	.08283	22	.34751	.01624	23	.35376	.01070	65	.72829	.08744	24	.36010	.01717	66	.73830	.09245	67	.74837	.09794	25	.36654	.01766	68	.75837	.10393	26	.37310	.01818	69	.76822	.11040	27	.37978	.01871	28	.38658	.01927	70	.77781	.11733	29	.39354	.01985	71	.78705	.12468	72	.79582	.13240	30	.40065	.02016	73	.80432	.14068	31	.40794	.02111	74	.81239	.14932	32	.41542	.02178	33	.42307	.02249	75	.82015	.15853	34	.43087	.02324	76	.82768	.16841	77	.83504	.17913	35	.43880	.02402	78	.84219	.19074	36	.44685	.02484	79	.81913	.20331	37	.45500	.02569	38	.46326	.02658	80	.85562	.21696	39	.47164	.02751	81	.86201	.23175	82	.80824	.24782	40	.48014	.02850	83	.87418	.20527	41	.48878	.02953	84	.87974	.28416	42	.49759	.03062	43	.50655	.03177	85	.88492	.30412	44	.51566	.03299	86	.88976	.32586	87	.89420	.34903	45	.52493	.03428	88	.89808	.37875	46	.53440	.03566	89	.90146	.40017	47	.54401	.03712	48	.55381	.03867	90	.90390	.42855	49	.56371	.04033	91	.90503	.45910	92	.90589	.49233	50	.57374	.04208	93	.90393	.52880	51	.58387	.04394	94	.89838	.56950	52	.59404	.04591	53	.60427	.04800	95	.88852	.61555	54	.61456	.05023	90	.80992	.67074	97	.83022	.74354	55	.62497	.05261	98	.77506	.86672	56	.63538	.05516	99	.05730	1.1694	57	.64598	.05790	58	.65657	.06084	59	.66717	.06397

IV. Health Assurance.

19. A contract to secure a weekly payment in sickness, incapacitating from ordinary occupation, is called a *health assurance*.

20. Tables of Sickness, showing from the experience of large numbers the amount of sickness to which the members of Friendly Societies are liable at each age, have been constructed by Mr. Ansell, Mr. Neison, Mr. Finlaison, and Mr. Ratcliffe, and published in their works on Friendly Societies (see list, page 2). Mr. Ratcliffe's Sickness Tables for 1866-70, constructed from the latest and largest experience, include all sickness experienced, and show the amount of sickness in various periods of sickness, as the Manchester Unity and many other Friendly Societies assure full sick benefits in a temporary period of sickness, and then make a reduction in a continuance of the same sickness.

21. *To find the value, at age x , of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life.*

Let s_x denote the number of days' sickness experienced in the year following the age x according to any sickness table, and, assuming that the sickness in the year is uniformly distributed through the year, let Mathematical equation denote the number of cases of sickness on any day of the year.

Let l_x denote the number of persons whose age is x living at the beginning of the year, and, assuming that the deaths in the year are uniformly distributed through the year, let $l_{x\#}$, $l_{x\#}$, $l_{x\#}$, denote the numbers living to the end of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd,... days of the year.

Then the probability of a person whose age is x being sick on the first day of the year is Mathematical equation.

As each of the $l_{x\#}$ persons living on the second day of the year has the same chance of being one of those who are sick, the probability of $x\#$ being sick on the second day is Mathematical equation; but

as only $l_{x\#}$ persons survive the first day, the probability of x living a clay, so as to be liable to sickness on the second day, is Mathematical equation. Therefore the probability, at the beginning of the year, of x being alive and sick on the second day of the year is Mathematical equation, which is the same probability as x being sick on the first day of the year.

As each of the $l_{x\#}$ persons living on the third day of the year has the same chance of being one of those who are sick, the probability of $x\#$ being sick on the third day is Mathematical equationMathematical equation; but as only $l_{x\#}$ persons survive the second day, the probability of x living two days, so as to be liable to sickness on the third day, is Mathematical equation. Therefore the probability, at the beginning of the year, of x being alive and sick on the third day of the year is Mathematical equation, which is the same probability as x being sick on the first day of the year.

And the probability, at the beginning of the year, of x being alive and sick on any day of that year is always Mathematical equation.

And the sum of the probabilities, at the beginning of the year, of x being alive and sick on each day of that year is Mathematical equation, that is the average number of days' sickness to each person in the year following the age x .

The present value, at the beginning of the year, of £1 payable

Mathematical equation

Mathematical equation

The sum of these values is equal to the product of Mathematical equation into the sum of the series

Mathematical equation

The sum of the series is Mathematical equation very nearly; therefore the value, at the beginning of the year, of £1 payable on each day of that year if x be then alive and sick, is Mathematical equation that is the present value of as many pounds as are equal to the average number of days' sickness to each person in the year following the age x due half a year hence.

Let £ $1/7$ denote the daily payment in sickness, then Mathematical equation is the value, at age x , of an assurance of £ $1/7$ per day in sickness for the following year, or making Mathematical equation to denote the average number of weeks' sickness yearly to each person, Mathematical equation is the value, at age x , of an assurance of £1 per week payable daily in sickness for the following year.

Let s_x denote the value, at age x , of an assurance of £1 per week in sickness for the following year, s_{x+n} the value, at age $x+n$, of the same payment for the following year; then

the value, at age x , of s_x being s_x

Mathematical equation

Mathematical equation

Let S_x denote the value, at age x , of an assurance of £1 per week in sickness during life; then

Mathematical equation

In formula (1) the numerator of the fraction is the sum of the present values of the number of pounds falling due at the end of 0, 1, 2,... years, to the last tabular age, and the denominator the number now living to contribute equally the present fund.

If (1) be transformed by multiplying both numerator and denominator by v_x , by which the value of the fraction is not altered, the equation becomes

Mathematical equation

The number in column $C\#$ of Table VII., opposite each age, is the product of as many pounds as are equal to the average number of weeks' sickness to each person in the year following that age due half a year hence into the number opposite that age in column D of Table II.

The number in column $M\#$ of Table VII., opposite each age, is the sum of the numbers in column $C\#$ opposite that and all the older ages;

The method employed in the construction of columns $C\#$ and $M\#$ of Table VII. is described in the Appendix.

thus

$M\#_x = C\#_x + C\#_{x+1} + C\#_{x+2} + \dots$ to the last tabular age;

$M\#_x = C\#_x + M\#_{x+1}$;

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 1. Value, at age 18, of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life.

Mathematical equation

22. To find the value, at age x , of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness for n years

Let $|_n S_x$ denote the sum of the first n terms of the series S_x , and $|_n |S_x$ the sum of all the terms after the first n terms; then

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 2. Value, at age 24, of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness until arriving at age 65.

Mathematical equation

23. To find the annual premium, at age x , for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life.

If the annual premium completed at the end of the year be £1, the present value of it, at yearly interest, will be ax , the value of an annuity of £1 on the life x .

Let $P_x S_x$ denote the annual premium, at age x , for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life; then the value of an annuity of £1 on the life x is to £1 as the value of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life is to its annual premium, or Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 3. Annual premium, at age 18, for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness during life.

Mathematical equation

24. To find the annual premium, at age x , for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness for n years.

If the annual premium completed at the end of the year be £1, the present value of it, at yearly interest, will be $|nax$, the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for the next n years if x shall live so long.

Let $P|nSx$ denote the annual premium, at age x , for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness for n years; then the value of a temporary annuity of £1 for n years if x shall live so long is to £1 as the value of an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness for n years is to its annual premium, or

Mathematical equation

EXAMPLE 4. Annual premium, at age 24, for an assurance of £1 per week in the first twelve months' sickness until arriving at age 65.

Mathematical equation

TABLE VI. Average Amount of Sickness Yearly in the first Twelve Months' Sickness, and after Twelve Months' continued Sickness, to each Member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Manchester Unity Friendly Society for 1866-70, in the Rural, Town, and City Districts combined.

Age. First Twelve Months. After Twelve Months. Age. First Twelve Months. After Twelve Months. weeks. weeks. weeks. 18 6599 .0021 60 26520 1.3812 19 .6753 .0068 61 28326 1.5665 62 3.0332 1.7756 20 .6907 .0115 63 3.2536 2.0088 21 .7061 .0162 64 3.4940 2.2658 22 .7216 .0189 23 .7309 .0256 65 3.7543 2.5467 24 .7402 .0297 66 4.0344 2.8518 67 4.3092 3.2477 25 .7475 .0328 68 4.5785 3.7346 26 .7526 .0387 69 4.8425 4.3125 27 .7606 .0155 28 .7716 .0524 70 5.1010 4.9814 29 .7854 .0590 71 5.3540 5.7413 72 5.5852 6.5156 30 .8022 .0646 73 5.7944 7.3047 31 .8218 .0753 74 5.9818 8.1081 32 .8406 .0852 33 .8587 .0935 75 6.1472 8.9263 34 .8759 .1052 76 6.2906 9.7591 77 6.4109 10.6913 35 .8924 .1191 78 6.5081 11.7230 36 .9080 .1259 79 6.5821 12.8542 37 .9269 .1344 38 .9193 .1463 80 6.6315 14.0864 39 .9750 .1577 81 6.6037 15.4721 82 6.5861 16.7403 40 1.0012 .1705 83 6.5787 17.8910 41 1.0367 .1850 84 6.5815 18.9245 42 10729 .2037 43 1.1128 .2267 85 6.5961 19.8369 44 1.1562 .2542 86 6.3172 20.9368 87 6.0208 22.0542 45 1.2034 .2859 88 5.7309 23.1641 46 1.2541 .3220 89 5.4233 24.2907 47 1.3098 .3597 48 1.3702 .3991 90 5.1063 25.4267 49 1.4355 .4403 91 5.1374 25.5676 92 5.1685 26.9935 50 1.5057 .4830 93 5.2000 27.8040 51 1.5806 .5276 52 1.6629 .5590 53 1.7527 .6372 54 1.8499 .7024 55 1.9545 .7743 56 2.0665 .8532 57 2.1923 .9532 58 2.3318 10746 59 2.4850 1.2173 The average number of weeks' sickness yearly to each person, and also in the first twelve months' sickness, for each age, from age 84 to 93, has been deduced from columns D and K [C#] of the Supplementary Report.

TABLE VII. Preparatory Table for finding the values of Assurances in the first Twelve Months' Sickness, according to the Manchester Unity Tables of Sickness and Mortality for 1866-70. Interest 3 per Cent.

Age. C#x M#x Age. C#x M#x 18 38189 1661800 60 25917 465415 19 37730 1623611 61 26018 439198 62 26115 413480 20 37248 1585881 63 26185 387365 21 36747 1518633 64 26212 361180 22 36232 1511836 23 35100 1475654 65 26180 334968 24 34574 1440251 66 26077 308788 67 25744 282711 25 33665 1405680 68 25190 256967 26 32674 1372015 69 24427 231777 27 31826 1339341 28 31112 1307515 70 23468 207350 29 30511 1276103 71 22331 183882 72 20976 161551 30 30019 1245892 73 19471 140575 31 29619 1215873 74 17814 121104 32 29174 1186254 33 23693 1157080 75 16161 103260 34 28172 1128387 76 14466 87099 77 12797 72633 35 27618 1100215 78 11183 59836 27031 1072597 79 9647.2 48653.4 37 26531 1045566 38 26116 1019035 80 8211.6 39006.2 39 25769 992919 81 6832.5 30794.6 82 5628.4 23962.1 40 25488 967150 83 4585.4 18333.7 41 25259 941662 84 3690.8 13748.3 42 25083 916403 43 24952 891320 85 2929.1 10057.5 44 24854 866368 86 2188.1 7128.4 45 87 1598 7 4940.3 24788 841514 88 1145.6 3341.6 46 24742 816726 89 800.86 2195.98 47 24736 791984 48 24755 767248 90 546.34 1395.12 49 24793 742493 91 39002 848.78 92 272.54 458.76 50 24840 717700 93 186.22 186.22 51 24884 692860 52 21957 667976 53 25049 643019 54 25148 617970 55 25242 592822 56 25322 567580 57 25455 542258 58 25614 516803 59 25774 491189

Age.	During Life.	To continue until Age 65.	Age.	During Life.	Single Premium.	Annual Premium.	Single Premium.	Annual Premium.				
46.921	4.6599	19 28.631	1.2996	22.724	1.0826	61 47.141	4.8534	20 28.972	1.3275	62 47.314	5.0538	22.853
1.1015	63 47.421	5.2596	21 29.317	1.3563	22.976	1.1208	64 47.433	5.4697	22 29.666	1.3861	23.093	1.1406
23 30.017	1.4166	23.183	1.1598	65 47.325	5.6820	24 30.379	1.4486	23.313	1.1818	66 47.066	5.8936	67
46.623	6.1017	25 30.751	1.4820	23.423	1.2036	68 46.016	6.3062	26 31.135	1.5169	23.533	1.2265	69 45.270
6.5052	27 31.535	1.5538	23.648	1.2508	28 31.948	1.5925	23.764	1.2762	70 44.403	6.6973	29 32.371	1.6330
23.876	1.3027	71 43.435	6.8802	72 42.381	7.0506	30 32.802	1.6754	23.983	1.3305	73 41.215	7.2079	31
33.237	1.7196	24.080	1.3592	74 39.996	7.3509	32 33.675	1.7658	24.166	1.3890	33 34.116	1.8138	24.240
1.4200	75 38.697	7.4791	34 34.565	1.8642	24.304	1.4523	76 37.316	7.5922	77 35.849	7.6896	35 35.024	
1.9172	24.361	1.4862	78 34.308	7.7708	36 35.498	1.9730	24.412	1.5219	79 32.704	7.8314	37 35.988	2.0318
24.459	1.5596	38 36.494	2.0939	24.498	1.5994	80 31.036	7.8692	39 37.013	2.1593	24.527	1.6413	81 29.323
7.8825	82 27.625	7.8861	40 37.542	2.2281	24.539	1.6853	83 25.915	7.8626	41 38.078	2.3004	24.533	1.7315
84 24.154	7.8017	42 38.620	2.3765	24.503	1.7800	43 39.163	2.4564	24.445	1.8307	85 22.314	7.6680	44
39.707	2.5404	24.355	1.8839	86 20.276	7.4271	87 18.331	7.1550	45 40.218	2.6287	24.227	1.9394	88 16.469
6.8535	46 40.787	2.7215	24.059	1.9978	89 14.651	6.5029	47 41.316	2.8190	23.841	2.0588	48 41.839	2.9217
23.573	2.1227	90 12.846	6.0910	49 42.353	3.0298	23.246	2.1897	91 11.015	5.5829	50 42.861	3.1435	92 8.571
4.6582	22.856	2.2598	93 5.123	2.9977	51 43.361	3.2629	22.398	2.3334	52 43.851	3.3888	21.861	2.4105
44.328	3.5214	21.236	2.4913	54 44.787	3.6609	20.510	2.5763	55 45.226	3.8075	19.671	2.6654	56 45.633
3.9619	57 46.013	4.1245	58 46.354	4.2948	59 46.660	4.4736						

Age. C# M# Age. C# M# 18 121.53 714932.89 60 13498 508589 19 379.92 714811.36 61 14389 495091
62 15288 480702 20 620.18 714431.44 63 16167 165414 21 843.08 713811.26 64 16998 449247 22 948.98
712968.18 23 1239.9 712019.2 65 17759 432249 24 1387.3 710779.3 66 18433 414490 67 19402 396057 25
1477.2 709392.0 68 20547 376655 26 1680.2 707914.8 69 21753 356108 27 1903.9 706234.6 28 2112.8
704330.7 70 22918 334355 29 2292.0 702217.9 71 23947 311437 72 24470 287490 30 2417.4 699925.9 73
24546 263020 31 2713.9 697508.5 74 24187 238474 32 2957.0 694791.6 33 31243 691837.6 75 23467 214287
34 3383.5 688713.3 76 22442 190820 77 21341 168378 35 3686.0 685329.8 78 20143 147037 36 3748.0
681643.8 79 18840 126894 37 3847.0 677895.8 38 4024.8 674048.8 80 17442 108054 39 4168.0 670024.0 81
16008 90612 82 14306 74604 40 4327.5 665856.0 83 12470 60298 41 4507.4 661528.5 84 10613 47828 42
4762.2 657021.1 43 5083.2 652258.9 85 8808.9 37215.1 44 5461.4 647175.7 86 7252.1 28406.2 87 5855.8
21154.1 45 5889.1 641711.3 88 4630.5 15298.3 46 6352.6 635822.2 89 3587.1 10667.8 47 6793.0 629469.6 48
7210.5 622676.6 90 2720.5 7080.7 49 7604.7 615166.1 91 1941.1 4360.2 92 1423.4 2419.1 50 7968.3
607861.4 93 995.70 995.70 51 8303.2 599893.1 52 8339.7 591586.9 53 9106.8 583197.2 54 9548.5 574090.4
55 9999.9 564541.9 56 10455 554542 57 11068 541087 58 11804 533019 12626 521215

Age. During Life. To continue until Age 65. Age. During Life. Single Premium. Annual Premium. Single Premium. Annual Premium. Single Premium. Annual Premium. £ £ £ £ £ £ 18 12.171 .5474 4.813 .2267 60

51.273 5.0922 19 12.605 .5721 4.983 .2374 61 53.104 5.4673 62 55.007 5.8756 20 13.052 .5981 5.155 .2485
63 56.976 6.3194 21 13.513 .6252 5.330 .2600 64 58.999 6.8033 22 13.990 .6536 5.508 .2721 23 14.484 .6836
5.691 .2847 65 61.069 7.3321 24 14.992 .7149 5.875 .2978 66 63.178 7.9111 67 65.315 8.5480 25 15.519 .7479
6.063 .3116 68 67.449 9.2434 20 16.065 .7827 6.256 .3261 69 69.554 9.9948 27 16.629 .8193 6.451 .3412 28
17.210 .8578 6.648 .3570 70 71.601 10.7995 29 17.809 .8984 6.847 .3736 71 73.565 11.6529 72 75.419
12.5468 30 18.428 .9412 7.047 .3909 73 77.114 13.4862 31 19.067 .9865 7.251 .4093 74 78.759 14.4751 32
19.723 1.0312 7.453 .4284 33 20.399 1.0845 7.654 .4484 75 80.305 15.5209 34 21.097 1.1379 7.856 .4694 76
81.753 16.6334 77 83.104 17.8258 35 21.817 1.1943 8.057 .4916 78 84.305 19.0951 36 22.559 1.2538 8.254
.5146 79 85.295 20.4250 37 23.333 1.3174 8.455 .5391 38 24.140 1.3850 8.660 .5654 80 85.975 21.7989 39
24.977 1.4571 8.864 .5931 81 86.281 23.1938 82 86.009 24.5530 40 25.846 1.5310 9.068 .6228 83 85.232
25.8592 41 26.750 1.6160 9.271 .6543 84 84.027 27.1405 42 27.689 1.7038 9.472 .6881 43 28.659 1.7976
9.667 .7240 85 82.568 28.3739 44 29.661 1.8977 9.850 .7619 86 80.798 29.5963 87 78.494 30.6378 45 30.692
2.0046 10.018 .3020 88 75.398 31.3766 46 31.753 2.1187 10.166 .8441 89 71.171 31.5894 47 32.838 2.2406
10.289 .8885 48 33.956 2.3712 10.383 .9350 90 65.200 30.9151 49 35.107 2.5114 10.451 .9845 91 56.584
28.6792 92 45.198 24.5641 50 36.301 2.6623 10.487 1.0369 93 27.394 16.0293 51 37.543 2.8251 10.492
1.0930 52 38.836 3.0012 10.460 1.1534 53 40.204 3.1938 10.406 1.2208 54 41.607 3.4009 10.280 1.2913 55
43.069 3.6259 10.093 1.3676 56 44.584 3.8708 57 46.168 4.1384 58 47.809 4.4296 59 49.512 4.7471

Valuation of Liabilities.

25. A valuation of the policies at the end of any given period is called a *valuation of the liabilities*.

26. *To find the value of a policy.*

If the rates of sickness and mortality experienced and the rate of interest realised correspond with the rates of sickness, mortality, and interest adopted in computing the premiums, the fund in hand to provide for the claims under the policies is the premiums received at the end of each year less the claims by sickness and death at the end of each year, accumulated at compound interest. Thus the accumulated fund at the end of each year is the accumulation of the premiums received less the claims paid at the early ages to meet the claims which exceed the premiums at the advanced ages. The share of each person living at the end of each year is the value of each policy.

Let nV_x denote the present value of a policy for £1 on the life of a person of the age x at entry after it has been n years in force, the premium being due a year hence, A_x the value of the sum assured on the life x , and P_x its risk annual premium; then at the end of a year the value of the policy will be equal to the value of the sum assured on the life $x+1$ less the value of the future premiums, that is

$$1V_x = A_{x+1} - P_x 1a_x$$

at the end of two years

$$2V_x = A_{x+2} - P_x 2a_x$$

at the end of n years

$$nV_x = A_{x+n} - P_x n a_x$$

RULE. *The value of a policy is the value of the sum assured at the present age less the value of the future premiums, computed by the rates of sickness and mortality adopted, and the rate of interest which will most likely be realised in the future.*

It is impossible to obtain correct rates of Sickness and mortality which may be expected to prevail in the future from the experience of a single Lodge with small numbers and financially independent as regards Health Assurance, but this is no reason why an incorrect rate of interest should be adopted in valuing the liabilities.

If the accumulated fund in hand is equal to the sum of the values of the sums assured less the sum of the values of the future premiums the Society is solvent.

Appendix.

To construct a table of the logarithms of the present value of £1 due at the end of any number of years.

The present value of £1 due a year hence is Mathematical equation, the logarithm of which is the arithmetical complement of $\log(1+i)$. When the rate is 3 per cent, $\log(1+i) = \log 1.03 = 0.01283,72247$, the arithmetical complement of which is 1.98716,27753. By taking the first nine multiples of this logarithm may be constructed a table of the logarithms of the present value of £1 due at the end of any number of years from 1 to 100 which will be true to the last figure to six places of decimals, thus:

Logarithm of the present value of £1.

Years.

- 1.987102 775
- .974325 550
- .961488 325
- .948651 100
- .935813 875

* *

To construct columns D and N.

Since $Dx = lxvx$;

therefore $\log Dx = \log lx + \log vx$.

Log Dx is formed in reverse order to facilitate the formation of column N, thus: Mathematical equation

To construct columns C and M.

Since $Cx = dxvx + 1$;

Mathematical equation

To construct columns C# and M#.

Since $C\#x = s\#xwDx$, where $s\#x$ denotes the average number of weeks' sickness to each person in the year following the age x , and w the present value of £1 due half a year hence;

therefore $\log C\#x = \log s\#x + \log w + \log Dx$.

The present value of £1 due half a year hence at 3 per cent. is Mathematical equation the logarithm of which is the arithmetical complement of $\log 1.015$. $\log 1.015 = 0.00646,60422$, the arithmetical complement of which is 1.99353,39578. Writing this logarithm to six places of decimals at the bottom of a card to be added to the other two logarithms at each age, the formation is as follows: Mathematical equation

Mr Joseph Braithwaite; G.M., I.O.O.F.,

SIR,—Having completed the necessary calculations for the various tables as specified in your letter of April 13th, we have now the honor to submit the results, which we feel assured, will afford you every facility for framing an equitable scale of contributions suitable to the requirements of your Society.

The rate of interest upon which these Tables have been calculated is 4 per cent., a rate that has been almost invariably adopted by Actuaries for the valuation of Life Assurance Societies in these Colonies. In calculations of this character, the future as well as the present must be looked to, therefore we think it would be scarcely prudent to reckon upon more than 4 per cent., for though higher rates may at present prevail, it is by no means certain that such will always continue to be the case. Moreover, it must be borne in mind, that in order that these results may be applicable to the Society, it is imperative that the rate of interest reckoned upon shall be received per annum upon the total capital of the Sick and Funeral Funds, whatever the same may consist of, houses, land, or goods, or anything in fact that represents money belonging to these Funds. In the event therefore, of any of these Tables being adopted, it would be incumbent upon the Officers of the Society to see that these conditions are complied with, for although as a rule Societies here receive more than 4 per cent, for investments, it will be found upon investigation that considerably less than that rate is realised upon their total capital. All circumstances considered then, we think that we are fully justified in not selecting a higher rate of interest than 4 per cent.

The Tables of Sickness and Mortality used are those of the Manchester Unity Oddfellows, compiled from the experience of that Society in Great Britain, by Mr Henry Ratcliffe, the C.S. of the Order. The reputation which these Tables have acquired renders comment on our part almost unnecessary. Such is the estimation in which they are held that the Actuarial Commission lately appointed by the Imperial Government, have affirmed them to be the only reliable Tables extant, relative to Friendly Societies,

Now, there is an opinion pretty generally entertained that the rates of Sickness and Mortality experienced among Friendly Societies in this Colony are considerably less than those of the Home Country, it being argued that our climate and manner of living is more conducive to health. Without presuming to dispute the correctness of this opinion, we would simply point out in the first place, that no experience has been hitherto collected to confirm it, and in the second, that although the average sickness per member may be less here than at home, this may proceed from causes of a less permanent nature than those of climate and manner of living. It is a fact amply demonstrated by all tabulated experience, wherever collected, that the rates of Sickness and Mortality show a continual increase, year by year, in almost regular gradations, from the youngest age at which persons are admitted into the Society, to the end of life. This may not be the experience of ten, twenty, or one hundred persons, but it is of a hundred thousand. Now, it is notorious that we have not that proportion of old men amongst the members of Friendly Societies in this Colony which they have at home, take for example the Manchester Unity Oddfellows in Otago, out of 1583 members, they have not one beyond the age of 56 years.

We may safely affirm that few, if any, Societies of the like number can be found at Home so favourably circumstanced, and this Society may be taken as a fair sample of the rest. It inevitably follows therefore, that the Sickness experienced by them will be less than that of Great Britain. But this advantage is only of a temporary character, (which will be lost in time,) and any experience in sickness that may be collected in this Colony must first show the ages at which it occurs, before any comparison can be made. Mr J. M. Templeton, Certifying Actuary for Friendly Societies in Victoria, in giving evidence before the Royal Commission lately appointed there, spoke upon this subject as follows :—"I believe the laws of sickness and mortality to be general laws, subject to variations for different races of people and for the varying circumstances of life, such as climate, occupation, and manner of living. We have in these colonies the same race of people as they have in England, they follow much the same occupation, their manner of living is probably better, there are not so many in extreme poverty, but as the very poor are not to be found among the members of Friendly Societies, this circumstance is of slight importance, and our climate may be considered more healthy, although even this is doubted by many who hold that the violent changes of temperature to which we are subject more than counter-balances the advantages we derive from our warmer climate. Therefore we may naturally conclude that the sickness and mortality among the members of Friendly Societies in this Colony will very closely approach to that which obtains in England." In this opinion Mr Templeton is amply borne out by the actual experience of Victorian Friendly Societies, which has of late years been considerably in excess of that obtained in England. It is perfectly evident then, that for us there remains no alternative but to base our calculations upon the English Tables of Sickness and Mortality, which we may fairly assume to be perfectly applicable to our circumstances.

Table A. shows the monthly premiums necessary for the benefits at present given by your Society, taking into account that part of the Initiation Fees which is apportioned to the Sick and Funeral Funds. The table has been assimilated as nearly as it is possible to calculate with the present financial regulations of the Society, and for all purposes of comparison, will therefore be found amply reliable. The considerations however, which were appended—viz., members admitted at the opening of a new Lodge, and members out of compliance re-admitted at half the usual rates for initiation—we have found it impossible to take into account, the proportion of members who join or re-join under these conditions not being specified. Moreover, with all due deference, we may remark that it seems to us both inconsistent and unjust that A. should be admitted into the Society on Monday for one pound, whilst B. who joins a fortnight later, although possessing the same qualifications as A., must pay two. It may be urged that it is an inducement for a greater number to join on the opening of a new Lodge, but the best answer to such an argument is the fact, that the fewer who join upon these terms, the better for the financial condition of the Society, and the same will also apply in the case of members out of compliance rejoining. A great proportion of those who allow their memberships to lapse, are men whose material prospects in life have so improved as to render the benefits of the Society a matter of indifference to them, and we believe that the number of those is very small who cease to be members of the Society through sheer inability to pay their contributions. Altogether these considerations are of a most pernicious character, detrimental to the financial progress of the Society, and the first step made in the direction of financial reform should undoubtedly tend to their abolishment.

Table B. has been calculated for the same benefits as Table A., except that new members are not entitled to benefits until the expiration of twelve months, and shows the Initiation Fees which would be required at each age, with a fixed contribution of 7½d. per week. At some of the younger ages it will be seen that the 7½d. is more than sufficient, whilst at the older, the fees requisite are so large, that we believe the table will be found of little practical use to the Society.

Table C. shows the monthly premiums necessary for the same benefits as Table B. without Initiation Fees, and is without doubt the one best adapted to the requirements of the Society as at present constituted. By adopting it, the loss at present incurred by accepting Clearance members would be avoided, for in this Colony, where the number of those who join by Clearance is much greater than those who leave, the loss entailed upon Societies is no doubt considerable. With a graduated scale of payments, without Initiation Fees, the hardships would of course fall on the member, who by drawing his clearance must forego all the advantage he derives from joining the Society at a younger age. But until a general system is adopted by Societies that shall be equitable between them and the member, the question of Clearances will always continue to be one of difficulty.

Table D. gives the monthly premiums necessary without Initiation Fees, for the same benefits as Tables B., and C., except that Sick Benefit ceases at age 65, after which an annuity of 10s. per week is to be received. The officers of the Society must be complimented on their sagacity in asking for a Table of this kind; it evinces on their part a keen perception of what are the true functions of a Friendly Society, which should offer facilities for its Members to make provision for old age, as well as the ordinary contingencies of sickness and accident to be met with in life, and we venture to affirm that the time is not far distant when the system of deferred annuities will be more generally adopted by Friendly Societies than is the case at present. If in this instance the

contributions are found to be too high, the difficulty might be overcome by reducing the amount of the annuity.

In life assurance calculations, it is customary to assume that when the premiums are paid they are at once invested, but as this is scarcely practicable in the case of Friendly Societies, it is generally thought that to allow six months for the payment and investment of contributions would be a fair average. In accordance with this principle, these Tables have been calculated, and if any of them be adopted, it is imperative that this condition be borne in mind.

Before concluding, we wish to say that the only infallible method of testing the sufficiency of the Society's scale of payments is by periodical valuations, but if the Tables of Sickness and Mortality upon which our calculations are based be applicable to Societies here, (and we have already given strong reasons for the supposition that they are so), then most certainly these contributions will be required to produce the benefits. It behoves the members then, to assure themselves that they are not at present paying their contributions into the Society in the hope of receiving benefits that can never be realized.

In conclusion, we beg to compliment the Officers of the Society upon the spirit shewn by them in raising the question of financial reform, it evinces on their part, an interest in the welfare of the Society that cannot be too highly commended, and we sincerely hope that their efforts will meet with that co-operation on the part of the members which its importance deserves.

Geo. Leslie.
Peter Black.

Dunedin,

May 11th, 1877.

Table A.

Contributions per month to Sick and Funeral Funds, with present Initiation Fees, apportioned as at present—for present Sick and Funeral Benefits, viz :

Sick Benefits—

After 6 months membership, 10s. per week; in sickness.
After 12 months membership, 20s. per week; in sickness.
for the first 6 months; 10s, for the next 6 months, and 5s.
for any sickness after a continued sickness of 12 months.

Funeral Benefits—

After 6 months membership, £10 on death of member
After 12 months membership, 20 on death of member
After 6 months membership, 5 on death of member wife
After 12 months membership, 10 on death of member wife
Thirteen monthly payments per annum.

Age. Sick Fund. Funeral Fund. Total Means. present Initiation Fees. £ £ s. d £ £ s. d £. s. d £ s. d £ s. d 18 .
08800 = 0 1 9½ . 02584 = 0 0 6¼ 0 2 3¼ 19 . 09018 0 1 10 . 02659 0 0 6½ 0 2 4½ 0 2 4 20 . 09223 0 1 10½ .
02737 0 0 6¾ 0 2 5¾ 1 0 0 21 . 09410 = 0 1 11 . 02804 = 0 0 6¾ 0 2 5¾ 22 . 09639 0 1 11½ . 02887 0 0 7 0 2
6½ 23 . 09878 0 2 0 . 02972 0 0 7¼ 0 2 7¼ 0 2 7 1 5 0 24 . 10130 0 2 0½ . 03061 0 0 7¼ 0 2 7¾ 25 . 10360 0 2
1 . 03138 0 0 7½ 0 2 8½ 26 . 10637 0 2 1½ . 03236 = 0 0 7¾ 0 2 9¾ 1 10 0 27 . 10929 0 2 2 . 03337 0 0 8 0 2
10 28 . 11182 0 2 3 . 03429 0 0 8¼ 0 2 11¼ 0 3 0 1 17 6 29 . 11506 0 2 4 . 03534 0 0 8½ 0 3 0½ 30 . 11790 0 2
4½ . 03630 0 0 8¾ 0 3 1¼ 31 . 12144 = 0 2 5 . 03755 = 0 0 9 0 3 2 2 5 0 32 . 12514 0 2 6 . 03888 0 0 9¼ 0 3 3¼
33 . 12788 0 2 7 . 03985 0 0 9½ 0 3 4½ 0 3 5 34 . 13195 0 2 8 . 04134 0 0 10 0 3 6 3 0 0 35 . 13624 0 2 9 .
04291 0 0 10¼ 0 3 7¼ 36 . 13957 = 0 2 10 . 04399 0 0 10½ 0 3 8½ 37 . 14435 0 2 11 . 04559 0 0 11 0 3 10 13
15 0 38 . 14817 0 3 0 . 04680 0 0 11¼ 0 3 11¼ 0 4 0 4 10 0 39 . 15349 0 3 1 . 04855 0 0 11¾ 0 4 0¾ 40 . 15783
0 3 2 . 04993 0 0 11¾ 0 4 1¾ 41 . 16374 = 0 3 3 . 05188 = 0 1 0½ 0 4 3½ 5 5 0 42 . 16777 0 3 5 . 05312 0 1 0¾
0 4 5¾ 43 . 17434 0 3 6 . 05525 0 1 1¼ 0 4 7¼ 0 4 8 6 10 0 44 . 18124 0 3 8 . 05759 0 1 2 0 4 10 45 . 18850 0 3
10 . 06005 0 1 2½ 0 5 0½ No provision is made in above calculations for expenses or benefits of any other

description.
Leslie and Black.

Table B.

Initiation fees necessary with an until an Annual Contribution of £1 12s. 6d. at each age, to the Sick and Funeral Funds, to secure the following Benefits after 12 months membership, viz :

Sick Benefits—

- 20s. per week for the first 6 months sickness.
- 10s. per week for the second 6 months sickness.
- 5s. per week for any sickness after a continued sickness of twelve months

Funeral Benefits—

- £20 on the death of a member
- £10 on the member's wife, (for one wife only.)
- Annual Contribution to be divided as follows :—
- To Sick Fund—£14s 11d. p an., or 1s. 11d p month of 4 weeks
- to Funeral Fund—7s. 7d. p an., or 7d. p month of 4 weeks

Age. To Sick Fund. To Funeral Fund. Total. £ £ s. d. £ £ s. d. £ £ s. d. 18 Contributions sufficient for Benefits. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 1 . 9502 = 1 19 0 0 . 6681 = 0 13 4 2 . 6183 = 2 12 4 26 2 . 5755 0 . 8841 3 . 4596 3 9 3 27 3 . 2232 1 . 1041 4 . 3273 4 6 6 28 3 . 8908 1 . 3305 5 . 2213 5 4 5 29 4 . 5775 1 . 5650 6 . 1425 6 2 10 30 5 . 2830 = 5 5 8 1 . 8014 = 1 16 1 7 . 0844 7 1 9 31 6 . 0026 2 . 0488 8 . 0514 = 8 1 0 32 6 . 7395 2 . 3038 9 . 0433 9 1 0 33 7 . 4963 2 . 5660 10 . 0623 10 1 3 34 8 . 2715 2 . 8356 11 . 1071 11 2 2 35 9 . 0717 = 9 1 6 3 . 1103 = 3 2 2 12 . 1820 12 3 8 36 9 . 8946 3 . 3912 13 . 2858 = 13 5 9 37 10 . 7463 3 . 6760 14 . 4223 14 8 6 38 11 . 6206 3 . 9661 15 . 5867 15 11 9 39 12 . 5216 4 . 2615 16 . 7831 16 15 9 40 13 . 4419 = 13 8 10 4 . 5631 = 4 11 4 18 . 0050 18 0 2 41 14 . 3843 4 . 8712 19 . 2565 = 19 5 2 42 15 . 3488 5 . 1867 20 . 5355 20 10 9 43 16 . 3295 5 . 5094 21 . 8389 21 16 9 44 17 . 3333 5 . 8403 23 . 1736 23 3 6 45 18 . 3382 = 18 6 9 6 . 1787 = 6 3 7 24 . 5169 24 10 4 No provision is made in above calculations for expenses or benefits of any other description
Leslie and Black.

Table C.

Monthly Contributions for the following Benefits, after twelve months membership, viz:

Sick Benefits—

- 20s, per week for the first six months sickness.
- 10s. per week for the second six months sickness.
- 5s. per week for any sickness after a continued sickness of twelve months.

Funeral Benefits—

- £20 on the death of a member.
- £10 on the death of a member's wife, (for one wife only)
- Thirteen monthly payments per annum. No Initiation Fee.

Age. To Sick Fund. To Funeral Fund. Total. £ £ s. d. £ £ s. d. £ £ s. d. 18 0 . 088055 = 0 1 9 0 . 02621 = 0 0 6½ 19 0 . 090101 0 1 9½ 0 . 02696 0 0 6½ 0 . 11706 = 0 2 4 20 0 . 092218 0 1 10 0 . 02774 0 0 6½ 21 0 . 094407 = 0 1 11 0 . 02854 = 0 0 7 22 0 . 09068 0 1 11 0 . 02937 0 0 7 23 0 . 09905 0 2 0 0 . 03022 0 0 7 0 .

12927 0 2 7 24 0 . 10155 0 2 0 0 . 031107 0 0 7½ 25 0 . 10417 0 2 1 0 . 032022 0 0 8 26 0 . 10685 = 0 2 2 0 .
 03298 0 0 8 27 0 . 10986 0 2 2 0 . 03397 0 0 8 28 0 . 11293 0 2 3 0 . 03501 0 0 8½ 0 . 14794 0 2 11½ 29 0 .
 11615 0 2 4 0 . 03611 0 0 8½ 30 0 . 11952 0 2 5 0 . 03724 0 0 9 31 0 . 123032 = 0 2 6 0 . 03845 = 0 0 9½ 32 0 .
 120713 0 2 7 0 . 03972 0 0 9½ 33 0 . 13058 0 2 8 0 . 04106 0 0 10 0 . 17164 0 3 6 34 0 . 13404 0 2 9 0 . 04247
 0 0 10 35 0 . 13892 0 2 10 0 . 04394 0 0 11 30 0 . 14345 = 0 2 11 0 . 04549 = 0 0 11 37 0 . 11823 0 3 0 0 .
 04709 0 0 11½ 38 0 . 15328 0 3 1 0 . 04877 0 0 11½ 0 . 20206 0 4 0½ 39 0 . 15861 0 3 2 0 . 05053 0 1 0 40 0 .
 16423 0 3 4 0 . 05288 0 1 0½ 41 0 . 17017 = 0 3 5 0 . 05434 = 0 1 1 42 0 . 17641 0 3 6½ 0 . 05640 0 . 1 1½ 43 0 .
 18600 0 3 8 0 . 05858 0 1 2 0 . 24158 0 4 10 44 0 . 18992 0 3 10 0 . 00087 0 1 3 45 0 . 19721 0 4 0 0 . 06332 0
 1 3½ No provision is made in above calculations for expenses or benefits of any other description.

Leslie and Black.

Table D.

Monthly Contributions for the following Benefits, after twelve months membership.

Sick Benefits, to Age 65—

20s. per week for the first six months sickness.

10s. per week for the second six months sickness.

5s. per week for any sickness after a continued sickness of twelve months.

Annuity of 10s. per week, payable quarterly during life, after age 65,

Funeral Benefits—

£20 on the death of a member.

£10 on the death of a member's wife, (for one wife only)

Contributions payable during the whole term of life.

Thirteen monthly payments per annum.

Age. To Sick & Annuity Fund. To Funeral Fund. Total. £ £ s. d £ £ s. d £ £ s. d 18 0 . 137880 2 9½ 0 . 02621
 = 0 0 6½ 0 . 16409 = 0 3 4 19 0 . 142570 2 10½ 0 . 026960 0 6½ 0 . 169530 3 5 20 0 . 147530 2 11½ 0 . 027740
 0 6½ 0 . 175270 3 6 21 0 . 15271 = 0 3 0½ 0 . 02854 = 0 0 7 0 . 18125 = 0 3 7½ 22 0 . 158200 3 2 0 . 029370 0
 7 0 . 187570 3 9 23 0 . 162960 3 3½ 0 . 030220 0 7 0 . 193180 3 10½ 24 0 . 170070 3 4½ 0 . 0311070 0 7½ 0 .
 201180 4 0 25 0 . 176550 3 6 0 . 03020220 0 8 0 . 206750 4 2 26 0 . 18343 = 0 3 8 0 . 03298 = 0 0 8 0 . 21641
 = 0 4 4 27 0 . 190720 3 10 0 . 033970 0 8 0 . 224690 4 6 28 0 . 198470 3 11½ 0 . 035010 0 8½ 0 . 233480 4 8
 29 0 . 206700 4 1½ 0 . 036110 0 8½ 0 . 242810 4 10 30 0 . 215370 4 4 0 . 037240 0 9 0 . 252610 5 1 31 0 .
 22463 = 0 4 5½ 0 . 03845 = 0 0 9½ 0 . 26308 = 0 5 3 32 0 . 234450 4 8½ 0 . 039720 0 9½ 0 . 274170 5 6 33 0 .
 244860 4 11 9 . 041060 0 10 0 . 285920 5 9 34 0 . 256000 5 2 0 . 042470 0 10 0 . 298470 6 0 35 0 . 267830 5 4
 0 . 043940 0 11 0 . 311770 6 3 36 0 . 28055 = 0 5 7 0 . 04549 = 0 0 11 0 . 32604 = 0 6 6 37 0 . 294110 5 10½ 0
 . 047090 0 11½ 0 . 341200 6 10 38 0 . 308660 6 2½ 0 . 048770 0 11½ 0 . 367430 7 2 39 0 . 327650 6 7 0 .
 050530 1 0 0 . 378180 7 7 40 0 . 340970 6 10½ 0 . 052380 1 0½ 0 . 393350 7 11 41 0 . 35895 = 0 7 2 0 . 05434
 = 0 1 1 0 . 41329 = 0 8 3 42 0 . 378220 7 7½ 0 . 056400 1 1½ 0 . 434620 8 9 43 0 . 399100 8 0 0 . 058580 1 2 0
 . 457680 9 2 44 0 . 421270 8 5 0 . 060870 1 3 0 . 482140 9 8 45 0 . 445490 8 10½ 0 . 063320 1 3½ 0 . 508810
 10 2 No provision is made in above calculations for expenses or benefits of any other description.

Leslie and Black.

F. Humffray, Printer, George-Street, Dunedin.

To the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States:

The duty of visiting Australia and New Zealand, under the resolution of this body at its last session, devolved upon the Deputy Grand Sire. Nothing but my sense of obligation to the Order could have induced me to abandon business and take the hazards of the trip. At one time I had concluded that the object in view did not

justify the money to be expended, nor the other personal sacrifices to be made, and, therefore, refused to accept the alternative appointment of the resolution. It was matter of doubt, too, whether those jurisdictions would consent to the plan decided upon, and the mortification of failure would be my only compensation. After correspondence between the Grand Sire, the Grand Secretary, and myself, I decided to accept the appointment. For that correspondence see the reports of those officers.

1. On the 15th day of April, 1878, your Commissioner left San Francisco, and landed at Auckland, May 7th. The correspondence just named will show the plan of adjustment he intended to propose to Australia and New Zealand. The situation was this: The Grand Lodge of Australia existed under Charter issued in 1868 by the G. L. of U. S., and was exercising jurisdiction over the whole of Australia and Tasmania or Van Diemen s Land. The Grand Lodge of New Zealand existed under Charter issued February 13, 1869, by said Grand Lodge of Australia, and was exercising jurisdiction over New Zealand. No other Grand Lodges existed or now exist in either country.

The Charter of the Grand Lodge of Australia made it a quasi sovereignty there; reserving to the G. L. of U. S. the power to prescribe the work, the traveling password, and the qualifications for membership in the Order. (Journal G. L. of U. S., 4295.)

This Grand Lodge has, apparently, always understood this Charter to embrace Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand: and hence, until recently, our correspondence has been with the Grand Lodge of Australia alone. This seems strange, because on its face the Charter includes Australia only, and has nothing to do with the other two countries, which are totally distinct from Australia in all respects. The real difficulty has been the general ignorance in Europe and America of these far-off Colonies of Great Britain; the ignorance on the part of the Odd Fellows there of the intention of the G. L. of U. S. in 1868 to create one sovereign Grand Lodge for the whole of Australasia. Possibly, we were not then quite so clear as to our own intentions as we are now. Time has taught us many things.

Further, up to this hour the G. L. of U. S. has never seen the Charter of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, nor has it known its contents. A copy of it is hereto annexed, marked "Exhibit A," and it is an exact copy (names being changed) of the Charter issued by this body to the Grand Lodge of Australia just referred to. That is to say, the Grand Lodge of Australia, having received from us a Charter with quasi sovereign power in Australia, at once granted New Zealand a Charter with like power there: as to which I will say more in another part of this report.

As this Charter was delivered to the Grand Lodge of New Zealand by Special Commissioner MEACHAM, it is not surprising that thereafter that Lodge considered itself independent of Australia, with the consent of the G. L. of U. S. There was, however, between those countries a difference of opinion as to their respective powers. New Zealand claimed to be independent; and in Australia opinions varied—some holding that New Zealand was right in her claim, others that she was subordinate. Both jurisdictions were opposed to the formation of a new Grand Lodge to which they should yield obedience. New Zealand especially was averse to any connection with Australia. Indeed, in the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, at its session in September, October, and November, 1877, the Proceedings of which reached me a few days before leaving California, an amendment to its Constitution was offered, the preamble of which says: "Whereas, among other privileges, this G. L. of N. Z., having by virtue of its Constitution full power to adjust its system of government on the same principles as the *Grand Lodges of the United States and the Get man Empire*," &c. This was laid over for action until this year.

Here was assumption of the most enlarged powers, by a body we designed to be subordinate to the one Grand Lodge created by us in 1868. As confirmation of this I may add, that the first time I entered a Lodge in New Zealand, the Initiatory and Degree Books placed in my hands bore on their title pages these words: "Reprinted by the authority of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand. P. V. G. F. Humffray, Printer, 1875." The next page runs:

"Officers of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand.

Elective.

(Here follow the names of the five elective officers.)

Appointed.

(Five names follow.)

Past Grand Masters.

(Three names follow.)"

Such was the condition upon the arrival of your Commissioner in New Zealand. The correspondence between the Grand Sire, Grand Secretary, and myself before mentioned, had resulted in the following plan as the proper solution of the Australian troubles:

1st. To erect into a sovereignty, similar to the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, the Lodges and Encampments, Grand and Subordinate, in Australia, New Zealand, and Tasmania, under the name of "*The R. W. Grand Lodge of Australasia, I. O. O. F.*" with jurisdiction over the whole of that country, and with a Charter

from the G. L. of U. S.

2d. To have the Grand Lodges of Australia and New Zealand surrender their existing Charters and each to accept a new one from said Grand Lodge of Australasia; except that in the case of Australia, the Charter should be to the Grand Lodge of Victoria, with jurisdiction over the Subordinates in that Colony, leaving the Subordinates in the other Colonies of Australia and in Tasmania under the direct jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Australasia until Grand Lodges were established; or attaching such Subordinates to the Grand Lodge of Victoria, as should be deemed best; thus inaugurating in Australasia a governmental system precisely like our own.

The resolution of the G. L. of U S at its last session was construed to give the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary full power to issue a Charter from the G. L. of U. S. to such Grand Lodge of Australasia. Accordingly such a Charter was prepared and placed in possession of your Commissioner, a copy of which is annexed to the report of the Grand Secretary.

Upon reaching Dunedin, after visiting many Subordinates on the way, your Commissioner found that the Grand Lodge of New Zealand had been regularly summoned in special session to meet him. He drew up and presented to that body for adoption, the preamble and resolutions, a copy of which is hereto annexed marked "Exhibit B," as embodying the plan proposed. There was opposition, but after full discussion, on two nights, the resolutions were unanimously passed, and the sentiment finally became as strong for as it had been against the new Grand Lodge. The Charter of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand issued by the Grand Lodge of Australia in 1869, as before stated, was put in my hands as Representative of New Zealand, to be surrendered to the Grand Lodge of Australasia when formed.

The members of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand met your Commissioner in the most fraternal spirit, and entered into all our mutual discussions with the most liberal and intelligent views. They had never clearly understood our system of government in Odd Fellowship. When it was thoroughly expounded, they saw its perfect fitness to Australasia. Not only so; but they became satisfied that the Order would never be fully grown there without the prestige and controlling power of a Supreme Grand Lodge.

Looking to the future, it is proper here to state a fact and make some suggestions. The main objection in New Zealand to the new plan was that this country was a totally distinct country from Australia, the two having nothing whatever in common. This surprised me. In America we regard them as essentially one; one geographically; peopled by the same race, and governed by the same Queen. Nothing can be further from the truth. New Zealand is as distinct from Australia as France from England or Spain. It is further from New Zealand to Australia than from Africa to South America, and between the two former rolls a rough and mountainous ocean. SIR CHARLES DILKE, an Englishman, in his recent book entitled "The Greater Britain," says:

"Australasia is a term much used at home to express the whole of our antipodean possessions; in the Colonies themselves the name is almost unknown, or, if used, is meant to embrace Australia and Tasmania, not Australia and New Zealand. * * * * *

"Had Australia and New Zealand been close together, instead of as far apart as Africa and South America, there could have been no political connection between them so long as the traditions of their first settlement endured. Not only is the name 'Australasia' politically meaningless, however, but it is also geographically incorrect, for New Zealand and Australia are as completely separated from each other as Great Britain and Massachusetts. No promontory of Australia runs out to within one thousand miles of any New Zealand Cape, the distance between Sydney and Wellington is fourteen hundred miles, from Sydney to Auckland is as far. The distance from the nearest point of New Zealand to Tasman's peninsula, which itself projects somewhat from Tasmania, is greater than that of London from Algiers; from Wellington to Sydney, opposite ports, is as far as from Manchester to Iceland, or from Africa to Brazil * * * * * The seas which separate Australia from New Zealand are cold, bottomless, without islands, torn by Arctic currents, swept by polar gales, and traversed in all weathers by a mountainous swell. * * * * * Not only is the intervening ocean wide and cold, but New Zealand presents to Australia a rugged coast guarded by reefs and bars, and backed by a snowy range, while she turns toward Polynesia and America all her ports and bays.

"No two countries in the world are so wholly distinct as Australia and New Zealand. The islands of New Zealand are inhabited by Polynesians, the Australian continent by negroes. New Zealand is ethnologically nearer to America, Australia to Africa, than New Zealand to Australia.

"If we turn from ethnology to scenery and climate the countries are still more distinct * * * * * It is impossible to conceive countries more unlike each other than are our two great divisions of the South. Their very fossils are as dissimilar as are their flora and fauna of our time."

Having read this book on my trip out; having conversed with new Zealanders and Australians on the ship, having, after reaching Auckland and during my journey thence to Dunedin, put to scores of persons this question: "If New Zealand and Australia were to separate from England, would the former unite with Australia

or form an independent nation?" and having uniformly received the answer: "New Zealand would be a nation by itself:" your Commissioner had nearly concluded that New Zealand ought to be an independent sovereignty in Odd Fellowship, as the leading men of the Order there maintained.

A few, however, insisted that in case of separation from England, New Zealand, Australia, and Tasmania would form a Confederation. Besides, just now there are quite a number of English and Colonial Statesmen who are advancing the idea of a great Confederation for the entire British Empire: and this is the special plan of Sir JULIUS VOGEL, one of New Zealand's most influential public men.

So that all things considered your Commissioner determined to adhere, if possible, to the original plan; bent all his energies to it, and succeeded. It seemed unwise for Odd Fellows to set the example of disunion. The case of Canadian Odd Fellowship under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of U. S., notwithstanding that Canada is politically united with England, at once offered proof that unity in Odd Fellowship, is consistent with disunion in politics. At all events the plan should have a fair trial.

There was so much question as to its practical working, that it was verbally understood between your Commissioner and the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, that the power should be somewhere reserved to the G. L. of U. S. hereafter to detach New Zealand from the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Australasia if experience proved it wise. Upon suggesting this to the Standing Committee of the Grand Lodge of Australia, it was agreed to insert in the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of Australasia a provision to that effect. All in Australia said, that without such agreement there would be no difficulty in future separation should New Zealand desire it.

2. Having obtained the consent of New Zealand to the formation of the Grand Lodge of Australasia, your Commissioner proceeded to Melbourne, and at once opened negotiations with the authorities there.

The Grand Master had called a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Grand Lodge of Australia by proper previous notice, instead of a meeting of the whole Grand Lodge. This was under a provision of its Constitution, that when the Grand Lodge is not in session the Standing Committee (composed of the Elective Officers, and the Junior P. G. M.) should constitute and have all the powers of the Grand Lodge, except the power to repeal, alter, and amend its Constitution. Under this clause the Standing Committee supposed they had power to assent to the formation of the Grand Lodge of Australasia. As, however, the plan proposed involved surrender of the Charter of the Grand Lodge of Australia, a change of name to the Grand Lodge of Victoria, and the acceptance of a new Charter from the Grand Lodge of Australasia, it was doubtful whether the powers of the committee were sufficient. But, under the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of Australia, there was not time to summon the whole Grand Lodge.

After two sessions of the Standing Committee, at which your Commissioner as such, and as Representative of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, was present, the plan proposed was informally agreed to, and the committee adjourned to July 1, 1878.

It was determined that in the interim your Commissioner should visit as many Subordinate Lodges as possible, explain the plan and get it approved by members of the Grand Lodge. This was done; and everywhere the committee were advised to adopt it.

After visiting Subordinates, your Commissioner returned to Melbourne, June 28th. Meanwhile he had resolved upon this course, to wit:

1st. To assume that the Standing Committee constituted the Grand Lodge for all the purposes in hand, and to have it adopt the plan named.

2d. To have the committee report its action to the Grand Lodge at its session in August for ratification.

3d. To summon as many members of the Grand Lodge as could get to Melbourne in time, and on the 1st day of July to institute them and the Standing Committee as the "Grand Lodge of Australasia."

Accordingly, July 1, 1878. at noon, the Standing Committee met pursuant to adjournment and adopted the following preamble and resolution:

(The Preamble is identical with that prefixed to the New Zealand resolutions hereinbefore referred to, and marked Exhibit B.)

The resolution is as follows:

"Resolved: That this R. W. Grand Lodge hereby consents to the formation of said 'The R. W. Grand Lodge of Australasia, I. O. O. F.' in accordance with said proposition and under said Charter; and further consents to accept from said. 'The R. W. Grand Lodge of Australasia, I. O. O. F.' in lieu of the Charter which it now has, a new Charter with the powers in all matters relating to Odd Fellowship in Victoria usually granted in Charters from the Grand Lodge of the United States to its several State Grand Lodges."

In the afternoon of that day I instituted the Grand Lodge of Australasia at Odd Fellows' Hall. Melbourne, with the following members: WM. GANE, G. M., WM. JUDGE, D. G. M.; W. H. T. WILKS, G. W.; J. H. B. CURTIS, G. Sec.; WM. STIRLING, G. T.; Past Grand Masters WRIGHT, CREWS, BATCHELDOR, KIDSTON, MOIR, ROSS, DUNN, and LAING; Past Grands BRAIM, GRIFFITHS, E. D. WILLIAMS, BARNARD, THOMSON. KELLY, COLLIS, LIBTHORPE, CONDY, MCIVER, J. L. WILLIAMS, WILLIAMSON, MCMASTERS, BURTON, EINSIKDEL,

LOW, WATRON, BISSMIR. TAYLOR, DRUMMOND, MCKEE, MCKENZIE, GORDON, KING, and LEE; and delivered to the Lodge the Charter hereinbefore named.

The Lodge then elected the following officers:

WILLIAM STIRLING, M. W. Grand Sire; MICHAEL KIDSTON, R. W. Deputy Grand Sire; J. H. B. CURTIS, Grand Secretary; JOHN MOIR, Grand Treasurer.

The Grand Sire appointed the following officers:

FREDRICK BATCHELDOR, Grand Marshal; T. W. WRIGHT, Grand Guardian; WM. JUDGE, Grand Messenger—all of whom were regularly installed, when the Grand Lodge adjourned to Saturday, July 6, 1878, to adopt a Constitution. On that day the Lodge met, and a draft of a Constitution previously prepared by your Commissioner in consultation with the Standing Committee of the Grand Lodge of Australia, and modeled after the Constitution of the G. L. of U. S., was considered; when the Lodge, after ordering a seal and directing that a Charter be issued to the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, postponed the further consideration of a Constitution until October, to which time the Lodge adjourned.

It was impossible to convert the Grand Lodge of Australia into the Grand Lodge of Victoria, in accordance with the plan, before I left, because of certain formalities required by a new Friendly Societies' Act.

Both in New Zealand and Australia new Acts had been passed at the last session of their Parliaments, and committees of the Grand Bodies were preparing new Constitutions and rules for registration under those Acts when I arrived. This was fortunate, as the new system of government in Odd Fellowship will be harmonized with the new laws of the land.

The Grand Lodge of Australasia has started with a superior set of officers. All of them, including the appointed officers, are Past Grand Masters, excepting Bro. JUDGE, who is D. G. M., and Bro. CURTIS, who is, and since the death of Bro. VINE has been, Grand Secretary of the G. L. of Australia. Grand Sire STIRLING was first Grand Master of the G. L. of Australia, and is a business man of wealth and standing in the community; one of those men whose integrity is unsullied, whose word is as good as his bond. He has the unbounded confidence of Odd Fellows and his heart is in the new organization. Deputy Grand Sire KIDSTON is a lawyer of high character, with most refined tastes, whom to know well is to love. Grand Secretary CURTIS is a learned man, of brain, heart, and energy; the right man in the right place. Grand Treasurer MOIR, with whom I have less acquaintance, is one of the clearest-headed men I met. Similar things could be said of the appointed officers. Many of the other members of the Grand Lodge, several of whom are Past Grand Masters, are men of experience, intelligence, and of strong determination to make the Lodge a complete success.

3. Before leaving I addressed a letter of instruction and suggestion to the Grand Lodge of Australasia, of which I have no copy. The substance of it was a clear idea of the manner in which the G. L. of U. S. conducted its business, whether in open or secret session; the duty of guarding carefully the secret work, which should now pass into the custody of the Grand Lodge of Australasia; and suggestions as to the propriety of the Grand Sire of that Lodge consulting the Grand Sire of the G. L. of U. S. in certain supposed cases before acting himself.

Your Commissioner had no trouble in getting Australia and New Zealand to adopt our views as to the necessity of having all cards issued by the Grand Lodge of the United States.

This brings me to a point where I desire to present a thought or two in connection with our foreign jurisdictions. In what respects are they *sovereign*? In what are they more sovereign than our State Grand Lodges, save in the power to grant Charters to new Grand Bodies? In the Charters to the Grand Lodge of the German Empire and to the Grand Lodge of Australasia we reserve the power to give the work written and unwritten, the traveling password, and the card. The questions suggested involve the extent of these *reservations*, and I think the reservations will in the future be found to cover a large number of practical questions which will arise in these foreign countries; that it will be necessary for us to hold that the G. L. of U. S. has the *exclusive* power to construe these reservations. Otherwise there might be a half dozen conflicting decisions by different foreign sovereign Grand Bodies.

Your Commissioner, therefore, respectfully advised the Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of Australasia and also the Grand Lodge itself, that if a question arose which might involve these reservations, it would be wise at once to seek a decision by the Grand Sire of the G. L. of U. S., as that decision would be reviewed by that body in the ordinary course of business without appeal, and its action be final.

Again: it has been seen that the Grand Lodge of Australia granted to New Zealand a Charter with power in that country as sovereign as Australia itself possessed. I contended at Dunedin that their Charter was originally void, because in excess of the power granted to the Grand Lodge of Australia, and that any action by the G. L. of U. S. recognizing that Charter was in ignorance of its terms. In short, this is the proposition: Can the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, for example, create within Germany another *Sovereign* Grand Lodge? No, in my judgment. In such case, the principle that delegated power cannot itself be delegated, must apply; else we may in time have a hundred so-called Sovereign Grand Lodges not created by the G. L. of U. S.

Again: If these foreign Grand Lodges have the secret work, it would seem that they ought also to have copies of some portions at least of our secret Journal; otherwise they must remain ignorant of many things essential to uniformity. They are in theory bound by legislation of which they can know nothing.

4. This report might end here, as it contains a history of the final adjustment of our complications in Australasia. This adjustment, however, your Commissioner feels to be a very small part of his mission. The new life which has been infused into the Odd Fellowship of that country constitutes the success, and amply justifies the time and money expended. The real good done has been on the floor of the Subordinate Lodge; and I would be faithless to my brothers there and to the Order, if I omitted all account of our meetings. It is impracticable to give details of visits to Subordinates, of daily private instructions and advice to individuals. It would be interesting to do so; and each Lodge naturally wishes an account of its part in the general movement. To gratify the wish would swell this report into hundreds of pages. I was on land nine weeks. Setting aside two weeks for direct efforts in reorganizing the Grand Bodies, seven weeks were left, during which your Commissioner, so far as he had capacity, turned himself into an apostle of Odd Fellowship and went around on a pilgrimage; making in that time forty-five addresses, besides initiating, exemplifying the work, and conversing nearly the whole day. In short every *hour* from nine in the morning till one o'clock at night was occupied. To write out an account of it all would make a book; and my brothers in Australia and New Zealand must excuse brevity upon this field of our common labors.

In New Zealand I visited Lodges at Wellington, Christchurch, Timaru, Oamaru, and Dunedin; and in Australia, at places too numerous to name. Your Commissioner soon saw that what was wanted was an earnest discussion of the higher principles of the Order; and that nothing need be said upon its financial features. Men join the Lodge, and are not seen in it again for a year; but their dues are punctually passed through the wicket by their wives or children and the receipt passed out. The benefit system is better understood and managed in Australasia than here. The scale of dues and benefits is fixed by an actuary. No guess-work about it. It is settled on business principles. Indeed Lodges furnish the doctor and medicine for members and their families. Advertisements like this in papers may be seen any time in New Zealand and Australia.

"Tenders are required for Medical Attendance for the members, their wives, and families, for ensuing six months. Tenders will be received up to 8 p. M., on the 26th inst. _____ HENRY SUMMERS, *Secretary*."

On such a notice doctors put in bids. The result of the system is that a brother pays five dollars per year additional dues and gets doctor and medicine free. Statistics show that the doctor receives about twenty-five dollars per year for each member he attends. So that financially considered the system works well for the brother, the doctor, and the Lodge. Men join the Lodge for this express purpose.

Your Commissioner, therefore, devoted his energies to the intellectual and moral features of Odd Fellowship; to the lifting of it from the mire and slough of a mere benefit society into the upper sky of human sympathy, of organized good will among men. How far he succeeded is for time and others to tell. He ought to say, that everywhere he was greeted with a loud, "Amen." Effort in this direction was the one great need. The soil of Odd Fellowship was becoming crusted over; and wanted deep ploughing, thorough harrowing, and fresh seeding. Friendly societies there are far more numerous than here; and their almost exclusive aim is money aid. Hence their members are generally men who earn their daily bread by the daily labor of their hands. Men of more means and more cultivation do not want such aid and do not join such societies. In other words these societies there are not composed of all classes of men as here; and therefore they lack our power for good. Odd Fellowship is surrounded by such societies and feels the effect. To make it cut loose from such moorings and set its sail to stronger winds, was the object of your Commissioner. He believes, too, he has left behind him brothers who will keep the ball in motion. BRAITHWAITE, WHEELER, BOYD, BRACKEN, MCGAW, and others in New Zealand; STIRLING, KIDSTON, CURTIS, BATCHELDOR, COOK, GANE, DUNN, ROSS, and others in Australia, are capable of doing so. I would rejoice to tell of my delightful intercourse with them; it will remain a memory forever.

Upon leaving Melbourne your Commissioner was presented with an address, a copy of which is hereto annexed, marked "Exhibit C."

5. A word as to the Manchester Unity. Your Commissioner thought, and doubtless this Grand Lodge thinks, that our Order in Australasia is largely composed of former or present members of the Unity. This is an entire mistake. Scarcely any members of the Manchester Unity have joined us. I know of none. The laws of the Unity forbid it. A man cannot belong to both Orders. The men who affiliated with us were the *Ancient Independent Order of Odd Fellows*, having no connection whatever with the Unity. I was told by two Provincial Grand Masters of the Unity that the laws just mentioned will be repealed this fall, and that they intended to unite with us—not leaving the Unity however. But our ranks must be filled mainly from the outside world. The Unity is, and in my opinion will remain, a competing institution. It is strong in numbers and money; comes from Great Britain, the fatherland of most of the men of Australia and New Zealand, and hence has their sympathies; and is, by virtue of its character as a prudent and merely beneficial society, in harmony with their natural tendencies

and their education. But of late years these countries are becoming filled with the thoughts, the aspirations, and the energies of the age; and the younger men are responding and will, respond to the loftier principles of American Odd Fellowship. I believe the union of our Order with the Manchester Unity will be effected, if at all, through Australasian Odd Fellows; and if such men as Grand Master LESLIE (M. U.), of Dunedin, and Grand Master STEWART (M. U., of Ballarat, both of whom are noble specimens of clear heads and big hearts, would will it, a union might be made.

For my own part, as a step toward practical union, I see no objection to a system by which members of either Order could visit Lodges of the other. Give them a card, password, sign, and obligation and the thing is done. Let them thus become familiar with the merits of both institutions and take their choice.

6. Australia and New Zealand are great fields for our Order. They are as free in their political government as we are. The will of the people is as potent there as here. A noble future is in store for them. They will become the home of a highly civilized people or all signs will fail. Climate, soil, products are of the best. Even now they can boast of free schools, public libraries, museums, hospitals, asylums, and numerous churches. Melbourne has a library of over one hundred thousand volumes, a gallery of paintings, and an organ 73 feet wide, 47 feet deep, and 47 feet high. Both countries are entering upon a most prosperous career, and are fit places for

Our present membership in Australia is as follows:

In New Zealand, 17 Lodges, and about 1,400 members.

On my last visit in Melbourne at the institution of Abbotsford Lodge, about fifty candidates were initiated, with ten to twenty more ready.

The outline of the work as performed in both countries is correct; remarkably so under the circumstances. Commissioner Bro. MEACHAM evidently gave thorough instruction; and considering the extraordinary difficulties under which he labored, used great tact and judgment in establishing the Order. The brothers there uniformly spoke of him with strong affection.

I cannot conclude without stating that the American Vice Consul General at Melbourne, Bro. SAMUEL P. LORD, an old and respected merchant, was constant in his attentions; placing one of the rooms of the Consulate at my disposal, and facilitating my intercourse with the public authorities.

The Governments of New Zealand, Victoria, and New South Wales are entitled to the thanks of this Grand Lodge for passes over their railroads to your Commissioner and for many public documents and maps. These courtesies were extended to me both as your representative and as an American citizen.

7. On the way, going and coming, the steamer stops at Honolulu. There I was met by a committee, and received a fraternal greeting worthy of the noblest Odd Fellows. I visited Harmony Lodge at its regular meeting, Monday, August 5th. D. D. G. S. PARKE had notified Excelsior Lodge, and a large number of members of both Lodges were present.

Much could be said about the Order in the Sandwich Islands, and I hope to have a chance to say it when the Grand Lodge is in session, and also to say many things of interest as to Australia and New Zealand which I do not think best to put in this report.

8. I have said nothing as to the Encampment branch of the Order, for the reason that as yet it is weak. There is but one Encampment in New Zealand and but three or four in Australia. To them I gave instructions, and further advised the Grand Lodge of Australasia that the Royal Purple Degree is an essential qualification for membership therein.

John B. Harmon,

Deputy Grand Sire and Special Commissioner to Australia and New Zealand.

"Exhibit A." Original Charter of Grand Lodge of New Zealand, 1869.

A. I. O. O. F.

FRIENDSHIP, LOVE, AND TRUTH.

To all whom it may concern:

Know Ye, That the Grand Lodge of Victoria, of the Ancient Independent Order of Odd Fellows, as the source of all true and legitimate Odd Fellowship in the Australian colonies, and by virtue of its constitutional

authority to organize Lodges, Grand and Subordinate, doth hereby create and erect into a distinct sovereignty the various Lodges of Odd Fellows heretofore existing in New Zealand, by the name and style of The Grand Lodge of A. I. O. O. F. of New Zealand, with power in all matters relating to Odd Fellowship within the said province, except in the following respects, viz.: That the said Grand Lodge of New Zealand shall not at any time hereafter in any wise alter or repudiate any of the signs, tokens, passwords, lectures, or charges, or any part or portion of either the written or unwritten work of the Order, as known and practised within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Victoria.

That this Grand Lodge reserves to itself the right to give to the said The Grand Lodge of New Zealand, the annual traveling password to be used within the jurisdiction of the said The Grand Lodge of New Zealand, and both jurisdictions shall use the same traveling password.

That the qualifications for membership in the Subordinate Lodges within the jurisdiction of the said "The Grand Lodge of New Zealand," shall be identical with those established for membership in Subordinate Lodges within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Victoria.

Otherwise, this Dispensation to be of no force or effect.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Grand Lodge of Victoria, at the city of Melbourne, in the Colony of Victoria, this nineteenth day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine.

By the
Grand Master,
[SEAL,] (Signed,)
J. B. Crews, *Grand Master*.
(Signed,)
A. J. COHEN, *Grand Secretary*.

"Exhibit B." Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, May 29, 1878.

Whereas Questions have arisen as to the powers of the Grand Lodge of Australia, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and as to the powers of this Grand Lodge; and as to the relations of each and both to the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of the United States of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows; and

Whereas, JOHN B. HARMON, Deputy Grand Sire of said Grand Lodge of the United States, is now present in this Grand Lodge as Special Commissioner, with power to adjust such questions, and, for the purpose of such adjustment, has proposed and now proposes, that this Grand Lodge, together with the Subordinate Lodges under its jurisdiction, and said Grand Lodge of Australia, together with the Subordinate Lodges and the Grand and Subordinate Encampments under its jurisdiction. be created and erected into a distinct sovereignty in Odd Fellowship, under the name of "The Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Australasia," with jurisdiction over the continent and countries known as Australasia, under a Charter from said Grand Lodge of the United States, which proposed Charter, dated the fourth day of March, A. D. 1878, and signed by JOHN W. STOKES, Grand Sire, and JAS. L. RIDGELY, Gr. Cor. and Rec Secretary, and under the seal of said Grand Lodge of the United States, is now exhibited to and examined by this Grand Lodge:

Now, therefore, *Resolved*, That this Grand Lodge hereby consents to the formation of said "The Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Australasia," in accordance with said proposition and under said Charter.

Resolved, That said JOHN B. HARMON be and he is hereby appointed to represent this Grand Lodge, in the city of Melbourne, or elsewhere in Australia, in a conference with said Grand Lodge of Australia, for the formation of said Grand Lodge of Australasia, with full power in the premises, including the power to surrender to said last-named Grand Lodge when formed, or to said Special Commissioner, or to such other Grand Body as he deems best, the present Charter of this Grand Lodge, dated February 19, 1809, and granted by the Grand Lodge of Victoria, A. I. O. O. F., when said Grand Lodge of Australasia has granted to this Grand Lodge a Charter under the name of "The R. W. Grand Lodge of New Zealand of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows," with the powers in all matters relating to Odd Fellowship in New Zealand usually granted in Charters from said Grand Lodge of the United States to its several State Grand Lodges.

Resolved, That when said Grand Lodge of Australasia has granted said Charter to this Grand Lodge it shall take effect immediately; and the Constitution, laws, rules, and regulations of this Grand Lodge, and the officers and members thereof, shall at once be the Constitution, laws, rules, regulations, officers, and members of said "The Right Worthy Grand Lodge of New Zealand of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows," under said new Charter and all Subordinate Lodges in New Zealand now under the jurisdiction of this Grand Lodge shall at

once be under the said jurisdiction of said Grand Lodge of New Zealand under said Charter.

"Exhibit C."

I. O. O. F.

MELBOURNE,

9th July, 1878.

To JOHN B. HARMON, Esq., *R. W. Deputy Grand Sire, G. L. of U. S.:*

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—We cannot suffer you to depart from our shores without a formal expression of those feelings which we believe you must often have read in our hearts during the past few weeks. Never will the memory of your affectionate and eloquent words be obliterated from our minds. Your presence amongst us has wrought a work that will produce fruit a hundredfold, not merely in the present generation of Odd Fellows, but in that brilliant future which, we trust, is destined to be achieved by means of that organization which has been effected in so admirable a manner through your instrumentality. May Heaven's protecting hand guide and guard you to the home of your love! Tell your fellow-workers in the great cause how much we thank them for having sent us so able an ambassador; and tell your dear wife and children that you found a host of men in Australia whose hearts have throbbed with love because they were privileged to hail you as a brother. Farewell!

On Behalf of the Brotherhood in Australia.

W. Stirling, *Grand Sire of Grand Lodge of Australasia.*

W. Gane, *Grand Master of Grand Lodge of Australia.*

Report of Grand Secretary.

To the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of the United States:

The Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary respectfully submits his Annual Report. The following schedule of duties devolved upon him to be performed during the recess, it is believed, comprises the several orders of the last session:

1. *Resolved*, That the sum of ninety-five dollars to the Grand Lodge, and three hundred and eighteen dollars to the Grand Encampment, of South Carolina, be donated by this R. W. Grand Lodge respectively to said jurisdictions, and that said sums of money, as indicated, be placed to their respective credit on the books of the R. W. Grand Secretary of this R. W. Grand Lodge.—*Journal*, 7348, 7371, 7448, 7472.

2. *Resolved*, That the Grand Secretary and his assistant be especially charged with the proper preservation and protection of all the property of the Grand Lodge other than supplies, and that no additional compensation be allowed.—*Journal*, 7301, 7461.

3. The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred that portion of the reports of the M. W. Grand Sire and R. W. Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, and the correspondence relating to Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1, and Anglo-American Encampment, No. 1, of the city of London, England, recommend the adoption of the annexed resolution:

Resolved, That the action of the M. W. Grand Sire, in reference to these bodies, be approved, and the further consideration of the subject, together with the report of Special Commissioner SMITH, be referred to the Grand Sire and Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, with power to act.—*Journal*, 7367, 7567.

4. The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the proposition of the Manchester Unity Odd Fellows of England, for a reciprocation of courtesies between the two Orders, believing that the best conclusion in the premises can be more safely and intelligently arrived at by intrusting the investigation thereof to the M. W. Grand Sire and the R. W. Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the proposition of the Manchester Unity Odd Fellows of England, mentioned in the reports of the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary, be referred to those officers to investigate and report thereon at the next Annual Session.—*Journal*, 7367, 7368.

5. The Committee on Petitions, to whom was referred the petition of five members of Amity Lodge, No. 6113, of the I. O. O. F., Manchester Unity, located at Bridgetown, Barbados, British West Indies, asking to be constituted a Lodge under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of U. S., having had the same under consideration in connection with the correspondence between the petitioners and the Grand Secretary (page 6867, *Journal* of 76), respectfully report, that, not having sufficient information before them to warrant a recommendation for the granting of a Charter to these brothers at this time, but recognizing the advantage and importance of the matter, recommend that the proper Grand Officers continue the correspondence with a view of establishing a Lodge so soon as the laws of the Order can be fully complied with.—*Journal*, 7374, 7472.

6. *Resolved*, That the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary be and he is hereby requested to compile and publish (under the supervision of the Committee on Printing Supplies) in one volume, 18mo, with proper title, the amended Forms for Public and Funeral Processions, Dedicating Halls, and Laying Corner-Stones, and the Funeral Service, as hereby approved and adopted, together with such other forms or parts of forms not inconsistent therewith, as may have been prescribed by this R. W. Grand Lodge, and in such number and style as in the judgment of the R. W. Grand Secretary may be deemed requisite and expedient, and he is hereby authorized to draw on the Grand Treasurer for the sum necessary to defray the cost of the same.

Resolved, That the volume shall be disposed of by the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary at the rate of 75 cents per copy to Jurisdictions, and \$1 per copy to Encampments and Lodges, in the usual form, after previous notice by the Grand Secretary of his readiness to furnish them.—*Journal*, 7382, 7475.

7. *Resolved*, That a sub-committee of the Finance Committee, consisting of not less than two of the members residing nearest the city of Baltimore, be appointed to examine the books and vouchers of the Grand Treasurer and Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary; such examination to be made within one week prior to the commencement of each Annual Session.

Resolved, That to this end it is suggested that the M. W. Grand Sire appoint the Finance Committee, or so many of its members as may be consistent, prior to the close of the Annual Session, instead of the commencement of the same, as has been the prevailing custom.—*Journal*, 7454, 7503.

8. WHEREAS, The Representative tax of the jurisdictions of Utah and Wyoming has been paid and the Representatives of those distant jurisdictions are not allowed mileage or per diem; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Representative tax be and is hereby remitted to the Representatives of Utah and Wyoming, and the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary is hereby instructed to draw warrants on the Grand Treasurer in favor of said Representatives, for the sum of \$75 each.—*Journal*, 7469.

9. The Appeal Committee, No. 2, to whom was referred the complaint of Dr. HAUSLEUTNER, a member of Germania Lodge. No. 1, Berlin, Prussia, against the action of Eclipse Lodge, No. 444, Chicago, Illinois, in the matter of complaint made by said Dr. HAUSLEUTNER against Bro. BIENEWISS, a member of said Eclipse Lodge, beg leave to report, that after due examination of the papers in the case, we find they are not in proper form; and that the complaint should have been made to the Grand Master or Grand Lodge of Illinois, and your committee offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the papers be returned to Bro. HAUSLEUTNER, and your committee discharged from the further consideration of the subject.—*Journal*, 7369, 7452.

10. BY-LAWS, ARTICLE XVIII.—Each State, District, and Territorial Grand Lodge shall annually be furnished with as many copies of the printed Proceedings of this Grand Lodge as it has Subordinate Lodges working under its jurisdiction, to be distributed among its Subordinates, and one-half of such number for its own use. Each Grand Encampment shall be furnished in the same manner. And each Lodge and Encampment working under the Warrant of this Grand Lodge, shall be furnished with a copy of the Proceedings. The Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary shall see that this law is carried into effect at as early a date as possible after the close of the Annual Session of this Grand Lodge.—*Journal*, 7479.

11. The Committee on Finance take great pleasure in calling the attention of the Grand Lodge to the willingness and promptness with which our efficient Grand Secretary has responded to the suggestion made by this committee at the last session regarding the printed matter attached to his report, and we suggest the thanks of this Grand Lodge are due and should be extended to him for his cordial endeavors to reduce the expenses thereof.—*Journal*, 7399, 7476.

12. "WHEREAS, we have positive assurance that in the late fire which destroyed the home of our esteemed Bro. GIBSON, of Ontario, his library was entirely consumed, including the *Journal* of this R. W. Grand Body heretofore drawn by him; therefore, in view of the above loss,

Resolved, That this Grand Lodge hereby donates to Bro. GIBSON a full copy of *Journals* and books to replace those thus destroyed.—*Journal*, 7489.

13. WHEREAS, The Charter of the Grand Encampment of the State of Texas was destroyed by fire at the late conflagration that occurred in the city of Galveston in that State:

Resolved, That a duplicate Charter be issued to the Grand Encampment of Texas —*Journal*, 7327.

14. WHEREAS, The Charter of the Grand Lodge of the State of Texas has been destroyed by fire:

Resolved, That the same be substituted by the Grand C. and R. Secretary.—*Journal*, 7327.

15. The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred that part of the Grand Sire's Report relating to "Financed" and "Infringement of Copyright," have considered the same and do not find anything requiring action, further than a recommendation that the law of this Grand Lodge in relation thereto be strictly enforced by the proper officers thereof in all cases. We ask to be discharged from a further consideration of these matters.—*Journal*, 7430, 7501.

16. The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the translation of the work of the Order into the Holland tongue, recommend the adoption of the annexed resolutions:

Resolved, That the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary be requested to have the translation thoroughly and critically examined, and when found to be correct, that the same be printed.

Resolved, That the sum of one hundred dollars be appropriated, if necessary, as recommended by the Grand Sire, to reimburse D. D. Grand Sire OSTHEIM for the expenses incurred in making the translation, and for performing the duties of Special Commissioner.—*Journal*, 7434, 7502.

17. As the Grand Lodge at the last session adopted a resolution, authorizing the Grand Officers of the subordinate jurisdictions "to forfeit and reclaim the Charter of any Rebekah Degree Lodge from whom no reports were received for three months after the 31st of December, 1876," it is to be hoped that at the next session of the Grand Lodge we will have correct returns from all the Lodges of this degree in the jurisdiction. We would therefore recommend that the attention of Grand Officers of the several jurisdictions be called to the above law, in order that they may have no further excuse for making imperfect returns of the condition of Lodges of this degree—*Journal*, 7461, 7504.

18 *Resolved*, That the form of card issued and in use by the Grand Lodge of Australia, is illegal, and is hereby interdicted, and the Order at large is warned not to recognize or receive it, and the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary are directed to use all means in their power to cause its disuse.—*Journal*, 7464, 7506.

19. *Resolved*, That the R. W. Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary be directed to forward to the post-office address of the several officers and members of this Grand Body the balance of the copies of the Daily Journal that may be due them after adjournment.—*Journal*, 7488.

20. *Resolved*, That the resolutions upon the death of Bro. WM. ELLISON, P. G. Sire, be placed upon the records, and a copy sent to the family.—*Journal* 7490, 7492

21. *Resolved*, That there be a new translation of the ritual into the French language the work to be done under the authority and superintendence of the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary; provided, that the same be done without expense to this Grand Lodge, such translation to be reported to the next session of this Grand Lodge.

22. *Resolved*, That there be a translation of the ritual into the Bohemian language, the work to be done under the authority and superintendence of the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary; provided, that the same be done without expense to this Grand Lodge, such translation to be reported to this Grand Lodge at its next session.—*Journal*, 7508.

The credit authorized on the books of the Grand Secretary by the first resolution, has been duly given.

The desks and chairs of Grand Representatives, referred to in the second resolution, have been placed in a room in the hall of the Grand Lodge of Maryland appropriated for that purpose, and the value of them covered by insurance.

On the subject of the third resolution, letters have been received from members of Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1, in the city of London, by no means flattering to its prosperity. On the contrary, appearances indicate dissatisfaction with the title, and a desire to substitute the name of Victoria Lodge, No. 1, as more congenial to the people of the country and better calculated to conciliate public opinion. Information was communicated that no such change could be authorized except in pursuance of a resolution of the Grand Lodge of the United States. The Lodge and Encampment each give but little signs of vitality at present.

The authority conferred in the fourth resolution has been exercised. A joint letter, signed by the Grand Sire and Grand C. and R. Secretary, was addressed soon after the adjournment of the last session to the G. Master and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., England, through JOHN SCHOFIELD, Grand Cor. Secretary, College House, Park Road, Bradford, Yorkshire, informing them of the reference of their proposition for a reciprocation of courtesies between the two Orders to the Grand Sire and Grand C. and R. Secretary, and respectfully inviting from them, such scheme, or plan, if any, they desired to submit for our consideration. Our communication was received and duly acknowledged. No further advice has been received.

The Cor. Secretary has written to Barbados, advising the parties of their proper course of procedure to form

a Lodge in that island under this jurisdiction. I have received a very satisfactory reply from E. ISAAC BAEZA, of the house of DA COSTA & Co. A continuance of the correspondence, to await better prospects, is suggested and cordially accepted.

The sixth resolution, relating to the new Form Book, has been complied with, in strict conformity to its several provisions. The contents of the book were carefully collated and arranged for the press by the Assistant Grand Secretary. Every effort was made to economize in the printing and binding, which job was done by Bro. JOHN MEDOLE in his usual good style and at a satisfactory price. A circular notice was given by the Grand Secretary of his readiness to furnish copies of the book, which created a large demand for the work so soon as it was out of press.

The book contains the following:

Public Installation. Forms for Public Processions. Funeral Procession and Regalia. Funeral Service adopted in 1874. Funeral Service adopted in 1877. Laying the Corner-Stone of a Public Edifice. Laying the Cornerstone of an Odd Fellows' Hall. Dedication of an Odd Fellows' Hall or Lodge-Room. Installation of Officers of the Grand Lodge of the United States. Anniversary Service. The Standard Tract. Petition for Encampment Degrees. Petition for a Subordinate Lodge. Petition for a Subordinate Encampment. Petition for a Grand Lodge or Grand Encampment. Petition for Aid for a Subordinate Lodge or Encampment. Commission to open a Grand or Subordinate Lodge or Encampment—Return of Institution. Commission to confer Encampment Degrees—Return of Service. Certificate of Grand Representative. Commission for a District Deputy Grand Sire. Dispensation to continue operations where a Charter has been destroyed. Card for a Wife or Widow. Card for a Daughter of Rebekah. Letter for transmitting the A. T. P. W. Letter for transmitting the Term P. W. Annual Report of a Grand Lodge. Annual Report of a Grand Lodge having Degree Lodges of the Daughters of Rebekah. Annual Report of a Grand Encampment. By-Law, Article X., relating to Returns. Instructions to Grand Secretaries and Grand Scribes. Annual Report of a Subordinate Lodge under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the United States. Annual Report of a Subordinate Encampment under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the United States. Cards and Diplomas issued by the Grand Lodge of the United States.

The sub-committee of the Finance Committee, provided for by the seventh resolution, was appointed at the last session by the Grand Sire, consisting of Reps. MUCKLE, of Pa., and SPEAR, of Md., to facilitate the examination of the books of the Grand Treasurer and Grand Secretary, within one week prior to each Annual Session. The duty will doubtless be discharged in a proper manner.

In conformity to the authority conferred in the eighth resolution, warrants were drawn by the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary in favor of the Grand Representatives of Utah and Wyoming for \$75 each, the amount of the Representative tax remitted to said jurisdictions.

The papers referred to in the ninth resolution were returned to Bro. F. MEYENDORF, G. Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, soon after the adjournment of the last session, pursuant to the order to that effect. They were duly received by him, and subsequently returned to this office, and sent by me to the Grand Master of Illinois.

The distribution of the Revised Journal according to the scale prescribed in the tenth resolution (amended By-Law), was made in December, 1877, to the several Subordinate Grand Jurisdictions, as fast as the same was received from the printer.

The eleventh resolution has reference to the suggestion, made by the Committee of Finance at the session of 1876, of the necessity and importance of economizing the expenditures of the Grand Lodge in relation to the printed matter in the Grand Secretary's report, and of the Grand Secretary's willing and prompt co-operation with that suggestion. The Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary has caused the amount of expense saved by the suggestion of the committee, and the adoption of the amended By-Law, to be ascertained, which is as follows:

I am happy to know, that the substantial interest of the Grand Lodge has been thus promoted by the careful co-operation of this office.

The duty enjoined by the twelfth resolution was discharged soon after the close of the session. Bro. GIBSON replied on the 3d of October as follows: "I beg to acknowledge with sincere and grateful thanks the receipt of your favor of the 26th ult. and the books, which supply what to me was the most valuable part of my library, which was totally destroyed; not a volume, nor indeed goods of any kind, being saved from the fire."

A duplicate Charter was issued to the Grand Encampment of Texas, as directed by the thirteenth resolution.

A like compliance was given to the fourteenth resolution by the issue of a substitute Charter for the Grand Lodge of Texas in place of the original, which was destroyed by fire.

The subject of the fifteenth resolution has had the special attention of the proper officers, but no occasion has arisen to enforce the law of the Grand Lodge on the subject.

The sixteenth resolution, so far as it relates to the translation of the work of the Order in the Holland language, has been the subject of a correspondence with D. D. G. Sire OSTHEIM. At his request, the translation

received from him has been returned for further examination and revision. Efforts were made to have the same thoroughly and critically examined, with a view to the printing of the same, but I regret to say, that my efforts have been without success. Touching that part of the resolution, which appropriates one hundred dollars "to reimburse D. D. G. Sire OSTHEIM for the expenses incurred in making the translation, and for performing the duties of special commissioner," the Corresponding Secretary, having no discretion in the premises, forwarded the amount to Bro. OSTHEIM, in obedience to his sense of duty, although he felt conscious that the Grand Lodge, if properly enlightened as to the character and value of the service performed, would have appropriated a larger sum. The characteristic modesty and silence of the brother on the subject, put it out of my power to recommend an adequate compensation, hence chiefly arose the limited appropriation. I now learn that the special services of Bro. OSTHEIM, D. D. G. Sire in the institution of Paradise Lodge, No. 1, at Amsterdam, Holland, involved several visits in person to Amsterdam from his home in Elberfeld, Prussia, a distance of 500 miles, causing a serious loss of time, besides the expense and delay and unavoidable neglect of private business incident to such service I recommend an additional compensation of two hundred dollars to D. D. G. Sire OSTHEIM in this connection.

The seventeenth resolution was designed to draw the attention of the subordinate Grand Lodges to the law requiring them to vacate the Charters of all Rebekah Degree Lodges which failed to report for three months after the 31st December, 1876. Accordingly a circular to that effect was issued to them from this office on the 12th day of March, 1878.

Notification was made to the Grand Lodge of Australia of the adoption of the eighteenth resolution, and a copy of the Revised Journal was sent out containing the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject, to which their attention was specially called. Further information will be communicated to the Grand Lodge on this subject, under the head of Foreign Correspondence.

The nineteenth resolution was promptly carried into effect immediately after the close of the last session, and it is believed that the subject matter safely reached its destination through the mail.

In obedience to the twentieth resolution the proceedings of the Grand Lodge having reference to the lamented death of Bro. WILLIAM ELLISON, P. G. Sire, were engrossed in handsome style upon a Diploma Form and were, accompanied by a letter from the Grand Secretary, transmitted to the family of the deceased, through Grand Secretary C. D. COLE, of Massachusetts.

The twenty-first and twenty-second resolutions, authorizing the translation of the ritual into the French and Bohemian languages, under the superintendence and authority of the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, to be reported to the Grand Lodge at its next session, provided that the same be done without expense to the Grand Lodge, have had general publicity, and a translation in the Bohemian language has been furnished by Grand Representative HASKINS, of New York, which is respectfully submitted. In the experience of the undersigned, the translation and printing of the ritual in foreign languages are exceedingly difficult, not only on account of our inability to reach an accurate judgment of the merit of the translation, but also for the reason that we are unable to correct the proofs with sufficient grammatical precision to venture to pass the translation through the press. It is therefore very respectfully recommended that hereafter proper efforts be had to have this work done among the people where the language is spoken. This recommendation is based chiefly upon the experience derived by this office in the matter of the translation and printing of the Spanish ritual, which involved us in a critical situation from which we were only extricated by the presence in our city of P. G. Sire LOGAN, who was fortunately equal to the emergency.

General Correspondence.

The general correspondence with the Grand Scribes, Grand Secretaries, D. D. Grand Sires, and other local officers, discloses the annual progress in each jurisdiction, which, with the tabular statements of annual reports received, present a satisfactory exhibit of the condition of the Order. Grand Secretaries and Grand Scribes usually accompany the returns with valuable information concerning their respective jurisdictions and the G. C. and R. Secretary, as heretofore, takes pleasure in submitting brief extracts from such letters:

ALABAMA.—On the 18th of March the report of the Grand Encampment was received from Bro. L. R. MCKEE, R. W. Grand Scribe, who advised as follows:

"We have lost in membership during the year, which result can only be attributed to financial depression within the jurisdiction. We comfort ourselves with the reflection that dawn soon follows the darkest hour, and hope that the future will be brighter for this branch of our beloved Order."

On the 1st of April the returns of the Grand Lodge were received from Bro. WILLIAM A. SHIELDS R. W. Grand Secretary, with the following:

"The reports from Subordinates are not flattering. But one reason for this can be given, and that is the universal business stagnation throughout this entire land. The loss by suspension for non-payment of dues

overbalances the additions by initiation, card, and reinstatement. This heavy loss is caused by three Lodges being declared extinct for failure to report for the length of time required by our Constitution. Then, the hand of death has been laid heavily upon us during the past year, eighteen out of a membership of less than twelve hundred being a very large mortality. Among those who have "joined the innumerable host" were three of our oldest and best workers, one of whom was ISAIAH DILI, P. G. M., P. G. P., and P. G. Rep.

"What the future will develop for us is beyond our present ken. The northern portion of our State is being rapidly settled with emigrants from the north and west, and already there are indications that several new Lodges will be established in the portions of the State that have been most favored by an influx of population.

"We have also partially perfected an endowment plan which we expect to put in operation in a short time, and which it is thought will materially add to the stability of the Order, if it does not greatly increase the membership.

"I hoped to be able to give you a satisfactory report of the status of the Rebekah Degree in this State, but the Secretaries of the Subordinates did not aid my efforts in that direction to the extent I anticipated, consequently I have had only meagre returns, which I have arranged to the best of my ability."

ARIZONA.—The report of Arizona Lodge, No. 1, for the year 1877, has not been received, notwithstanding several requests have been made for it

ARKANSAS.—The report of the Grand Lodge came to hand March 19th. Bro. PETER BRUGMAN., R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, writes as follows:

"Odd Fellowship in Arkansas is making its way slowly but surely, and another period of general prosperity in our country will place it far in the van of all similar institutions.

"There seems to be a wild furor throughout the Order in favor of '*Endowments*,' or, more properly speaking, '*Life Insurance*,' and while I do not partake in the slightest degree of the excitement, and have little confidence in the systems proposed yet I think good might be effected by making such insurance '*the feature*' of the Encampment branch of the Order, abolishing sick benefits, which few Encampments pay. This arrangement might result in greater perfection of the proposed system, and what is more or equally important, create a renewed interest in the Patriarchal branch, of which there is a present need. Should such a scheme fail no harm would result to the great body of our noble Order."

The report of the Grand Encampment was received August 1st, exhibiting 7 Encampments and 124 members. Bro. BRUGMAN wrote in explanation as follows:

"The reports of Subordinates for the first term of 1877 were destroyed in the fire that consumed our hall in October last, and I have but two reports for the second term. I have done everything in my power to get returns, without success. To keep up our Encampments is a continual struggle as there are but two points in our jurisdiction which have more than one Lodge from which to draw membership, and the average membership of our Lodges is too small to give stability to the Encampments. The outlook is by no means encouraging; but I assure you our zeal is equal to the emergency, and we will labor to the end, and if the end must come, it will be because we cannot conquer the inevitable."

AUSTRALASIA.—See Foreign Correspondence.

BARBADOS.—See Foreign Correspondence.

BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA.—Bro JAMES D. ROBINSON, R. W. Grand Secretary, under date of March 8, 1878 (received March 22d), writes as follows:

"Inclosed I hand you returns of this Grand Lodge to 31st of December, 1877. We have not elected any Representative this year, as we cannot afford to pay the expense. The dues I will remit after I receive the amounts due by our Subordinates in July.

"Would you kindly inform me whether it will be necessary to forward a new petition for the remission of our dues, or will the one sent last year and referred to the Committee on Finance be brought up without any further action from me?"

The Grand Secretary adds this item to the return: "Current expenses of Lodges, \$2,806.26, which amount to about 26 per cent, of the receipts."

The two Encampments (Vancouver, No. 1, and Harmony, No.2) in this Province, are under the jurisdiction of the Grand Encampment of Oregon.

CALIFORNIA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received June 29th, from Bro. W. B. LYON, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe. We are without other information than is exhibited in the reports. We find the following special remarks on the Grand Lodge return: "Increase of Lodges, 10; increase of members, 528; total receipts, \$458 888.29; paid for current expenses, \$151,348.48; paid for relief, \$160,-254 35; total expenditures, \$311,602.83; net gain, \$147,285.46; total assets, \$1,679,906.04; average per member for expenses, \$7.30; for relief, \$7.73; total average, \$15 03; average per member of receipts, \$22.14; of assets, \$81.04; average age of members, 38.40." The Grand Encampment report exhibits an increase of 111 members. The Degree Lodges of the Daughters of Rebekah appear to be in prosperous condition.

We acknowledge the receipt from G. Secretary LYON of a very interesting table of the statistics of the Lodges in San Francisco for the year ending Dec. 31, 1877.

CHILE.—See Foreign Correspondence.

COLORADO.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received May 11th, from Bro. JOHN L. BELL, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, and exhibit an increase of 48 in the Lodge and 31 in the Encampment membership.

CONNECTICUT.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received on the 30th January, the Grand Encampment, February 5th, and the Rebekah report, February 12th. Bro. FREDERICK BOTSFORD, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, under date of January 29th, advised:

"The report of the Grand Lodge shows a gratifying increase both in membership and finances, and notwithstanding the continued depression in business interests our prospects for the future are very encouraging. We re-instituted one of the old Lodges on New Year's night, and we have one or two more nearly ready.

"The pleasure and joy at the prosperous condition of our beloved Order are greatly subdued by the sad news of the death of Past Grand Sire STUART in addition to that of NATHAN PORTER. The Order has met with a severe loss in the death of these two devoted Odd Fellows, and while we feel keenly and deeply their loss, we have great reason to thank God for the good example they have set and for the good work done for humanity."

On the 9th of February, Bro. BOTSFORD wrote: "Only 9 of the 14 Rebekah Lodges have reported, although all were specially notified that the report must be in on or before the 31st of January. I forward the report in an imperfect condition, and have reported the delinquents to the G. Master, hoping that this action may have a salutary effect. Last year by hard drumming I obtained all reports by the second week in May. I wish, if a report must be made, that it could be simplified by giving, for instance, round number of membership without regard to sex, additions, or reductions; amount paid out and received, and amount of benefits. I can see very little value in a report like this."

DAKOTA.—On the 26th of April the report of the Grand Lodge was received from Bro. RALPH R. BRIGGS, R. W. Grand Secretary, who is also D. D. G. Sire for this jurisdiction, and transmitted the reports of the three Encampments in good season. Bro. BRIGGS, under date of April 20th, wrote:

"We are slowly but surely progressing in this jurisdiction, having increased our membership 111 during the year 1877. We instituted Sioux Lodge, No. 14, at Standing Rock, March 2, 1878. We are not in favor of establishing Lodges of the Degree of Rebekah at present, the condition of the country being such as would preclude a hope of success."

The Encampments exhibit a slight decrease of membership.

DELAWARE.—The Grand Lodge returns were received on the 23d of January, from ISAAC W. HALLAM, R. W. Grand Secretary, who says:

"With feelings of regret, I direct your attention to the details furnished by the report of this jurisdiction. You will notice the work of depletion goes bravely on, fully one tenth of the membership having been suspended for non-payment of dues. Apparently, there is no practical remedy to prevent these losses, as the agricultural districts suffer alike with the cities. Many of our Lodges are in dire extremity; a moiety of prosperity may save them, but a little more adversity will prove their speedy destruction. One Lodge has succumbed during the year, but its fate is due as much to other causes as to financial depression. Although there is very little of an encouraging nature to write of, or to cheer us, we intend to fight a good warfare and aim at any victory within the hope of success."

The report of the Grand Encampment was received on the 19th of July, its transmission having been delayed on account of the severe illness of Bro. EDWIN HIRST, R. W. Grand Scribe, as appears by the following letter from him:

"While I very much regret the adverse circumstances and severe physical suffering which caused the preparation of the report to be delayed, I must return to you my heartfelt thanks for your forbearance in waiting so patiently, knowing, as I do, the importance of having the returns at hand in proper season. I would not have put you to the inconvenience of waiting so long had I been able to control all the circumstances.

"We have added one more Encampment to our list, which enables us (although having a general slight falling off in the older Encampments) to show a net gain in membership over our last report. The Patriarchal branch in this jurisdiction still seems to hold its average ratio to the Order at large of about 14 to 17 or 18 per cent"

DENMARK.—See Foreign Correspondence.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The report of the Grand Encampment was trans-mitted by Bro. THOMAS W. FOWLER, R. W. Grand Scribe, on the 23d of January, with the following:

"It will be seen that the admissions to the Encampments have been very few, whilst the suspensions have been greater than ever, caused, principally, by the extreme depression of business and want of employment, yet

there must be some other reason for such a great loss of membership. The Grand Encampment, at its session on the 15th inst, amended the Constitution of Subordinates by reducing the Encampment admission fee, placing it where it was a few years ago, also, permitting members to be reinstated upon payment of one year's dues. I am of opinion that this legislation will stop the loss of membership, if it does not add to our numbers during the current year. Should it, however, prove otherwise, then indeed the outlook for the Patriarchal branch of the Order in this jurisdiction is very gloomy."

On the 2d of March the report of the Grand Lodge and Rebekah report were received from Bro. P. HALL SWEET, R. W. Grand Secretary, who remarked:

"Taking into consideration the varied circumstances by which we have been surrounded, the Order here has cause of congratulation for its present healthy condition."

FLORIDA.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received July 20th, with the following from Bro. ROBERT D. MURRAY, R. W. Grand Secretary:

"You will see that we have gained 20 members the past year, an average of two to a Lodge. The Order is improving in tone, spirit, and work, but is languid, in unison with the times, which can be no harder in other sections than in our State. Our prospects for the next two years are cheering, and we hope to soon give you a better report. Our Spanish venture in Cuba Lodge is a grand success, and if Cuba was liberally governed, No. 15 (and No. 1 of our Latin progeny) would at once begin to plant the Order in that lovely isle. The Spanish translation gives tolerably good satisfaction, but in a few points can be improved."

Bro. MURRAY was elected Grand Secretary at the session of the G. L. of Florida in April and until notified to forward the report was under the impression that his predecessor had attended to the duty; hence the delay.

The returns of the four Encampments were received in good season, and exhibit a slight increase in membership.

Bro. L. M. MERRITT, D. D. G. Sire, on the 18th of February, wrote:

"I regret that the past year shows so little improvement in the Patriarchal branch of the Order in this jurisdiction, but the causes operating against us are now, in part, dispelled. Excelsior, No. 4, has barely maintained its organization, but at the last meeting four applications for membership were received. I think we have seen our darkest days."

GEORGIA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge, Grand Encampment, and Rebekah Lodges were received May 17th from Bro. JOHN G. DEITZ, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, who advised as follows:

"You will find that we number as many Subordinates as we reported last year. Two Lodges have been instituted and two surrendered their Charters during the year 1877. The membership has decreased slightly, but in the main we are in fair condition. The Lodges in the cities are energetic, but the country Lodges are not doing much. The Encampment branch remains about the same no new Encampments having been instituted since our last report. I fear that one or two of our number are weak. Nine Lodges of the Degree of Rebekah have been chartered in this jurisdiction, but only one has reported; the others are apparently doing nothing.

"There may be causes for the failure of the Order to increase in our State. Several new Orders have been introduced that have attractions such as the insurance feature, and many are connecting themselves with these institutions."

GERMAN EMPIRE.—See Foreign Correspondence.

GREAT BRITAIN.—See Foreign Correspondence.

IDAHO.—The report of Idaho Encampment, No. 1, was received February 25th. Bro. SAMUEL BECK, D. D. G. Sire, writes that he is 'sorry the Encampment can make no better show in membership and receipts, but the general stagnation of all kinds of business and scarcity of money is the cause thereof. We have already two new members this term, with a promise of some more in a few weeks, and I think we do as well as can be expected."

The Lodges in this Territory are under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Oregon.

Under date of July 13th Bro. BECK advises of the installation of the officers of Idaho Encampment, and adds: "They have at this time 23 members in good standing and but for the troubled times we would count a few more."

ILLINOIS.—On the 1st of April the report of the Grand Encampment was received from Bro. J. C. SMITH, R. W. Grand Scribe, who thus advised:

"The loss of 249 members is not because we have suspended more than in former years, but that we have not initiated as many. Our members have done well, but the 'hard times' have prevented the usual number of applications for initiation, admission by card, and reinstatement; in this is our loss. The number of working Encampments is the same as last year. No new ones have been organized, and no Charters surrendered, and we hope to have no cause to recall any. The general opinion is that we have Encampments enough if they were only judiciously located throughout the State, and we are now engaged in trying to secure so desirable an end. Several Encampments that have been lying dormant have been roused up so far as to petition for removal to more eligible locations, and with the change has come some activity."

The returns of the Grand Lodge were received April 8th, from Bro. N. C. NASON, R. W. Grand Secretary, who, under date of July 27th, wrote as follows:

"For the first time since I have held the office of Grand Secretary, I was compelled to report, for the year 1877, a decrease in membership in this jurisdiction. To enter upon an investigation and exposition of the causes which have produced this result is wholly superfluous. They are known to all. We should feel well satisfied that our loss was so small, in the midst of general stagflation of business, pinching poverty, and even actual destitution among those who heretofore had been strangers to such a state of things.

"Briefly, the totals show, as compared with those for the year 1876, a net loss in membership of 2? per cent, a falling off in revenue of 2 per cent., and an increase in relief of 2½ per cent. The loss in membership comes mainly from the excess of droppings for non-payment over initiations; the reduction in revenue can be wholly accounted for by the diminished receipts from fees for membership and degrees, while the increase in relief expenditures is found in payment of burial expenses, aid to the widow and the orphan, and special relief.

"Those of our Lodges whose finances are managed with prudence and ordinary business foresight meet all their obligations promptly, are strengthening their resources, and generally hold their membership. But many follow the haphazard style, accumulate no funds, and are liable at any time to be rendered bankrupt by unusual drafts for relief. Some are profiting by the lessons of the past and the certain prospect of ruin as the result of persistence in the course heretofore pursued, and are mending their ways: it is to be hoped that all will do so in time to save themselves from total wreck.

"Notwithstanding the continued financial depression, the diminished returns for labor, and the large number of men wholly or partially destitute of employment, the Order in this jurisdiction is already beginning to recover its losses. Of 576 Lodges from which reports were expected for the term ending June 30, 1878, reports are now received from 470, showing an aggregate net gain of 175 members in six months. This gain will probably be reduced, and may be wiped out entirely, by the 106 reports yet to come; but evidently the wave of adversity has been stayed, and we can with some degree of confidence look for a return of our wonted prosperity in the not distant future. '

INDIANA.—On the 9th of May, with the reports of the Grand Lodge, Grand Encampment and Rebekah Degree Lodges, we received from Bro. B. F. FOSTER, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, the following:

"Owing to the fact that many of our Lodges and Encampments have failed to report until a late date, I have been unable to forward my annual reports as early as I would have desired. I had hoped that by the close of the year 1877, we should have been able to make a better showing than in my preceding report. In this respect my hopes have not been realized. A comparison of the figures will show quite a loss of membership. This is accounted for by the continued depression in the marts of business and industrial pursuits, causing many to forfeit their membership, as well as lessening the number of those who would otherwise seek admission to our Lodges. We have however suffered less than might have been expected in view of the utter prostration of all kinds of business, as well as the failure in crops for two or three consecutive years. We are thankful that our condition is no worse, and that the report of the Grand Lodge shows, December 31, 1877, 518 working Lodges and a contributing membership of 25,146. With resources amounting to \$1,233,852.24, and annual receipts of \$218,615.86, it will be seen that our financial condition is all that could be desired, while our relief report will fall but little below that of any preceding year. The prospect of a fine fruit crop and an abundant harvest of grain, as well as the visible signs of a returning prosperity in the business world, is having a marked effect upon our Order. One Lodge has already had during the present term, beginning January 1, 1878, over thirty accessions, while others that have been dormant for a long time are doing proportionally well.

"I regret that I am unable to report anything favorable with regard to our Rebekah Lodges. While our records show 189 Charters issued, there are only some 30 or 40 Lodges from which we have had any reports for several years. Though we have taken steps to secure the return of Charters where Lodges have ceased to work, but few have as yet been returned. With the close of the present year we shall endeavor to enforce a compliance with the law of the G. L. of U. S., with regard to a forfeiture of Charters where Lodges fail to report. Some three or four Lodges are doing well, while a few more are making their meetings attractive in a social point of view; but aside from this, no tangible results are produced. As the late changes with regard to the office of N. G., etc., have only gone into effect with the present term, it is too soon to predict the result of this change. That it may prove beneficial is our sincere wish and desire."

INDIAN TERRITORY.—Bro. ISRAEL W. STONE, D. D. G. Sire, also Secretary of Caddo Lodge, No. 1, forwarded the report of his Lodge at an early day, as it reached this office on the 31st day of December, 1877. The reports of Nos. 2 and 3 were received January 7th and 16th. An increase of 15 in the membership of the jurisdiction is exhibited.

Erin Springs Lodge, No. 4, was instituted at Erin Springs on the 29th of June, concerning which Bro. STONE wrote: "I experienced considerable trouble in getting a sufficient number of brothers to go with me, the distance was so great. It is 110 miles, and we had to procure a team for the journey. We had very bad weather,

and it required ten days to make the trip. However, the job is done. I initiated and conferred the degrees upon four persons, and think the Lodge, with proper management, will prosper, as there is more material in that part of the Territory than here—more white men."

Bro. STONE also advised that "Caddo Lodge has completed the new hall, and now holds its meetings there."

IOWA.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received April 15th, and the Grand Encampment report on the 6th of June. Bro. WILLIAM GARRETT, B. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, under date of April 10th, wrote:

"I have the pleasure of inclosing report from Grand Lodge of Iowa nearly one month earlier than usual, and to inform you that every one of the 336 Lodges in our jurisdiction have made reports for 1877. You will observe that our gain is not so much as heretofore, but we have the satisfaction of reporting an addition of 12 Lodges and 441 members in 1877, which, considering the extreme hard times in this country for the last three or four years, is certainly gratifying. There are but few of our Lodges that are not gaining some, and I believe few that will be unable to sustain themselves and keep at work in the good cause. We have fallen off slightly in receipts, but reports show nearly all the Lodges to be in good, healthy condition. Since December 31, 1877, we have issued Dispensations for live new Lodges, and not a Charter has been surrendered, so we have to-day at work, 341 Lodges. The average age of members in this jurisdiction is 41 years.

"Will send report from Rebekah Lodges as soon as I can. Reports come in slow, as I have only 31 out of 93 Lodges, but we intend to have the reports or reclaim the Charters."

On the 1st of June, accompanying the report of the Grand Encampment, Bro. GARRETT advised:

"I have delayed the return, hoping to get reports from all the Subordinates, but have been disappointed. Three have not made returns, and I fear they will have to surrender their Charters. Since January 1st we have issued Dispensations for two new Encampments. The extreme hard times, throwing so many brothers out of employment, keep them from joining the Patriarchal branch of the Order, and have caused many Patriarchs to be dropped. With a return of prosperity we will take a new start and soon regain all we have lost. You will see that we gained five Encampments and 125 Patriarchs in 1877. We paid less for relief, and our annual receipts have also been less, but we have no reason to be discouraged, and are not. I expect to report next year 100 Encampments and 3,500 Patriarchs."

KANSAS.—The reports of the Grand Lodge, Grand Encampment, and Rebekah Lodges were received April 16th. Bro. SAMUEL F. BURDETT, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, writes: "Owing to a long and severe illness, from which I have scarcely recovered, I feel unable to write you any lengthy report other than contained in the regular returns."

The Grand Lodge report shows a gain of 96, and the Grand Encampment report a loss of 67 members.

KENTUCKY.—On the 6th of April the Grand Lodge, Grand Encampment, and Rebekah reports were received from Bro. WILLIAM WHITE, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, with the following:

"The reports, I regret to say, still show a general falling off, as compared with former years. I had fondly hoped for the lifting of the cloud that has been hanging over us, and to be cheered by the light of our former prosperity, but in regard to the increase of the work, adding to our membership and Subordinates, I have not realized my hopes and anticipations of writing progress in either branch of the Order. Still I do not feel discouraged, as I see and find no diminution in the spirit, zeal, and good work of the Order. The good work of 'The Benefit Association,' inaugurated at the last session of our Grand Lodge, which is now cheering and imparting new life to the jurisdiction, must tell with great effect on the future interest and welfare of the Order here. The Rebekah Degree Lodge report is almost a copy of the former, and I am compelled to say that little or no interest seems to exist in this department."

LOUISIANA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received May 6th from Bro. LUTHER HOMES, Acting Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, who wrote:

"I am sure you will excuse this almost unpardonable delay, as Bro. F. W. DELESDERNIER, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, has been and is still very sick and unable to attend to any work. I am attending to the business as well as my time will permit, but not to my entire satisfaction."

The reports exhibit a slight increase in Lodge and Encampment membership.

Later information from Bro. HOMES advises: "Bro. F. W. DELESDERNIER, late R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, died on the 6th of June, and was buried in a very quiet manner."

LOWER PROVINCES, BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—The report of the Grand Lodge, transmitted by Bro. J. C. P. FRAZEE, R. W. Grand Secretary came to hand May 14th. with a letter as follows:

"You will observe that our membership has increased somewhat, notwithstanding the hard times and disasters to which we have been subjected. The great fire at St. John on the 20th June, 1877, seems to have given quite an impetus to the progress of the Order in that city. The noble manner in which the brotherhood, far and near, came unsolicited to the assistance of the sufferers by that great calamity, has shown that the philanthropy of our Order is something more than a name, and, whether from that cause or not, the membership of the St. John Lodges has increased more than in other parts of the jurisdiction. The number of Lodges is now

27, two having been recently organized—one of them late in 1877, and the other in February. The Order may be considered in a healthy condition throughout the jurisdiction."

The reports of Stuart Encampment, No. 10; Halifax, No. 12, and Port La Joie, No. 13, have been received, exhibiting an addition of 37 to the membership. No report has been received from Milicete Encampment, No. 11, located at St. John. Bro. ANDRE CUSHING, D. D. G. Sire, on the 8th of February wrote: "Milicete Encampment has not held a meeting since the fire. Steps are now in progress for re-organizing." And on the 28th of the same month he said: "A meeting will be held to-night for re-organization;" but on the 6th of July he advised: "Milicete Encampment does not propose to surrender, but, having met with a good many obstructions, has been unable to resume work as contemplated."

MAINE.—Bro. JOSHUA DAVIS, R. W. Grand Secretary, forwarded the reports of the Grand Lodge, on the 13th of February, with the following:

"The Grand Lodge report will show, on examination, that this jurisdiction has still continued to increase in finances and membership, notwithstanding the general depression in business throughout the country. You will observe that we have gained eight Lodges, and 1,052 members, and paid \$26,716 for relief. The Rebekah Degree branch has also continued to increase, having gained three Lodges and 348 members.

"I send by this mail a bound copy of the 'History of Odd Fellowship in Maine,' and submit the following table, which may be interesting and perhaps of some advantage to the Order."

Bro. DAVIS adds to his report the following items: "Current expenses, separate from benefits and charities, \$31,661.78: invested funds, \$171,957.05."

On the 23d of February the report of the Grand Encampment was received from Bro. N. G. CUMMINGS, R. W. Grand Scribe, who thus advised:

"I am happy in being able to state that the best of feeling prevails throughout the jurisdiction. In view of the 'hard times' and general depression of business, we think we have made a fair record in increasing the membership 244 during the past year."

MANITOBA, CANADA.—The report of Manitoba Lodge, No. 1, was received February 12th, exhibiting 51 members, an increase of 3; receipts, \$626.88; relief, \$140.67. We are without returns from North Star Lodge, No. 2, and it is feared the Lodge is defunct. On the 24th of December, Bro. J. RANDOLPH CAMERON, D. D. G. Sire, transmitted a letter addressed to him by WM. H. SAUNDERS, N. G. of North Star Lodge, No. 2, dated Winnipeg, Dec. 3, 1877, authorizing him to "take possession of the Charter, books, and effects of the Lodge, and hold the same subject to the order of the G. L. of U. S." The N. G. also stated: "I am forced into this step by the fact of being unable to open the Lodge since my accession to the position of Noble Grand, for want of a quorum." Bro. CAMERON asked for instructions as to the disposition of the property, and stated that the few working members of No. 2 desired to "join Manitoba Lodge, No. 1, and amalgamate the widow and orphan fund of No. 2 with the W. and O. fund of No. 1." The District Deputy was urged to resuscitate the Lodge if possible, but if the Lodge could not be maintained, he was directed to "take possession of the Charter and effects and forward a schedule of the same to this office, together with the funds, which will be held in trust subject to the action of the G. L. of U. S. at its session in September next" He was further informed: "When the funds are received, with a schedule of the Charter, books, and other property certified as being in your possession, and a list of the members with the rank attained, and the indebtedness of each is furnished, cards will be issued from this office to those who apply and pay their dues to the time of surrendering. The G. L. of U. S. is the only power that can authorize the W. and O. fund of North Star Lodge to be transferred to Manitoba Lodge, and if such transfer is desired, proper application must be made. The Lodge reported 31 members on the 31st of December, 1876, and was apparently in good condition at that time; we can therefore find no good reason for disbanding it in so short a time. It is no credit to a jurisdiction to have a young Lodge so soon surrender its Charter, and while in other Provinces, States, and Territories greater financial difficulties have been encountered and surmounted than any (so far as we can learn) your people have been called to meet, we submit a strong effort should be made to maintain North Star Lodge, No. 2."

The next and the last letter from the District Deputy is dated February 4th, in which he says: "In regard to North Star Lodge, I called a meeting of the members, and there is a probability of a resuscitation. If the members use reasonable energy, there is no reason why they should not succeed in raising the Lodge to a prosperous condition."

No report has been received from Harmony Encampment, No. 1.

MARYLAND. - On the 12th of February the returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were presented by Bro. JOHN M. JONES, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, with the following:

"Upon examining the reports you will observe that we have decreased somewhat in membership during the past year, which is due solely to the continuation of the depressed condition of business of all kinds. Yet the decrease during the past year is considerable less than the year previous, and I trust that the future will be more bright."

MASSACHUSETTS.—The reports of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received April 1st, with the following from Bro. CHARLES D. COLE, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe:

"It is with pleasure that, notwithstanding the depression in business, I am again able to report to you that the Order in this State is in a very flourishing condition. In fact Odd Fellowship appears to be more appreciated than ever before. It is gaining an envied reputation for good deeds and works and is attracting the attention of the best members of society. Our Lodge meetings are well attended, and the interest which has so long prevailed does not seem to abate, but is still on the increase, and the members appear determined to do their utmost in carrying out the great principles inculcated in our ritual.

"During the past year four new halls have been dedicated; one old Lodge has been revived and live new Lodges have been instituted, making the total number of working Lodges in this jurisdiction one hundred and forty. We have made a net increase in membership of 835, and had on the 1st of January 22,520 members, which I think is a very good number for this small jurisdiction. We have lost by death 214, and paid for funeral benefits \$9,483.10. We have also paid \$41,542.44 for 10,160 weeks' sickness, and \$5,424.26 for the relief of widowed families. The total paid for relief amounted to \$64,511.41, and the receipts amounted to \$191,915.57.

"The Patriarchal branch has been rather quiet during the year. Three new Encampments were instituted, making a total of 44 Encampments, with a membership of 6,078. They have paid \$6,941.65 for 306 weeks' benefits, and \$1,510.41 for the burial of Patriarchs. The total relief amounted to \$8,872.72, receipts, \$27,741.10.

"In the Rebekah Degree the number of Lodges is the same as last year, and nearly all appear to be in a healthy condition. Some of them are increasing in membership, and their meetings are interesting, but this is owing to the individual efforts of their members, who are indefatigable in their exertions to sustain the degree and make the meetings attractive. We have now 28 Lodges, with a membership of 3,239, being a net gain during the past year of 189. The expenditure for relief was \$508.09, total receipts, \$4,018.40, and the assets of the Lodges aggregate \$10,958.31."

MICHIGAN.—On the 10th of June the returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received from Bro. E. H. WHITNEY, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, who advised as follows:

"For the first time in many years we yield to the pressure of universal decline, and report a loss in membership during the year 1877. While we are able to report an addition to our force of 23 new Lodges, yet the large list of suspensions for non-payment of dues reduces our aggregate membership below our last report. This we observe is true of many of the older and stronger jurisdictions, and with them we are determined to struggle manfully for the truth, hoping soon to return to the path of success in the increase of numbers. Our fair State is destined to hold her rank and position, and our guards are at their posts, doing active service, and ready to do their every duty promptly.

"I also inclose the report of our Degree Lodges of Rebekah and regret to say they yet remain feeble, although they seem to say to us, 'We are pledged not to weary in well doing.' I am inclined to the belief that the legislation by the G. L. of U. S. at its last session, will give many of them the relief they have long sought."

Under date of July 15th, Bro. WHITNEY advised: "Our reports for term ending June 30, 1878, are coming in promptly and indicate a very prosperous condition and increase of membership in many of the Lodges and Encampments. we hope to regain the losses of 1877 during the year 1878."

MINNESOTA.—The report of the Grand Encampment was received March 25th from Bro. J. FLETCHER WILLIAMS, R. W. Grand Scribe, who wrote; "Notwithstanding the unprecedentedly severe monetary stringency, you can see we have made a small gain. We have petitions in hand for two new Encampments, which we shall institute in a few days. We feel encouraged and believe a prosperous season is at hand."

The report of the Grand Lodge was received April 25th from Bro. SHERWOOD HOUGH, R. W. Grand Secretary, who wrote as follows:

"Reports have been received from all the Subordinate Lodges with but one exception. You will notice that we have gained five Lodges and 409 members during the year. But one of the twelve Rebekah Lodges has furnished a report for the year ending Dec. 31, 1877, and I therefore deem it unnecessary to send you a report for that branch of the Order. In view of the continued hard times and the fact that several other societies founded on plans similar to our own have made *special efforts* to work up large memberships during the past year, we feel that our increase has been entirely satisfactory."

Under date of July 26th, Bro. HOUGH wrote: "You may safely say that Rebekah Degree Lodges are 'played out' in Minnesota."

MISSISSIPPI.—On the 22d of April the returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received from Bro. JAMES T. MCCOWN, R. W. Gr. Secretary and Grand Scribe, who advised:

"There has been a slight falling off in membership in this jurisdiction since our last report, caused by surrender of the Charter of our oldest Lodge, but during the present term two new Lodges will be instituted and Lodge No. 17 will be revived. All of them are located in thriving towns, and will add largely to our

membership, as well as encourage other Lodges to work with more energy. The Grand Encampment return exhibits an increase of twenty-six members "

MISSOURI.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received June 4th from Bro. E. M. SLOAN, R. W. Grand Secretary, who thus advised:

"We think we may claim the congratulations of our brethren both East and West in that we have not only maintained our ground, but really gained some in membership, revenue, and permanent investments during these late years when so many interests have suffered from the almost unprecedented 'hard times,' scarcity of profitable labor, and great difficulty of remunerative investments. Our membership, as evidenced by the attendance and zeal of the members of the Grand Lodge, just closed, was never more in earnest than now; never more willing to labor for the growth, influence, and extension of our Order; never more determined to do the full measure of duty; never more anxious to understand and appreciate the full scope of our mission, and never more enthused with the contemplation of our God-appointed destiny. Ought not we to more and more feel the pressing importance of the labor before us and really esteem it but a labor of love?"

On the 8th of June the report of the Grand Encampment came from Bro. C. C. ARCHER, R. W. Grand Scribe, with the following:

"I am somewhat late in forwarding the report, but I have done the best I could under the circumstances. You will see that the Patriarchal branch of the Order in this jurisdiction is not in as flourishing condition as we desire, but taking everything into consideration, the stringency of the times, the scarcity of employment, and the general prostration that has attended all branches of trade and labor, we have reason to rejoice that our condition is no worse. During the year we have instituted two new Encampments and two have become extinct. Since the adjournment of our Grand Encampment I have received several letters from various points in the State inquiring as to the cost and proper manner of procuring Charters for Encampments. I am in hopes that something will grow out of these inquiries, and the next report from this jurisdiction will show not only an increase in the number of Encampments, but also an increase in membership in the Encampments now in existence."

MONTANA.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received July 11th, from Bro. LEW. COLEMAN, R. W. Grand Secretary, who wrote: "I supposed that the report had been sent by Bro. HYDE, my predecessor, as he said nothing to me on the subject, hence the delay." The report exhibits eight Lodges, 274 members; relief, \$788.78; receipts, \$4,505.73.

The returns of Rocky Mountain Encampment, No. 1, and Golden Star, No. 2, were forwarded on the 4th of April by Bro. JAMES L. DAVIS, D. D. G. Sire, who advised: "You will see that there has not been much increase in this branch of the Order in Montana, but I think there has been progress made in working. I am in hopes to have another Encampment to report during the present year."

NEBRASKA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received April 22d, from Bro. D. A. CLINE, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, with the following:

"The report of the Rebekah Degree Lodges is very meagre indeed. I am almost compelled to believe that branch a failure under any circumstances, It does not seem to meet the social want. Woman does not accept it cordially, and man does not need it in her absence. I have inaugurated an effort to save it and make it more useful in Nebraska. Should I fail I shall abandon all interest and will help to root it out of this jurisdiction.

"You will discover that the Order here has made a slight advance during the year. The State has not yet fully recovered from the effects of the famine of 1873, but will with the bounty of another year. A partially developed territory is no place for despair; its history is yet unwritten, and I do not doubt but the grandest word in that history will be 'success.'"

NETHERLANDS.—See Foreign Correspondence.

NEVADA.—The report of the Grand Encampment was received, March 18th, from Bro. WILLIAM H. HILL, R. W. Grand Scribe. They have 10 Subordinates, 412 members; relief, \$1,108.56; receipts, \$5,442.51.

The returns of the Grand Lodge were received, May 8th, from Bro F. V. DRAKE, R. W. Grand Secretary, who wrote: "I regret exceedingly the decrease in our membership, although slight. The general condition of the Order in this jurisdiction is prosperous in every other respect, as our returns show. The Rebekah Degree report, being our first for some years, is of course incomplete in some respects. It is, however, correct as a basis upon which further complete reports can be made."

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were forwarded by Bro. JOEL TAYLOR, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, with the following remarks:

"With the reports from this jurisdiction, I am glad to be able to say that the past year has been one of unusual prosperity. Our membership has increased, and our means for usefulness are more and better than at any former time. Everything is encouraging. We have 53 Lodges and 7,033 members, a gain of four Lodges and 391 members. Paid for relief, \$17,34.73; amount of receipts, \$48,318.06; funds and investments, \$144,372.

"Of the Daughters of Rebekah we have 11 Lodges and a membership of 1,415, a small gain from last year.

Considerable interest is reported.

"In the Patriarchal branch a good degree of interest is manifested, although there is a falling off in some of the smaller Encampments. We have 24 Encampments and 2,154 members, a loss of 32. Paid for relief, \$1,945.88; amount of receipts, \$5,795.12; funds and investments, \$18,000 "

NEW JERSEY.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received, April 22d, from LEWIS PARKER, Jr., R. W. Grand secretary and Grand Scribe, who advised as follows:

"An unfortunate depreciation of membership still continues, owing to causes which have prevailed for several years past in the troubled condition of the times; yet, notwithstanding a loss in numbers, we are still active in the operations of a charitable nature, for which our Order is distinguished. The revenue received by our Lodges has not materially decreased, and we are therefore permitted to rejoice that we have not been compelled to reduce our charities. While these things continue we need not be discouraged, but may confidently look forward to better times and a more happy prosperity in the future. It is, moreover, a significant fact, that in the very midst of a general depression in all branches of industry throughout our State, we are still permitted to carry on successfully our beneficent efforts for the amelioration of human suffering and the elevation of the character of man; it demonstrates the vitality and efficiency of our brotherhood."

NEW MEXICO.—The returns of Paradise Lodge, No. 2, and Centennial Encampment, No. 3, forwarded by Bro JOHN RITTER, D. D. G. *Sire*, reached this office February 27th. During the year the Lodge gained one member, and the Encampment lost one.

NEW YORK.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received, May 8th, from Bro. CHARLES V. CLARK, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe. No special information was furnished, but an examination of the reports discloses a loss of 994 in the Lodge, and 405 in the Encampment membership.

NORTH CAROLINA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge reached this office on the 4th of May. Bro. J. J. LITCHFORD, R. W. Grand Secretary, did not accompany the reports with remarks, as heretofore, and we have referred to the documents and note a loss of 71 members. He reports one Rebekah Degree Lodge with 51 members.

The report of the Grand Encampment was received, June 1st. from Bro. JOSEPH L. KEEN, R. W. Grand Scribe, and exhibits a loss of 35 members.

OHIO. — On the 8th of May the reports of the Grand Lodge were received from Bro. WILLIAM C. EARL, R. W. Grand Secretary, with the following:

"Accustomed to promptness in the discharge of my official duties, it has vexed me much that I could not sooner transmit my annual report for the year 1877. But the fault is not mine; I could not sooner, even with the greatest efforts, secure returns from all the Lodges, and I did not wish to forward until that was accomplished. Let me here ask why it would not be as well for all parties to have the time for reports extended to *May 1st*? In a jurisdiction so large as that of Ohio, it is not possible to get full returns by April 1st, and I do not like a law which *compels* me to appear delinquent.

"As you will see, we have decreased in membership again, and to a greater extent than last year. Under the monetary pressure hundreds have been forced to relinquish their hold upon an institution which, I am sure, they love as tenderly as ever, whilst other hundreds perhaps thousands, from the influence of the same cause have been unable to step within our portals. But though the clouds have gathered over our heads and the storms have descended, the fires upon our altars have not been extinguished; the love of our hearts has not grown weaker, nor the will to labor less strong. I trust that the day is not a far off when hope fulfilled shall kindle anew our affections, add increased strength to our desires, and lead us again in the way of prosperity. To insure this, we must never forget that 'the letter killeth, but the spirit of the law giveth life.' Of all the teachings of our order, perhaps none needs to be more frequently repeated than this 'Too many do not yet study or understand what the true teachings of Odd Fellowship are. Confining themselves entirely within the positive demands of the law, they never imbibe the sublime principles of benevolence which lie outside of and above the 'letter.' But these thoughts I need not express to a veteran like yourself, whose years of service have given the fullest opportunities for knowledge upon every point of interest to the Order. I would, however, that we could impress upon the hearts of all, the genuine, true, and exalted meaning of the institution. When that shall have been done, our temple will stand before the world with new grace and richer charms. That we have many good and noble men in Ohio, who are laboring to adorn our beautiful structure with the works of a true and generous spirit and liberal benevolence, I feel assured, and this strengthens hope in my heart that the time will come when the banner of our Order will float in the reflected grace of an azure sky, illumined by the bright rays of sunshine, and be regarded as the emblem of beauty, because it will be as a token of joy to so many weary hearts.

"From letters received I think, *I hope*, that the work of 1878 will make a better exhibit than has that of 1877."

On the 11th of May, Bro. JOSEPH DOWDALL, R. W. Grand Scribe, transmitted the report of the Grand Encampment, advising:

'You will notice a loss in membership, but a good financial condition. At our Annual Session, held on the 7th inst., Charters for four Encampments were granted. The new officers show a determination to work earnestly during the year for the advancement of the Order.'

ONTARIO—The report of the Grand Lodge was received March 29th from Bro. J. B. KING, R. W. Grand Secretary, who wrote as follows:

"But for the delay of a few Lodges I would have sent the report much earlier, having held it, hoping the delinquent Lodges would forward returns, but so far they have not. The showing for the year is very favorable, though that for the last six months is not. The great commercial depression which still continues throughout Canada is doubtless, to a very large extent, the cause of the decline, though some of it may be attributed to the fact that other societies of a similar character are springing up in Ontario, which offer greater inducements in the way of insurance. We are trying to devise some plan whereby the loss of so large a number by suspension for non-payment of dues may be checked. From the last returns of Subordinates it is quite evident that Lodges are exercising more care in the expenditure of funds for 'current expenses,' though this outlay is yet much larger than seems really necessary. As Lodges become convinced of the necessity of being very careful in the management of their funds, the interest of the members will increase, and the number be maintained, as few like to be continually paying money to a Lodge which is careless in its financial affairs, fearing that when sickness and death come the Lodge may not be in a condition to fulfil all its promises of relief. Nothing inspires more confidence in the minds of the members of an institution than a full treasury and economical management.

"In common with our whole jurisdiction I beg to express my sorrow for the loss by death of those distinguished brothers, STUART and PORTER, who have lately been called home. In their death the Order sustains a loss which it will be difficult to repair, and one which will surely be seriously felt by the G. L. of U. S. at its next session on account of the very active part they have for so many years taken in its deliberations."

Accompanying the letter was a printed statistical table of returns, from which we extract the following:

"Percentage of relief to receipts 20.08, or over one-fifth. Total current expenses, \$36,380.21. Percentage of expenses to receipts, 32.87, or nearly one-third. Death rate 1 in 143. Average benefits paid to each sick brother, \$21.17; average to total membership, \$1.79. General fund of Lodges, \$223,- 718.89. Widow and Orphan fund, \$06,494.21. Contingent fund, \$0,030.7C. Total fund, \$296,-243.86. Increase during the year, \$73,028.41."

On the 19th of April the report of the Grand Encampment was received from Bro. M. D. DAWSON, R. W. Grand Scribe, with the following:

"I regret that the report has been so long delayed, but it was my earnest desire to have returns from every Encampment in the jurisdiction, so that our statistics may be relied upon as correct. In that I failed, as the reports from three Encampments have not come to hand, but they would make but slight change in the figures. Notwithstanding the heavy financial pressure throughout the entire country the past year, cramping the resources of every one, we have to congratulate ourselves on a net gain in membership of 51; and we are pleased to report, independent of membership, a healthy increased interest in this branch of the Order. Since the last session of our Grand Encampment, August, 1877, we have instituted four new Encampments with every reasonable prospect of success, and several other localities are getting ready for organization, so that we hope next year to show a much better result. A great many members have been dropped for non-payment of dues, to be attributed to the scarcity of money, and I trust with the return of better times many of the suspended will be restored to membership. The total annual receipts of our 39 Encampments amounted to \$7,620.68, and our relief \$888.00, which is a fair exhibit for a young jurisdiction like ours "

OREGON.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received April 10th from Bro. J. M. BACON, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe. No special information has been communicated, but an examination of the reports shows an increase of 70 in the Lodge and 74 in the Encampment membership. Receipts of Lodges, \$54,598.65. Encampments, \$4,650.18. Belief by Lodges, \$13,576.95. The Rebekah report exhibits 8 Lodges, 186 members; receipts, \$348.35; relief, \$81.50.

PENNSYLVANIA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received on the 30th May, without special advice other than that contained in the printed report of the G. Secretary to the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, May 21, 1878, from which the following is presented:

"Net loss in membership, 6,377; increased number of Lodges, 5; Lodges in working condition, 899; apparent number of Rebekah Degree Lodges; total amount paid for relief, \$365,565.75; decreased amount of relief from preceding year \$13,700.71; total receipts \$711,209.05; decrease, \$53,- 615 85; assets, \$2,510,642 82; increase, \$1,457.08.

"Notwithstanding the loss in membership and the surrender of some Charters, there is abundant reason for congratulation that so much good has been accomplished, and that the Order still maintains its pre-eminent position in Pennsylvania. A revival of confidence and business will doubtless mark a new era in the progress of the Order. Let it be distinctly recognized, however, that amid all its fluctuations, that the Order has never ceased

to progress since its first establishment in America. It has moved steadily onward, gaining much and losing little, overcoming the difficulties in its path, developing its power, becoming better understood and more fully appreciated, and thus establishing its true character."

The Grand Encampment report shows a loss of 1,147 members; receipts, \$89,402.69; assets, \$277,948.15; relief, \$59,123.04.

PERU.—See Foreign Correspondence.

QUEBEC, CANADA.—The returns of Montreal Encampment, No. 1, and the eight Lodges in this jurisdiction, were received on the 21st of June from Bro. JOHN C. BECKET, D. D. G. Sire. The reports exhibit the Subordinates to be in good condition; net increase in membership during the year, 55. Unity Lodge, No. 8, was instituted at Sherbrooke, October 29, 1877, by Bro. G. VAREY, Special Deputy, with 13 petitioners, and reported 29 members on the 31st of December. On November 2d, transmitting the return of institution, Bro. VAREY wrote:

"On the occasion of institution I was ably assisted by Past Grands from Oriental Lodge of Vermont, and officers from Pioneer Lodge, No. 7, of this jurisdiction. We had a large attendance, 67 being present at the evening meeting. From the appearance of the petitioners for the Lodge as well as those we initiated, I should say Sherbrooke bids fair to compete with any of the Lodges in this jurisdiction as to intellectual and moral ability. I was much pleased with the economy displayed in the fitting up of the Lodge-room as well as the regalia and emblems provided. I consider the great stumbling-block on which most of our Lodges here have fallen at the outset of their career, was fitting up expensive rooms and furnishing expensive regalia, thereby crippling their finances for some time to come. From all I could learn in the few hours I was in Sherbrooke, I believe that Unity Lodge will have the confidence of the community, the public generally being in favor of the Order, and if such is the case there is no fear but that it will soon become a large Lodge, and if they act upon my advice, to 'guard well the outer door,' one of the best in this jurisdiction.

"Concerning Oriental Lodge, No. 36, of Vermont, whose Past Grands kindly assisted me. I understand they meet in a room on the Canada side of the line, having received permission from the G. L. of U. S. so to do *pro tem.*, until they get a room on the U. S. side, and I am informed by them that their Charter from the G. L. of Vermont contains a clause whereby, in the event of a Grand Lodge being instituted in the province of Quebec, they have the privilege of uniting with them without further action. Now if this Lodge would come in at once under this jurisdiction, making 9 Lodges, there would be no difficulty in the formation of a Grand Lodge of Quebec. Besides, Oriental has several Past Grands who have served in Grand Lodge, filled some of the elective offices, and are well informed in the work, having been in harness for some 40 years, consequently their aid would be invaluable in a new Grand Lodge."

In forwarding the returns, Bro. BECKET wrote, under date of June 17th, as follows:

"I regret exceedingly that by the delay in receiving the Encampment report, which was only recently completed, I have been so long in making the returns for 1877. The Lodges presented their reports at the proper time and are not to blame for the delay.

"I am glad to be able to state that the Order in this jurisdiction is in a very satisfactory condition, as the returns will show; two of the Lodges have not made as much progress as the others, and, indeed none of them have done as well as we had a right to expect from the general favor with which the Order is regarded here. I can only account for this by the very depressed state of trade for the past four years, and a revival in business generally seems still in the future. However, in the midst of all the depression we are making some progress, as you will see from the inclosed notice of the dedication of a new hall last Friday night by Mizpah Lodge, No. 3. Mount Royal, No. 1, intends to hold a similar service shortly on the completion of the hall they are now fitting up."

RHODE ISLAND.—The returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment reached this office on the 18th of March. Bro. JOHN F. DRISCOL, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, wrote as follows:

"You will see that both reports show a loss of members during the year, but the times are such in our jurisdiction that such a result was unavoidable. As soon as there is a change and business revives, the Order will grow again. A great number of those who have been dropped for non-payment of dues will return, and many will apply for admission by initiation."

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—See Foreign Correspondence.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—At the date of putting the first pages of this report to press (August 6th), no information of any character concerning the Order has reached us from this jurisdiction, notwithstanding repeated requests have been made for the annual reports. On the 10th of February, Bro. ROBERT JAMES, R. W. Grand Secretary, wrote as follows:

"Can you inform me how I can obtain the A. T. P. W. for our jurisdiction? I have failed to get it from our G. Rep., as he did not attend the session of the G. L. of U. S. last September, in consequence of our tax not being paid. The G. L. of U. S. at the same session placed to our credit the amount of the tax (\$75, thereby

placing us in good standing as to our Representative tax.

"I am happy to inform you that on the 16th of January, we installed Bro. W. F. BARTON, of Orangeburg, as M. W. Grand Master. I was also reelected for the eighth time."

Bro. JAMES was informed that the P. W. was transmitted in cipher on the 30th of January to the Grand Representative.

On the 25th of June, the Grand Secretary sent a request by postal card, for "blanks to make up my returns for the year 1877." The blanks were immediately forwarded.

SWITZERLAND. - See Foreign Correspondence.

TENNESSEE.— On the 18th of April the returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received from Bro. J. R. HARWELL, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, with the following concerning the situation:

"Sickness has prevented me from sending the reports earlier. I am sorry to say that Odd Fellowship in Tennessee is on the decline, both as to popularity and membership. Other institutions, promising larger funeral benefits, are rapidly depleting us, so that our utter extinction in this State seems to be only a question of time, and not very long time at that. It is true, we have an "Odd Fellows' Relief Society," as it is called, but it is an outside affair, not a part of the Order, not even controlled by our State Grand Lodge, and our members do not seem disposed to take hold of it. They seem to lack confidence in it, and the result is, we have only about one hundred members. Now, it does seem to me, and it is almost the universal sentiment amongst Tennessee Odd Fellows, that the Grand Lodge of the United States ought to adopt and control a system of endowment (or enlarged funeral benefits, as I prefer to call it. This would infuse new life into the organization in Tennessee; it would give confidence and insure success. In this State we are becoming demoralized, and I warn the Grand Lodge of the United States now, that we will be routed unless something is done to place Odd Fellowship in the front rank of *progressive* institutions. We have done and are doing all we can, but we are too feeble to stem the tide, and we implore the Grand Lodge of the United States to give us relief. Other and newer institutions have stolen our thunder, and are elaborating and improving our own system of funeral benefits, and making it wonderfully popular and successful. These are plain words, but they are true.

"I report, as you will see, 147 Lodges, of which 22 are practically defunct, although their Charters have not been formally reclaimed by the Grand Lodge.

"I can make no report of Rebekah Degree Lodges, because none have made returns to me. That branch of the Order is a failure here.

"The Encampment branch of the Order in this State is in a worse condition than the Lodge department. While my report shows 36 Encampments, 12 of them are practically defunct, but their Charters have not been surrendered."

TEXAS.—On the 19th of June the returns of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment were received from Bro. GEO. W. GROVER, R. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, who thus advised:

"The prostration of business generally throughout our State, for the past year or two, has been felt by our members, and comparatively there is a larger membership than we anticipated in both branches of the Order. While for local causes some Subordinates have demised, others hold their own, and many show an increase of strength numerically and financially. It is to be hoped that another year will prove more advantageous, not only in this section of our country, but to all within the realms of our beloved Order."

UTAH.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received January 30th. Bro. E. M. WILSON, R. W. Grand Secretary, under date of January 24th, wrote:

"By comparing the present with our last report, you will discover that we are progressing somewhat, more particularly in the amount of relief, which is probably more for the benefit and credit of our jurisdiction than a larger influx of members would be. Our Lodges are gradually increasing in wealth and influence, and we look hopefully forward to the time when our Territory will partake more of the principles of civilization and morality, and thus become a more favorable field of labor for our noble institution. Wildey Degree Lodge, No. 1, instituted last August, and Oquirrh Encampment, No. 1 (which reports to the Grand Encampment of California), are both in a prosperous condition, and have proven important adjuncts to the Subordinate Lodges."

VERMONT. The report of the Grand Encampment was received from Bro. D. P. CELLEY, R. W. Grand Scribe, on the 11th of February. A loss of 125 members is noted. Relief, \$126.30; receipts, \$764.76; number of weeks' benefits paid not reported.

The report of the Grand Lodge reached this office 12th of February, and the Rebekah report on the 11th of March. Bro. H. L. STILLSON, R. W. Grand Secretary, on the 8th of March, wrote:

"It is with more than ordinary pleasure that I forward you the inclosed 'Annual Report of the Rebekah Degree Lodges of Vermont,' which completes our returns to the G. L. of U. S. The Order in the land of Ethan Allen, Gen. Stark, and other Revolutionary heroes, during its Centennial year, 1877, claims that it exemplified in deeds the banner of Friendship, Love, and Truth. May we not boast a little? There has not been an appeal

case before the Grand Lodge in two years, and there is now no prospect of one. Every Subordinate Lodge has reported correctly and paid in full, and every Rebekah Degree Lodge has reported correctly, and we have not a failing Lodge of any kind in the State. Whatever may have been true of us heretofore, our returns are this year complete."

Grand Secretary STILLSON also transmitted, on the 23rd of February, memorial resolutions adopted by the Grand Lodge of Vermont, and directed to the G. L. of U. S., as follows':

"*Resolved*, That in the death of Past Grand Sire WILLIAM ELLISON, Odd Fellowship loses one of its oldest, most prominent and useful members, venerable in years as in character. In all the varied relations of life, God had honored him as an instrument of blessing to our fraternity; and he has been gathered into the garner of the illustrious company of those who have shown their love to God by works of love to their fellow-men.

"*Resolved*, That in the decease of Past Grand Sire FRED. D. STUART, the Grand Lodge of the United States and the fraternity at large have cause to mourn the loss of an earnest and devoted brother, who has labored unceasingly for the promotion of our principles; and one whose voice was familiar to many of Vermont's Odd Fellows; and whose counsels have been frequently our guide in important matters of legislation and work."

VIRGINIA.—Bro. T. WILEY DAVIS, R. W. Grand Secretary, transmitted the report of the Grand Lodge on the 2d of March, with the following:

"In presenting the annual return of the Grand Lodge of this jurisdiction for the past year, I regret exceedingly that I cannot report an increase of membership, or show some improvement in our condition as the result of our labor for the year. On the contrary, we have lost from our ranks 247, while the receipts by the Lodges, their disbursements for relief, &c., show a corresponding decrease. This state of affairs, whilst attributed to the long-continued depression in business of all kinds throughout the country, is I am convinced, influenced by other causes that have been at work in the towns and cities of this and other States, and are making rapid inroads upon the field that our Order, in my opinion, should occupy. I allude to the various other Orders (their name is Legion) of a kind similar to Odd Fellowship in many respects, yet having greatly the advantage in their feature of *Endowment* or *Insurance*, thus holding out great inducements to those who would otherwise seek admission to our ranks. The people are learning to regard with distrust a large majority of the Life Insurance Companies of the present day, because of their failure to fulfil their obligations; and as life insurance occupies a high position in the hearts of those who are pecuniarily able to maintain it, they very naturally seek association with institutions or Orders that offer inducements of that kind. I have made this subject one of very earnest study, and am convinced that if we desire to make our Order what it should be, we shall have to adopt some such plan as has been referred to. To do so may be called a new departure, but if it will save us from further depletion and again turn the tide in our favor, we should cheerfully accept the situation.

"No new Lodge has been chartered, and only one defunct Lodge has been re-organized. Two halls have been dedicated to the use of the Order, and notwithstanding the adverse circumstances surrounding us, we are still determined to labor for the prosperity and perpetuity of our Order, and hope that under the blessings of our Heavenly Father a bright day may soon dawn upon us, and our hearts be cheered by the consciousness of duty performed.

"We have no Lodges of the Degree of Rebekah, though the degree is conferred upon applicants at stated times."

Under date of April 29th, Bro. HUGH LATHAM, R. W. Grand Scribe, transmitted the report of the Grand Encampment, with the following:

"I regret exceedingly that the accompanying report should have been delayed until this time. Indifferent and negligent Scribes of Subordinate Encampments cause the whole trouble. I must again express my regret at being compelled to submit another report exhibiting a decrease in our membership and a corresponding decrease in revenue. This is discouraging; but there is one cause for gratulation, that is, there has been a decrease of \$836.80 in the expenditures for relief. Thus, while adversity has laid its heavy hand upon us, a kind and beneficent Providence has relieved us from many afflictions.

"I cannot, in justice to myself and the Scribes who have reported promptly, refrain from saying that the report of Neilson Encampment, No. 2, to December 31, 1877, has not to this date been received; hence the delay in making my return. I hoped to have reported in January, but the negligence of others prevented. I earnestly hope next year to fulfil my expectations of submitting an early report, and only wilful negligence on the part of others will prevent me from accomplishing my wishes."

"WASHINGTON.—The reports of New Castle Lodge, No. 8, Mount Baker, No. 9, and Patit, No. 10, were received in February and March. These Lodges, instituted February 10th, February 26th, and March 8th, 1877, return an aggregate membership of 85: receipts, \$1,997.01; relief, \$332.00. By a letter dated Seattle, June 13th, it appears the blanks sent in December, 1877, to Unity Encampment, No. 2, failed to reach their destination. Duplicates were immediately forwarded, and on the 30th of July, the report reached this office, exhibiting the work from August 24th to December 31, 1877, as follows: Initiated, 5; admitted by card, 12; total, 17. Receipts,

\$298.75.

Lodges 1 to 7 are under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge, and Encampment NO. 1, under the Grand Encampment of Oregon.

Since the last session four more Lodges have been instituted, viz: Ranier, No. 11, at New Tacoma; Snohomish, No. 12, at Snohomish; Friendship, No. 13, at Port Gamble; and Colfax, No. 14, at Colfax All the information received represents the Order as flourishing in this distant Territory. Bro. H. G. STRUVE, D. D. G. Sire, has been a faithful correspondent and efficient officer, and advises that "the Order in the Territory is rapidly increasing in numbers and influence." Of the new Lodges, he wrote: "The institution of No. 11 was accomplished under the most favorable auspices, a large number of visiting brethren from Olympia and Seattle being present. No. 12 was instituted successfully on the 23d of April, and has all the elements of permanence and prosperity. No. 13 starts out under splendid auspices. It is located in a thriving place, and embraces the best elements of the town. The night of institution we had 14 initiations. Our Subordinate Lodges confidently expect that the next Grand Lodge of the U. S. will give us a Grand Lodge Charter."

Bro. E. L. POWELL, Special Deputy G. Sire, who instituted No. 14, advised that "they have some brothers well posted, and no doubt they will succeed well as a Lodge." The petition for this Lodge was signed by 19 brothers, of whom only 8 were present at the institution, and recognized as Charter members.

WEST VIRGINIA.—The returns of the Grand Lodge reached this office March 16th. Bro. THOMAS G. STEELE, R. W. Grand Secretary, wrote:

"The report of the Grand Lodge exhibits a decrease this year of 143 members, and our financial statement shows a considerable shrinkage, which I attribute to the clog on the wheels of business. Our day of adversity is upon us, but we shall try like men to keep the bark West Virginia afloat until a more prosperous wind strikes us and we get into more favorable waters. Numerically we have no cause for alarm, and we have not lived in vain, as the following shows. At our organization in 1866 we had 22 Lodges and 1,100 members; now we have 84 Lodges and 4,283 members Our Order has attained a high place in the community, and were it not for the depression in business I would have a large increase to report.

"The information of the death of P. G. Sire STUART came to me very unexpectedly. One of my respected and valued brothers has gone, and we shall meet him no more on earth, but hope to meet him in heaven "

On the 29th of March the report of the Grand Encampment, with the following from Bro. H. A. U THMAN, Grand Scribe, was received:

"I am compelled to report a small loss in this branch of the Order. I cannot think this result is from lukewarmness, but attribute it to the want of money which prevents members from paying their dues. Many are out of employment, and besides that, new institutions are springing up with new methods of insurance, promising large benefits for small fees, which are drawing members from our Order at present. I think, however, that in a short time all will return to us, and our onward progress will be greater than ever."

WISCONSIN.—The returns of the Grand lodge and Grand Encampment came to hand on the 19th of April, Bro. L. 13. HILLS, It. W. Grand Secretary and Grand Scribe, wrote:

"Our annual showing is not what we hoped for, yet notwithstanding the very small increase in membership the financial condition of the Lodges is stronger than ever. Concerning *the work*, I can say there is scarcely a Lodge in this State that does not perform the entire subordinate ceremony without the use of a book, and many of them the degree work. In other words, the officers are required to memorize the entire ritual, and the result is that we have what I call an educated brotherhood, and our Grand Lodge is composed of a body of men who are critical without being captious. We are making similar efforts with our Encampments, but have succeeded with only a portion of them as yet. The example and success of such as have adopted the plan is so marked, that others are making the effort."

Bro. HILLS adds these items to his report, "Number reported sick, 700; number of brothers relieved, 540; total number of weeks' sickness, 2,598," from which it appears 160 members received no benefits.

WYOMING.—The report of the Grand Lodge was received on the 1st of February from Bro. H. ALTMAN, R. W. Grand Secretary, who advised as follows:

"It is with regret that I have to report the same number of Lodges as last year, and cannot fulfil the promise of Bro. W. L. KUYKENDALL, G. Rep. We have suffered from great depression in financial affairs, though the brethren have worked faithfully, as you will see by the return Although a decrease of numbers is exhibited, there has really been a fair and healthy growth, and all the Lodges have greatly improved in the work, so that on the whole the condition of the Order is entirely satisfactory, affording strong proof that the principles of Friendship, Love, and Truth are to have more weight in the future, and permitting us to see the glimmering of the dawn of that day when Odd Fellowship shall reign triumphant throughout our wide Territory."

The report of Wyoming Encampment, No. 1, was received January 28th, and that of Hope Encampment, No. 2, March 4th.

Bro. - JOHN A. FISHER, acting for the D. D. G. Sire, in forwarding the report of No. 1, wrote:

"We do not make a very encouraging showing, having decreased our membership 10 during the year, but the way things look now, I think there is a better promise for the future, as since the commencement of this term we have had several applications for membership, and a few of the negligent brothers who were dropped last term are anxious to be reinstated. I hope they will apply soon, as some of them were always good workers and valuable members, and enable us to redeem ourselves in our next report."

Bro. PETER HAMMA transmitted the report of No. 2, saying: "The Lodges are doing as well as we could expect. By the Encampment report you will see we have improved a little."

Bro. W. L. KUYKENDALL, D. D. G. Sire, under date of April 3d, advised:

"You will see from the reports of the Encampments under my supervision that there has been a falling off in membership during the past year; the main cause for this is to be found in the general depression that has existed in business throughout the nation, and from which our Territory has not entirely escaped. With the revival of business and financial prosperity there is no doubt that the Encampment branch will resume its former standing. The faithful few will, at least, strive to keep the fires bright on the altars of Faith, Hope, and Charity in Wyoming and Hope Encampments until the dawning of a brighter day. I regret the necessity of sending such an unfavorable exhibit, but hope that a speedy return of prosperity to our country and awakened interest in the Order will enable me to send, as my next, a more favorable report."

It will be seen by the foregoing, that the prostration of business in all sections of the country has been felt by the Order, as manifested by an increased number of suspensions for non-payment of dues, a lessening of initiations, and consequently a reduction of the revenue. The loss of membership is more particularly noted in the Middle and Southern States, and but few of the Western States retain their numerical standing; while the New England States and the Canadas, with a few exceptions, appear to be in a highly prosperous condition.

Foreign Correspondence.

AUSTRALASIA.—The condition of affairs in this jurisdiction, at present under the control of the Grand Lodges of Australia and New Zealand, is well understood by the G. L. of U. S., the Grand Officers having fully explained the situation in their reports to the Annual Sessions, and recommended for several years the appointment of a Special Commissioner to visit that important country at our expense, for the purpose of adjusting the complications there existing, deeming such action a desideratum worthy of the earnest consideration of this body. At the last session proper measures were presented to this end by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which ultimated in the following form:

First, The appointment of the M. W. Grand Sire JOHN W. STOKES, as a suitable commissioner to Australia and New Zealand.

Second, The appropriation of one thousand dollars to pay the expenses of the mission.

Third, Authorizing the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire, JOHN B. HARMON, in the event of the inability or refusal of the Grand Sire to perform said duty, to act in his stead.

In pursuance of this effective legislation, evincing the great interest of the Grand Lodge in the subject, and testifying also its adequate liberality, the M. W. Grand Sire took early steps to consummate the purpose. That worthy officer participating cordially in the object, so soon as he discovered his inability to leave his post of duty for so long a time, tendered the appointment to the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire as provided by law, who promptly accept-ed, and officially embarked for the seat of his labors on the 15th of April last, by steamer from San Francisco, California. Brother HARMON expressed his intention to visit Auckland and Dunedin in New Zealand, Sydney and Melbourne in Australia, and such other points as time and convenience of travel would permit, returning in time to present his 'official' report at the next session.

The following correspondence between the Grand Sire, Deputy Grand Sire, and Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary will present to the Grand Lodge an intelligent view of the action of the Grand Sire, including the commission issued, the general instructions to the Deputy Grand Sire, and the latter's deliberate views and opinions of his duties in the premises.

I. O. O. F. OFFICE OF THE M. W. GRAND SIRE, R. W. G. L. OF U. S, Philadelphia, Pa.,

February 5, 1878.

To JAMES L. RIDGELY,

R. W. Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary:

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—I find that I shall be compelled to decline the mission so generously tendered me by the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States to visit the Order in New Zealand and Australia. I have held it under advisement longer than was probably prudent, in the hope that it would be possible for me to

accept it. and even now very reluctantly forego the high honor of being the bearer of the friendly greetings of half a million of my brethren in America, to the brethren of another continent engaged in the same noble cause.

As this high honor and pleasurable duty, under the terms of my appointment, will now devolve upon the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire, Hon. JOHN B. HARMON, of California, you will please notify him of my declination, and afford him all the facilities in your power to fulfil the object and purposes of this important mission.

You will also please advise the Grand Authorities of New Zealand and Australia of this change, and express to them the deep regret I feel in not being able to make them an official and fraternal visit.

Yours very respectfully,

John W. Stokes, *Grand Sire*,

I. O. O. F. OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., Baltimore, Md.,

February 7, 1878

John B. Harmon, *R. W. Deputy Grand Sire*:

MY WORTHY BROTHER,—I herewith transmit to you a copy of an official letter, this day received from the M. W. Grand Sire, having reference to his appointment to visit Australia, and of your like appointment in the alternative. You will perceive that the M. W. Grand Sire, in consequence of unavoidable impediments in his way, has devolved upon D. G. Sire, the high honor of being the Representative of the Grand Lodge of the United States to that important jurisdiction, and also of being the bearer of the fraternal greetings of a half million of brethren in America, to brethren in another great continent engaged in the same noble cause and having a common descent and education from the Anglo-Saxon race. May I not hope that this mission will meet from you with a prompt and cordial acceptance, not more on account of the high and well-deserved compliment which it confers, than for the reason of the magnitude of the interests to Odd Fellowship involved. You are aware of what constitutes the special interests referred to, and they need not here be recapitulated. Suffice it, that I now reiterate the fact that your personal presence in that jurisdiction would more than probably re-arrange satisfactorily our form of government in Australia, establish it upon a stable basis, and harmonize entirely our machinery of work, which although generally correct, jars slightly here and there.

I need not say to you that now is a most auspicious period for the execution of this commission. The state of feeling in the jurisdiction toward their American brethren is highly fraternal and kind; their appreciation of American Odd Fellowship is a source of pleasure to us and of pride to both jurisdictions. There are now two prosperous Grand Lodges with many Subordinates; also several other Grand Jurisdictions already advancing toward organization. But above all. our brotherhood there are expecting you, and are now preparing to welcome you in Dunedin (New Zealand), and in Melbourne, with open arms. The news of your advent has already preceded you, and the Revised Journal of the Grand Lodge of the U. S., of 1877, is already in their possession, advising them fully of our interest in their welfare, and of the sacrifice we make for our great cause.

Let there be no delay, my brother, in your acceptance, I pray you, except for deference to higher obligations, to which our laws demand a surrender. I have labored to this noble end for several years with great earnestness. Let not the cup be dashed from my lips in the moment of success, but I pray you let this fortunate opportunity be availed of to consummate a purpose long desired, to see the perfect American system of Odd Fellowship established throughout every civilized country on the globe. Such a consummation, in addition to the considerations which will occur to you of the great moral service you have rendered to humanity, will unite two mighty peoples in Odd Fellowship, heart and soul, in one form of government and one language, by whose harmonious co-operation the further ubiquity and identity of the Order will be greatly promoted. Besides, a paramount fitness for this great service places the Order under lasting obligations to you, which it cannot afford to overlook, and which strengthens our hope that you will realize the general expectation.

The voyage may be performed in the time to intervene before the next session, and your return will be joyfully hailed by your brethren.

I have already "officially" transmitted information of your appointment to our brethren in Australia, and have received their reply, testifying their extreme gratification, and extending to you the cordial and heartfelt welcome of brother Odd Fellows. From the tenor of the welcome uttered, and the warm hospitality tendered, I anticipate a general rejoicing and demonstration of gratulation among our brethren. May I again renew the expression of my earnest hope, that you may be free to accept this distinguished office.

Yours ever truly,

Jas. L. Ridgely, C. S.

SAN FRANCISCO,

Feb. 11, 1878.

JOHN W. STOKES, *M. W. Grand Sire*:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—By the inclosed telegram, which appeared in one of our papers yesterday morning, I conclude you have decided not to visit Australia. In my last to you I also declined positively. Since then I have been urged by many here to make the trip; and after examining the Journal relative to Australian matters, I concluded things were very much mixed there, and that, if at all possible, I would start in April.

I do not yet see my way clear. There is, however, one chance in ten, but whether I can go or not will be an open question up to within *a week* from my departure. Hence I write now to inquire whether it would be well for you and Bro. RIDGELY to prepare instructions, make suggestions, and supply me with books, papers, letters, &c., &c, if any be in your judgment necessary.

Several things require consultation, and let me take them up *seriatim*.

1st. The great trouble is the money. That depends on *time* mainly. I could spare three months better than four. Will three answer? It takes about 32 days to Melbourne. The steamers' route and time are as follows for April, running once a month. Leave San Francisco, April 15th, Honolulu, April 23d, arrive at Auckland (New Zealand), May 8th, and at Sydney, May 13th. The steamer does *not go to Melbourne* my objective point, but coast steamers run from Sydney to Melbourne every two or three days—taking about two and a half days between those two cities.

Further, steamers run between Sydney and Auckland—about five to seven days.

Now in no event can it be expected that I spend more time than is essential to *adjusting the differences* in Australia. Six months there would doubtless redound to the good of the Order; that is, if a man were to travel around in ail the Colonies, he might arouse an interest. This can't be done. We can only act at head-quarters: to wit, Melbourne and Auckland; and in these places we can deal only with the Grand Bodies. Can't this be done as well in *one month* as in a year. Certainly two weeks at Melbourne ought to do all that can be done—give a month, and it is ample. This would enable me to make the trip in three months, unless stopping at Auckland going or coming be absolutely necessary.

2d. To this point I invite your attention. *How* are we to right matters? New Zealand has a Grand Lodge. Australia the same. Both of equal power. What are we to do Get one to step down and out? If so, which shall we ask to retire? Who shall we approach first? Australia is by far the more important place. All that could be accomplished at Auckland would be to get that G. Lodge to become subordinate to the Grand Lodge of Australia. Otherwise New Zealand must be left as she is, independent for a time, trusting to the future to adjust her relation with the G. L. of Australia.

What we want is a Supreme Grand Lodge for the whole of Australia—or rather Australasia—with power to grant Charters to other Grand Lodges within that continent. This could be done with one stroke of the pen, thus: Ask the Grand Lodge of Australia to *surrender their present Charter*, and then grant a new one, with full power over Australasia, excepting only the ritual and work, the traveling password and card, and probably the qualifications for membership. As our legislation now stands, we would be forced to stick in this last clause. That Grand Lodge would not object to this enlarged jurisdiction, unless the Order at large in the three colonies would object, and if for this reason the Grand Lodge of Australia deemed it inexpedient to make the proposed change, then my mission *would be ended* so far as substantial results are concerned. Of course, I could instruct in general principles and in the work, and thus do good. But *the one Sovereign Grand Lodge is the necessity*.

My idea is, to go straight to Melbourne, call a meeting of the Grand Lodge, say to them, "Brothers MEACHAM did not fix this thing right; I am authorized to arrange this matter; bring that Charter here, and let me tear it up; it is done; here now is a new one in which old man RIDGELY (our Nestor) has spread himself; take it, and go preach the gospel of Odd Fellowship in all the land of Australasia."

This done, I would advise New Zealand of the *fact*, explain fully by letter or personal visit. If they accepted the new order of things, I would put it in writing, and have them take a Charter from the Grand Lodge of *Austraasia*. If they declined, then I would leave them as at present, with jurisdiction over New Zealand, and directly amenable to the G. L. of U. S. This would probably be better than to attempt to revoke their Charter. Provision would have to be made in the Charter to the Grand Lodge of Australasia, excluding its jurisdiction over New Zealand until the latter yielded the point, or until the G. L. of U. S. acted.

This plan would require me to stop at Auckland a week only on my return. That is, having closed my business at Melbourne, I would take a coast steamer to Sydney, and thence to Auckland, in advance a week or

ten days of the regular San Francisco line.

You see the practical difficulty of bringing New Zealand and Australia into joint conference with me. I think the Order there would recognize it and make allowances. Still it is a matter of some nicety to decide as to the policy of not stopping at Auckland on my trip out. If they were written to one steamer ahead, one, two, or three leading men might conclude to go with me to Melbourne, or the latter might send some one or more back with me.

So much for the *time* and matter. As to the money, I see the appropriation is \$1,000, or whatever of it is *necessary*. If I go, the whole sum would have to be used, as my loss would be at least \$3,000. Can we, under the resolution, use the whole, if the *actual* expenses are less?

3d. As to our power, The resolution is broad, if you wish to so construe it. We are authorized to *adjust the complications*, and perform such other offices as the welfare of the Order requires. Now, the complication is, that there are two Grand Lodges, neither of which has *sufficient power*. To adjust would be to wipe out and *create*. Can you and RIDGELY, therefore, put your hands and the seal of the G. L. of U. S. to a *Charter*, leaving me to fill certain blanks? In short, does not the resolution, in effect, authorize you to grant a certain kind of a Charter—that is, a Charter such as ought originally to have been granted? I think so.

4th. It occurs to me, that I ought to have a copy of the reports of NICHOLSON and PORTER at secret session on *Uniform Work*, &c.; and also some other matters in Secret Journal.

I stop. You have enough to wade through, particularly as it may come to naught. Cogitate over these suggestions, and send them to Bro. RIDGELY, and write me; only don't delay.

Consider, among other things, whether it will not be wise to give up the trip.

Fraternally,

John B. Harmon, *D. G. S.*

I. O. O. F. OFFICE OF THE R. W. DEPUTY GRAND SIRE, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., San Francisco,

February 18, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGELY, *R. W. Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary*:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Yours of the 7th of February, notifying me that the Grand Sire has declined the mission to Australia and New Zealand, and that it now devolves upon me, is to hand this morning. The Grand Sire had suggested two or three months ago, that this contingency might arise; and in two letters to him I have already stated the difficulties in the way of my going to Australasia in his place; and have also discussed some of the questions which will demand settlement there. In my last, I requested him to confer with you, and to have made such preparations for my departure as seemed necessary. I also named April 15th as the earliest day I could leave, and promised to accomplish the object in view if possible. Your letter has given a fresh impulse, and I have determined to struggle hard to arrange my business so that either on March 18th or April 15th I may start. The trouble is, the great sacrifice a lawyer in full practice in a large city makes, when he quits his profession for so long a time as the mission to Australia requires. But having suffered much from this cause on one occasion heretofore, I may as well suffer a little more. Besides, what a man does for his fellow-men will count largely in the final trial balance-sheet of his life. He may lose some money, but in the great cause of humanity money weighs nothing as against love and duty. Let me add that a strong motive with me, is the happiness this mission, if successful, will give you. You have been urging this matter upon the Grand Lodge for years, and at last you have *almost* won; and I want you to be able to shout, "Victory."

In my last to the Grand Sire I asked for your joint views upon many things. Among them was whether it would be necessary to stop at New Zealand on my way out. Yours of the 7th inst., to the effect that you have received letters from there expressing satisfaction at my anticipated arrival, I suppose decides the matter. It would look ungracious at least to pass by Dunedin until my return. Still let me have your ideas.

Another thing I suggested, that it would be well to send me a copy of the reports of NICHOLSON and PORTER as to certain limits in conferring degrees, &c., &c. I am aware that these reports went over to the next session; but from hearing them read I thought they were substantially a statement of the correct practice *now*, without further legislation: and hence would be a good guide to me in some of the minutiae of the work. You can judge as to the necessity or propriety of sending the copy.

On yesterday I again read your report at the last session of G. L. of U. S. upon Australia, and I think I ought to have copies of one or two of the letters from there which you refer to but do not print in full.

Please turn to pages 7232 and 7236 Journal where you say,—"I also recommended that the two Grand Jurisdictions would harmonize in establishing the Grand Lodge of Australasia, and each become subordinate

thereto," and "in fact at this juncture, it will become necessary to organize the Grand Lodge of Australia under a new Charter, and to modify the present Charter of the Order in the colony of Victoria in the matter of its name," &c., &c., and consider these suggestions in connection with my last to the Grand Sire. Do we agree or not? If we differ, which is the better plan?

By offering to the Grand Lodge of Australia as now existing a new Charter constituting it a sovereignty in Odd Fellowship throughout Australasia, with the limitations named by me, we have a very simple plan. The body to be made *quasi* supreme has an identity; it is compact, accessible. On the other hand, if we create a Supreme Body out of *new* elements, what and where are they? what individuals and what Lodges? And when we have found the elements and made the body, then we must still modify the Charter of the present Grand Lodge of Australia and make it subordinate. By my plan, we *abolish* the Grand Lodge of Australia with its consent, and that ends the transaction. This new Supreme G. L. of Australasia could then grant a Charter to a Grand Lodge of Victoria having jurisdiction of the Subordinates in that colony; and the Grand Lodge of New Zealand could accept a Charter from the same source.

If, as you suggest on page 7232, the Grand Lodges of Australia and New Zealand should harmonize and agree to establish the Grand Lodge of Australasia, and become subordinate thereto, exactly how is that to be done? The two jurisdictions are 1,200 miles apart; the only plan which strikes me as feasible is to obtain the consent of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand as I go out. Suppose they decline?

Further: In any event, will it be necessary or advisable to have these two Grand Lodges, both or either, consult their *Subordinates*? The latter are now subject to their respective Grand Body, acting under a given Charter. Can they be placed under a new body without consent? Doubtless, the answer is, they will not object; and if they do, the supreme power of the G. L. of U. S., through its Deputy Grand Sire, must control.

Again: If we succeed in establishing the Grand Lodge of Australasia, what shall be the title of its chief executive officer—Grand Master or Grand Sire? The latter I take it.

By your report I see they have a Grand Encampment in Australia. This would become subordinate to the Grand Lodge of Australasia, and would require a new Charter from the latter; and probably necessitate the Royal Purple Degree as a qualification for membership in said Grand Lodge.

Now a few minor matters. You state in your report of 1877, that the revised rituals have not been received in New Zealand. If so, I will need them, including the book for instituting Grand Encampments. I presume the secret work and diagrams have never been seen in Dunedin. The work, of course, I know, and can give orally; and I will be a diagram myself. There will be trouble here, as our New Zealand brothers will be very anxious to be equally privileged with Australia

I would like a copy of the Charter of the G. L. of the German Empire, unless it is in some volume of the Journal.

The Charter made out for the new sovereign Grand Lodge ought to contain, in express terms, the clause of the *German Charter granting power to constitute Grand and Subordinate Lodges and Encampments*. This would be a constant reminder of the sovereign character of the Lodge.

It would aid our Australian brothers, if I should take with me a copy of Constitutions and By-Laws of some of our Grand Lodges—say Md., Pa., and Cal.; so of Subordinate Constitutions and Laws.

I have now in my two letters—one to the Grand Sire, and this to yourself—set forth some of the thoughts which have occurred to me in relation to the proposed mission. My object has been to draw from both of you in return advice, suggestions, opinions. There may be great difficulty in adjusting the complications in Australasia, or there may be little.

Having learned the entire facts, I shall take the responsibility of putting Odd Fellowship there on solid ground. No half-way measures will do; and I believe the brothers with whom I shall have to deal can be induced to adopt our views. The resolution of the G. L. of U. S., construed in connection with its defined foreign policy, is ample authority for us to establish the Grand Lodge of Australasia, with power equal to the Grand Lodge of the German Empire—excepting possibly the qualification for membership as to color; and I am clear that the resolution does not make this exception. Still, as this precise question of color was determined adversely to the wishes of Australia at the session of 1875, it must be deemed a finality in granting the new Charter.

I have just learned that Dunedin is several days from Auckland; and this compels me to take another steamer at the latter place, and adds to the time and expense of the trip. The route is as follows: 1st. Steamer from San Francisco to Auckland; 2d. Steamer from Auckland to Dunedin; 3d. Back to Auckland; 4th. Steamer to Sydney; 5th. Thence by another steamer to Melbourne; 6th. From Melbourne back to Sydney; 7th. Steamer home.

The job begins to look big; and if I could put hands on the Grand Sire just now, he might fare badly.

Fraternally,

JOHN B. HARMON, *DEPUTY G. S.*

Letter of Instructions. I. O. O. F. OFFICE OF THE M. W. GRAND SIRE, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., Philadelphia, Pa.,
March 4, 1878.

To JOHN B. HARMON,
R. W. Deputy Grand Sire:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—After offering to you and to the whole Order my sincere congratulations that your private affairs will permit you to accept the alternative appointment made by the Grand Lodge of the United States, "that in the event of the inability or refusal of the Grand Sire to perform the duty devolved upon him by law, to visit Australia and New Zealand, to effect an adjustment of the present complications there existing, and perform such other offices for the welfare of the Order there as in his judgment he may deem expedient, that the Deputy Grand Sire, JOHN B. HARMON, be authorized and empowered to act in his stead," I proceed to prepare and present for your consideration and guidance, in the performance of this important mission, such suggestions and instructions as appear to me will be useful and proper.

First.—I adopt and accept your letter dated San Francisco, Feb. 11, 1878, addressed to the M. W. Grand Sire, as presenting clear, succinct, and very intelligent views of the situation and complications in the Order in that remote jurisdiction; of the proper remedy for them, and of the most ready and feasible means of approaching the brethren in New Zealand and in Australia on the subject.

Second.—I suggest that your idea of inducing the Grand Lodge of Australia to voluntarily surrender its Charter, and to accept in lieu thereof a new Charter as *the Grand Lodge of Australasia*, adjusting satisfactorily to it the reservations of authority to the Grand Lodge of the United States claimed, viz., its exclusive right to regulate the work, traveling P. W., and cards, as part of its machinery, to make ubiquitous and uniform its control of visitation throughout the world.

Third.—As to the Grand Lodge of New Zealand and your idea to act independently of it, treating exclusively with the Grand Lodge of Australia, I respectfully suggest that you stop at Dunedin, disclose your purpose, and endeavor to conciliate that Grand Body, and get it also to surrender its Charter and accept one from the Grand Lodge of Australasia. In the event of any disagreement on the part of New Zealand to this arrangement, you will proceed with, your negotiations with the Grand Lodge of Australia, and issue to that body the Charter for *the Grand Lodge of Australasia* spoken of, leaving the Grand Lodge of New Zealand as at present constituted, subject to future legislation. You will also encourage all other Provinces, in which Subordinates exist, to organize Subordinate Grand Lodges under "*the Grand Lodge of Australasia*."

Fourth.—Concerning the special subjects in your letter of February 18th, addressed to the R. W. Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, not mentioned in the foregoing, I have to advise that the Grand Secretary will furnish copies of the letters and documents you suggest as important for you to have, and will reply in detail to the several queries. In all other respects, the views presented by you in your letters of February 11th and 18th (copies of which are hereto annexed), of the duty in the premises, are so practical and depend so much upon the circumstances of the position, that I cordially defer to them, and recommend you to carry them out as far as may be in your power.

Fifth.—The appropriation comprehends the whole sum named (one thousand dollars), which is at your disposal.

Sixth.—The Grand C. and R. Secretary will be directed to prepare blank Grand Warrants, properly signed and attested to meet such exigencies as may arise, which you will apply according to such exigencies in your discretion, deferring the ratification of all assumption of extraordinary powers, if any rendered necessary, to the Grand Lodge of the United States.

Seventh.—The Grand C. and R. Secretary will be further charged with the preparation of your proper commission and credentials as *Special Commissioner of the Grand Lodge of the United States* to the brotherhood in Australia and New Zealand, with power to adjust and settle definitely with them all questions touching Odd Fellowship at issue with them, especially such as relate to the form of government of the Order, and to the general prosperity and welfare of the institution; also to supply you with such books, documents, and proceedings as may be required to enable you satisfactorily to discharge your duty in the premises.

Eighth.—The Grand Secretary will also supply you with data in reference to the question of the right of the Grand Lodge of the United States to furnish Australia with cards, and you will find inserted in the new Charter a similar provision on that subject to that in the Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, in order to establish beyond controversy the *universality* of the laws of the Order as to the manner of visitation therein throughout the world -it being the undoubted attribute of the sovereignty of the G. L. of U. S.. as the supreme

head of the Order, to regulate this subject.

The Grand Sire, in concluding his instructions, would recommend to the Deputy Grand Sire, to avail himself of his opportunity to impart general instructions to the brotherhood upon the subject of Odd Fellowship, especially to address them wherever they can be assembled in considerable numbers, and to encourage them to our example, which has been so abundantly prospered throughout the world.

Wishing you a prosperous voyage, life and health adequate to so momentous and important a service; the special care and blessing of the Heavenly Father upon your long, distant, and perilous journey; success in your high, honorable, and useful mission; and a safe return to your home, family, and anxious brethren, I commit you with confidence to the keeping of *Him* who hath always vouchsafed the shelter and refuge of His outstretched wing to our beloved Order.

The Special Commissioner, Bro. JOHN B. HARMON, will report in detail the results of this important mission, at or before the next session of the Grand Lodge of the United States, the third Monday of September, 1878.

Yours very respectfully,

J. W. STOKES, *Grand Sire*.

Commission.

To JOHN B. HARMON,

Special Commissioner:

The Grand Lodge of the United States, I. O. O. F., having confidence in your ability and discretion, commission you, the Deputy Grand Sire of that Grand Body, as

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER,

to visit Australia and New Zealand and then and there represent that Grand Body in adjusting all subjects of conflict which have arisen between the respective jurisdictions, agreeably to the instructions this day committed to you, which you are to regard as your rule of action.

You will duly report your proceedings under this commission to the undersigned.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Grand Lodge of the United [SEAL.] States, this, the fourth day of March, A. d. 1878, and of our Order the fifty-ninth.

John W. Stokes, *Grand Sire*.

Jas. L. Ridgely, *Grand C. and R. Secretary*.

Charter for the Grand Lodge of Australasia.

INDEPENDENT ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS.

To all whom it may concern:

Know Ye, That the Grand Lodge of the United States of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, as the source of all true and legitimate Odd Fellowship in the United States of America, and by virtue of its constitutional authority to organize Lodges and Encampments, Grand and Subordinate, in Foreign Countries, doth hereby create and erect into distinct sovereignty the various Grand and Subordinate Lodges and Encampments now existing in the country known as Australasia, including Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and other islands, by the name and title of

THE RIGHT WORTHY GRAND LODGE OF AUSTRALASIA, I. O. O. F., to be independent of the Grand Lodge of the United States in all respects, excepting as follows:

First. The said Grand Lodge of Australasia shall not at any time hereafter in anywise alter or repudiate any of the signs, tokens, passwords, lectures or charges, or any other portion or part of either the written or unwritten work of the Order as known and practised within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the United States.

Second. This Grand Lodge reserves to itself the right to give said Grand Lodge of Australasia the annual

traveling password to be used within the jurisdiction thereof, and to prescribe the form of card; and both jurisdictions shall use the same traveling password; and also, the right to furnish all books containing the lectures and charges, and such cards and certificates as are now or may hereafter be prescribed by it.

Third. The qualifications for membership in the Subordinates within the jurisdiction of the said Grand Lodge of Australasia shall be as provided in Section 2, Article XYI. of the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of the United States.

The said Grand Lodge of Australasia shall have power to establish and grant Charters to other Subordinate Lodges and Encampments, and to other Grand Lodges and Grand Encampments within its jurisdiction; and when such other Lodges or Encampments, Subordinate or Grand, shall be so established, they shall sustain the same relations to the said Grand Lodge of Australasia as like Lodges and Encampments sustain to this Grand Lodge.

The said Grand Lodge of Australasia shall pay due respect to the Grand Lodge of the United States, and conform to the provisions of this instrument, otherwise this dispensation to be of no force or effect.

Given under our hands and the Seal of the Grand Lodge of the United States, at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, [SEAL.] this the fourth day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and Seventy-eight, and of our Order the fifty- ninth.

John W. Stokes, *Grand Sire.*

Jas. L. Ridgely, *Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary.*

I. O. O. F. OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, Baltimore, R. W. G. L. OF U. S.,
Md.,

March 4, 1878.

To JOHN B. HARMON,

Special Commissioner of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the U. S., I. O. O. F., to the Jurisdiction of Australasia:

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—In addition to the special instructions received from the M. W. Grand Sire, which are very appropriate, specific, and fully to the point, I reply to the several subjects mentioned in your letter of 18th ult., as follows:

1. The Grand Sire in his letter of instructions explained the importance of visiting the brethren in New Zealand, and I consider it absolutely essential to the success of the mission that you should visit Dunedin.

2. A copy of the "propositions" submitted to the last session by a special committee on Encampment work is herewith transmitted. This matter, you will, of course, carefully preserve, guard, and return to this office.

3. Concerning the letters from Australia printed with the report of the the Grand Secretary in Journal of 1877, I do not know which you refer to as important to have in full, or I would gladly send you complete copies.

4. Regarding my remarks found on pages 7232 and 7236, Journal of 1877, considered, as you suggest, in connection with the views expressed in your letter of Feb. 11th to the Grand Sire, I reply to your question: "Do we agree or not?" that our opinions are in harmony.

5. The provisions of the Charter fully explain, and agree with your views as to what is to constitute the Grand Lodge of Australasia. They are identical with the grant in the original Warrant to the. Grand Lodge of Australia, Journal of 1868, p. 4295; also with the Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, Journal of 1872, p. 5476. If deemed necessary the limits of the jurisdiction may be defined by adding after the words "known as Australasia" the proper boundary. I append some extracts from "Johnson's Cyclopaedia" and "Colton's Atlas," in relation to the country. It appears there are nine provinces in New Zealand, and six colonies in Australia. The Order also exists in Tasmania, where, it is probable, a Grand Lodge will be organized.

6. Touching the manner of organizing the Grand Lodge of Australasia, the initiatory proceedings might be by proxies, as was the case when the G. L. of U. S. was formed in 1824 (Journal, p. 63), by proxies from the Grand Lodges of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania, who with a Representative from Maryland (four men) constituted the Grand Lodge of the United States. On page 70, Journal of G. L. of U. S., will be found a copy of the first Constitution, Article I. of which provides for "a Representative or Proxy." It appears to me, if inconvenient for a Representative of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand to proceed with you to Melbourne, the officers might commission one of the Past Grand Masters of the Grand Lodge of Australia to represent the G. L. of New Zealand in the organization, or hand you a blank proxy with their consent to the arrangement proposed, and leave it to your discretion to select a proper person to represent them.

7. I do not think it necessary for the Grand Lodges of Australia and New Zealand to consult their Subordinates and agree with you that "they will not object, and if they do, the supreme power of the Grand

Lodge of the United States through its Deputy Grand Sire must control."

8. As to the title of the chief officer, undoubtedly "Grand Sire" is proper, and it was contemplated to have the following inserted in the Charter, but afterward deemed inexpedient to place it there, viz.: "The officers and members of the said Grand Lodge of Australasia shall be such as are prescribed in Article II. of the Constitution of the G. L. of U. S. for the officers and members of that body."

9. The Charter provides for the Grand and Subordinate Encampments being under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Australasia, I do not think that a new Charter would be required for the Grand Encampment of Victoria, as no change of name or jurisdiction will be necessary. The Encampment in New Zealand, will, of course, pass under the immediate jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Australasia, as also the Subordinate Lodges in Tasmania, New South Wales, South Australia, &c., though the Grand Lodge of Australasia, if it adopts a Constitution, etc., similar in its provisions to that of the G. L. of U. S., can place Subordinates under Grand Bodies of contiguous jurisdiction. (See By-Laws, Art. XIII.) The qualifications for membership in the Grand Lodge of Australasia should be identical with those required for membership in the Grand Lodge of the United States. (See Journal, J876, pages 6879-81.)

10. I inclose memorandum of supplies forwarded Feb. 1, 1878, to New Zealand. Bro. W. B. LYON, Grand Secretary, can inform you if the box has been forwarded from San Francisco, as we consigned it to him. You will note that all the revised books were sent. Three copies of the Grand Encampment Institution Books were sent to the Grand Encampment of Victoria. The secret work and diagrams have not been sent to "Subordinate Grand Lodges," and New Zealand must be considered such a body whether attached to the G. L. of Australasia or the G. L. of the United States. Australia and the German Empire were considered "sovereign and independent" jurisdictions; therefore, as specially directed by the G. L. of U. S., the work was placed in their possession.

11. The provisions of the Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire will be found on page 5476, Journal of 1872, and you will find that the Charter herewith, contains the clause you refer to. I send, as you request, Constitution of Grand and Subordinate Bodies.

12. I do not find anything to dissent from in the views expressed by you, and heartily agree with you that "no half-way measures will do," but that Odd Fellowship in Australasia should be placed on solid ground.

I have some further suggestions for your consideration which may be worthy your notice.

There are, as you know, two Grand Lodges in Australasia, viz.: the Grand Lodge of Australia, at Melbourne, Colony of Victoria, and the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, at Dunedin, N. Z.; the former under Charter from the Grand Lodge of the United States, the latter under Warrant from the Grand Lodge of Victoria (now the Grand Lodge of Australia), and recognized by it and also by the G. L. of U. S. as independent of and co-equal with the G. L. of Australia, at Melbourne.

The several reports of the G. C. and R. Secretary since the definite acquisition of this important jurisdiction and for several years previous, you will recollect, dwelt with interest and pride upon its value as a vast and productive field, if properly cultivated, especially of the advantage of the situation to us in view of our common origin and consequent homogeneity as a people. A slight drawback to us has unexpectedly arisen out of an error in the form of government for the Order which has crept in inadvertently, as much from our inability fully to carry out our original plan on account of the sparse occupancy of the Order and the prematurity of the plan to the improved condition of the country and its several Colonial governments or political divisions. Up to this time but two Subordinate Grand Lodges have been formed, whereas the number of Colonies or political divisions of the continent, as we understand, admit of Grand Lodges.

Thus it will be seen, that by keeping our original plan in view and sedulously cultivating the co-operation of our brethren of that jurisdiction, we shall ultimately surmount present obstacles. We shall be able to begin aright by erecting a Grand Lodge of *Australasia*, which shall embrace the continent, and of which the several defined political divisions will form the several representative subordinate parts. The Grand Lodges of Victoria and New Zealand forming the nucleus of that Supreme Grand Body, admitting the other divisions so soon as ready for forming Grand Lodges, adhering in all respects to our system as proved by experience to be appropriate and reliable.

You will find the brethren at Dunedin somewhat unfriendly to this plan, inasmuch as it will require a reconstruction of their Grand Lodge, which in this contingency would have to recognize the Grand Lodge of Australasia by taking a Grand Warrant from it, and by sending to it a Representative once a year, according to its Constitution. At first this Supreme Body would be weak, but its growth, power, and influence would be alone a question of time. As the other Provinces or political divisions of the country united with it, its strength and power would be settled and fixed. In a few years, the Grand Lodge of Australasia, I. O. O. F., would become a power in the great world of philanthropy, an honor to the human race, and especially the glory of American Odd Fellowship. This is your message and mission to your brother Odd Fellows of Australasia. I pray that the winds of Heaven may be propitious and that the Almighty will have you in his keeping amid the

perils which you will have to brave, and return you safely to your home, your family, and friends, having fulfilled your task to the satisfaction of the cause, the consolidation of Odd Fellowship throughout the world, and for the increased love and fellowship of the human race.

May God bless you, protect you and yours, and restore your precious life to us in due time, as a messenger of peace to your fellow-men.

Yours always,

Jas. L. Ridgely, C. S.

Without undertaking to present in detail the special subjects of correspondence which have occupied our attention with the authorities of the Order in the continent of Australasia, I may say generally that the foregoing topic has absorbed all others, except that of the issue of cards by the present Grand Lodges. The exercise of such independent authority has never been even constructively recognized by the Grand Lodge of the United States, nor could it have been consistently with our system of Traveling Cards and of the A. T. P. W.; but the necessity of any present discussion of the subject is superseded by the presence of our Special Commissioner in Australasia, who will doubtless be able to adjust all subjects of difference, including the exclusive authority of the Grand Lodge of the United States to regulate the form of card, whose ubiquity as well as universality in American Odd Fellowship must be conceded. To enable him to act understandingly, a condensed statement of the entire legislation of the G. L. of U. S. on the subject of supplies to Australia and other jurisdictions was carefully prepared and placed in the hands of the Special Commissioner.

It is now hoped, as well from the large intelligence displayed by all the parties on the subject, from the thorough sympathy of our Commissioner in our special views, and from the greatly enlarged area of usefulness contemplated by the unity and domestic independence of the federal system designed to be now inaugurated, and the proper adaptation of the people and their system of government by Provinces, or political subdivisions, that harmony and union of counsels will reward our efforts, and that as a result the course of fraternity and brotherly love will be greatly promoted among the different nations of the earth, especially among the Anglo-Saxon race. In consequence of the remoteness of the country, and the comparatively unsettled policy of the Grand Lodge of the United States concerning the propagation of Odd Fellowship to foreign countries, but little progress was made in that direction until the successful advent of the Order to Germany in 1870, under the wise direction of our illustrious and beloved brother, JOHN F. MORSE, P. G. M., to California. Since that auspicious consummation and the formation of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire and several Subordinate Grand Lodges in Europe, the more enlightened counsel has prevailed in the Grand Lodge of the United States of foreign propagandism, so that American Odd Fellowship now prevails in British America, in Europe, on the continent of Australasia, in the Republic of Chile, in Peru, and in the Islands of the Sea. In organizing Odd Fellowship in Australasia, notwithstanding the mistake committed in form of government, which is not to be wondered at under the circumstances and surrounding difficulties, we have reason to be gratified with the general accuracy of the measures adopted. We are satisfied that the unwritten language was communicated by Special D. G. Sire MEACHAM with correctness. Since Bro. MEACHAM'S presence in Melbourne, Dunedin, and at other points in that country, the formal unwritten text and illustrative diagrams have been transmitted and received by the authorities at Melbourne, and have verified the truth of this fact. Thus upon the return of our worthy brother, the Deputy Grand Sire, and his successful negotiations upon the special subjects which now estrange us, we shall be as correct in form as we are in substance, and the general welfare and prosperity will thus be permanently assured.

On the 27th of June a letter was received from Bro HARMON, dated Wellington, New Zealand, May 18th, from which I make a brief extract as follows:

"To-day I leave for Christ Church, where Bro. BRAITHWAITE is to meet me. Some new features will probably arise in my efforts at adjustment; matters which we know little of I can see looming up. The situation of this country has been entirely misunderstood by us, as I have learned by reading and conversation with Australians and New Zealanders on the ships. Instead of being out of the world I find myself in the midst of civilization with its schools, churches, museums, libraries, etc. It was high time for the G. L. of U. S. to send some one here."

From publications in the newspapers we learn that our Commissioner was gladly welcomed in New Zealand, receptions having been tendered him at various points, and a superb dinner in honor of his arrival was served at the Theatre Royal Hotel, Wellington, on the 18th of May, when Bro. HARMON made an eloquent address in reply to a toast to "The Grand Lodge of the United States." On all sides the kindest feelings were expressed for the Order in this country, Mr. MCKENZIE, of the Manchester Unity, remarking that he was "extremely gratified to meet an officer of such high standing in America, and it shows that the heart beats in the right place when they send out such a gentleman to visit this far-off land in the interests of this noble work."

The correspondence had with the authorities of Australia and New Zealand has been quite voluminous, and only short extracts will be made from the several letters received and sent since the last session.

The letter from this office dated Sept. 29th transmitted, by direction of the M. W. Grand Sire, the P. W's for the year 1878, of which proper acknowledgment has been received

On the 1st of October Grand Secretary CURTIS was advised of the action of the G. L. of U. S. in authorizing a Commissioner to Australia and New Zealand, also of the adoption of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of cards, taking occasion to say: "You will find the argument of the committee fully sustained by the record, and I take it for granted that the law in the premises will be promptly conformed to. I shall write by this mail a similar letter to Bro. BRAITHWAITE, G. M. of New Zealand, and thus place the two Grand Jurisdictions, all we have in Australasia, in full possession of the important legislation, in order that they may confer, if necessary, to enable them to harmonize in opinion and judgment in this momentous matter, before the arrival of the American Commissioner."

The reply to this letter by Grand Secretary CURTIS is dated Melbourne, Nov. 28, 1877, and to comply with the request contained therein, the following extract is presented:

"I beg to acknowledge your kind favor of October 1st, and am very much pleased to hear from so good a judge as yourself that the recent session of your Grand Lodge was so complete a success.

"The decision of the R. W. G. L. of U. S. in reference to our '*clearance forms*' has given rise to a great deal of unfavorable comment. We cannot imagine how the Committee on Foreign Relations could have fallen into so lamentable an error as that contained in the following paragraph: '*That one of the specifications in the Charter of the Grand lodge of Australia provides that all cards issued by that jurisdiction shall emanate from the Grand lodge of the United States.*' Surely they must have been examining the copy of some other Charter, or else a copy of something intended to have been inserted in our Charter, and, upon more mature consideration, expunged. I inclose you a copy of our Charter, and you will see that there is not one word in it about cards. Moreover, as certain things are therein enumerated which we are not to do, it is implied that it will be lawful for us to do all others. Any jurist will understand this. I send you by this same mail a report of the last meeting of our Standing Committee, wherein you will see that the following resolutions were passed:

"That, whilst the committee is most willing to obey the just commands of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of the United States, it most respectfully yet strongly protests against the groundless accusation of having violated its Charter, which does not contain one single word in reference to Clearance or Visiting Cards, but merely states that we are to use the same traveling password. The Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire does (we believe) contain such a restriction in reference to the cards. It is, however, unfair to bind us to the terms of any other Charter than our own.

"*Resolved*, That our Grand Secretary write to Gr. Secretary Bro. RIDGELY, and ask him to be kind enough to give the same publicity to our respectful denial as has been given to the mistaken assertion of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"As the premises on which the R. W. G. L. of U. S. grounded its resolution were completely erroneous, we must ask for the matter to be reconsidered. We had several copies of your cards circulated among our Lodges, but they were replaced by our own forms and were destroyed, so that we should have to purchase fresh stock. However, I have no doubt that the matter will be amicably arranged by the Commissioner when he arrives."

The following is the copy of Charter sent by Grand Secretary CURTIS, which it will be observed, varies slightly from the printed copy on page 4295, Journal of G. L. of U. S., 1868.

"To all whom it may concern: Know ye that the G. L. of XJ. S. of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, as the source of all true and legitimate Odd Fellowship in the United States of America, and by virtue of its constitutional authority to organize Lodges and Encampments, Grand and Subordinate, in foreign countries, doth hereby create and erect into a distinct sovereignty the various Lodges of Odd Fellows heretofore existing in Australia by the name and style of 'The Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of Australia,' with power in all matters relating to Odd Fellows within the said Province, except in the following respects, viz.: That the said 4 The Grand Lodge of Australia' shall not at any time hereafter in anywise alter or repudiate any of the signs, tokens, passwords, lectures, charges, or any part or portion of either the written or unwritten work of the Order as known and practised within the jurisdiction of the said 4 The Grand Lodge of the United States,' and both jurisdictions shall use the same traveling password. That the qualifications for membership in the Subor- dinate Lodges within the jurisdiction of the said 'The Grand Lodge of Australia,' shall be identical with those established for membership in Subordinate Lodges within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the United States, otherwise this Dispensation to be of no form or effect.

"J. P. Sanders, *Grand Sire*.

"J. L. Ridgely, *Grand Secretary*.

"Dated 3d June, 1868."

This letter was received February 2, 1878, but the minutes of the Standing Committee arrived on the 24th of January, when the following reply was addressed to Grand Secretary CUKTIS:

"It has been found necessary to make full quotations from the printed proceedings of the Standing Committee to render the reply which I shall make in defence of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, intelligible and of proper force.

"First, I will frankly concede that the committee have erred in stating that 'the card issued is in contravention of the *terms* of the Charter,' and 'that one of the specifications in the Charter of the Grand Lodge of Australia provides that all cards issued by that jurisdiction shall emanate from the Grand Lodge of the United States.' This is certainly error, superinduced possibly by the existence of such provision in the Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire; more probably, from the utter inability of the G. L. of U. S. to surrender so vital and indispensable an attribute of its sovereignty to enable it to maintain a uniform T. P. W. and card throughout the world. It is, however, an unimportant inquiry how the committee fell into the error. It is conceded to be error. The simple question is: Is the card illegal otherwise, and has it been improperly interdicted in the jurisdiction? I do not propose to occupy many words in the vindication of this position. Let us examine for a moment the Charter of the Grand Lodge of Australia. The sovereignty in Odd Fellowship granted in your jurisdiction, is limited in the second and third paragraphs to the *third* more particularly I refer (although the second is quite definite and comprehensive), viz.: 'That this Grand Lodge reserves to itself the right to give to the said the Grand Lodge of Australia the annual traveling password, to be used within the jurisdiction of the said the Grand Lodge of Australia, and both jurisdictions *shall* use the same traveling password.' The position assumed is that *the card issued by the Grand Lodge of Australia is unauthorized and of course illegal.*

"*First*, because it is an 'alteration and repudiation of the work of the Order as known and practised within this jurisdiction' forbidden by the first section (second paragraph) of its Charter. See also Digest, title 'Cards,' Sec. 214 *et passim*. It need only be remarked that cards are a fundamental part of the machinery of our system and are an indispensable part of the detail of the traveling password which the G. L. of U. S. *alone* supplies throughout the globe

"*Second*. The *casus omissus* of this condition in your Charter *in words* is abundantly supplied by its *ubiquity in spirit* in every part of the document, and the utter want of ability which the Supreme Grand Body would thereby possess to enforce uniformity and universality in its T. P. W. or its system of work wherever the Order is established.

"I shall with pleasure give the publicity to the minutes of your Standing Committee on this subject which you desire, by giving the same publicity to your denial as has been given to the mistaken assertion of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"And now, having with the best grace of which we are capable, considered the mistake of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in assuming in their report the existence in your Charter *in terms* of a clause requiring the emanation of all cards issued in your jurisdiction from the G. L. of U. S., and shown the presence of such a provision in the Charter *in spirit* and in un- avoidable combination with the reservation to supply what the general system of work requires, we have done, and fraternally conclude this communication, satisfied that you will promptly retire the cards and conform to our law on the subject with pleasure."

On the 2d of February Grand Secretary CURTIS was informed:

"Your favor of Nov. 28th has been this day received at this office, I am sorry that our respective Grand Lodges should apparently be getting asunder, instead of drawing closer together in conformity to first principles and to the instinctive fellowship of our beloved Order.

"The present aspect is inauspicious, it is true, but it involves no irreconcilable conflict. Patience, forbearance, intelligence, and a spirit of reciprocal love for Odd Fellowship, will, it is believed, restore our fraternal relations and adjust our system upon a sound basis, so that the superstructure will be everywhere a unit, everywhere solid and enduring. I have already replied to the minutes of your Standing Committee in that spirit, and now feel persuaded that your Grand Lodge will respond correspondingly. The question of the uniform card is a vital one, and involves not only the supremacy as to jurisdiction and authority, but also the entire possibility of maintaining the system of ubiquitous visitation, which is an essential and indispensable part of our working machinery. The system in the jurisdiction of the German Empire is simple and free from all trouble. The card is supplied by us in the English language; authority is conferred to print the text on the reverse side of the card in German, thus the same card emanating from the head of the Order circulates in both jurisdictions and is equally effective, vital, and convenient, maintaining one supreme law and one entire working system. How easily you perceive all conflicts of right and jurisdiction are avoided, and how beautifully harmony of system is maintained. I respectfully commend this practice to your imitation and adoption "

The letter of J. H. B. CURTIS, It. W. Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Australia, of September 17, 1877, refers to the meeting of the Grand Lodge at Melbourne on the 21st, 22d, and 23d of August, remarking:

"You will observe that the two important questions in reference to the Clearance Cards and the Supreme Grand Lodge of Australasia were left for the decision of the Standing Committee. I do not think it probable that a Grand Lodge of Australasia will be formed for sometime; meanwhile, I ask your instruction as to the granting of Warrants or Charters to Grand Lodges in any of the Australian or Australasian Provinces. There are now six Lodges opened in South Australia, of which Adelaide is the chief city. To whom must they apply for a Charter for a Grand Lodge? In yours of 17th of July (which I received yesterday), you speak of the R. W. Grand Lodge of New Zealand as being subordinate to our Grand Lodge. I fear it will scarcely be prepared to acknowledge any such subordination. It seems to me that, until the Grand Lodge of Australasia is *de facto* established, Charters for all Grand Lodges in Australia must be issued from the Grand Lodge of the United States. Please give me definite instructions in this matter at your very earliest convenience.

"At the end of the Journal of the Grand Lodge you will find a brief report of the proceedings of the Grand Encampment. From it you will perceive that I have been elected Grand Scribe, FREDERICK BATCHELDOR is M. W. Grand Patriarch; WILLIAM GANE, M. W. Grand Master."

To the above a reply was sent on the 27th of October, from which I quote as follows:

"You inquire of me as to the granting of Warrants or Charters to Grand Lodges in the Australasian Provinces, premising what you have to say with the remark that, you do not think it probable that a Grand Lodge of Australasia will be formed for some time.' Proceeding upon the theory of a federal government in Odd Fellowship for Australasia all applications for Colonial or Provincial Grand Lodges which are to form the Supreme Lodge, should be to the Grand Lodge of the United States. I spoke of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand as being subordinate to your Grand Lodge, from the fact, that it was not authorized by the Grand Lodge of the United States. More recent information, as you will perceive in my last report, removes all doubt about its illegal status in the Order. It claims to have been organized by Bro. MEACHAM, D. D. G. Sire of the G. L. of U. S., by and with the consent of the Grand Lodge of Victoria, and that it is a Co-Grand Lodge of equal power and privileges with the G. L. of Victoria (now Australia); is wholly independent of it, pays no tribute to it, and occupies the same position as that of a State Grand Lodge in our federation. I notice in the printed address of G. Master BRAITHWAITE to the G. L. of New Zealand, session of 1877, a reiteration of his position, that 'a Supreme Grand Lodge for Australasia, to which the Colonial Grand Lodges should all be subordinate, would be expensive, unworkable, and without any advantage,' also that they, the G. L. of New Zealand, desired to retain the position it had hitherto held, viz.:—that of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, co-equal to the Grand Lodge of Australia, and subordinate only to the Grand Lodge of the United States. This is a remarkable position to occupy on the question of independence and national sovereignty. A communication received from Bro. MEACHAM and published on pages 7415, 7416, Journal of 1877, establishes the fact that the Grand Lodge of New Zealand has no such status as is assumed by Grand Master BRAITHWAITE. The letter referred to contains this remarkable passage. 'In 1869, by virtue of a Charter granted by the Grand Lodge of Victoria, which had already received a Charter from the G. L. of U. S., I established the same Order in New Zealand, and gave to them the signs, working password, etc.' Hence G. M. BRAITHWAITE'S position is not well taken."

This letter was promptly acknowledged by Grand Secretary CURTIS on the 26th of December, who said:

"We were all particularly interested in reading the copy you inclosed of a letter received from Bro. A. D. MEACHAM at the last session. It had been rumored in Melbourne that he had gone over to the 'great majority' some years ago; we are happy to find that he is still alive, and that he takes an interest in our welfare, notwithstanding that, owing to his somewhat isolated position, he is not quite *au fait* with our doings here. I had not the honor of his acquaintance, but many of the brothers here speak very highly of the pains that he took to indoctrinate them in the working of the new system.

"I submit to you, with great respect for your superior judgment, that the only way of giving a legal status to the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, would be by giving them a Charter from the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States. I have this day written to the M. W. Grand Sire, Bro. JOHN W. STOKES, giving him some particulars about the voyage. I hope he will be able to spare the time to visit us, as there can be no doubt that his presence will fan the flame of Odd Fellowship, and be the means of bringing many under its genial influence who might otherwise remain in the cold.

"I have a piece of intelligence which I have no doubt will be gratifying to you. In a conversation which I had a few days ago with my friend Mr. JACOB HART, the Grand Secretary of the Victoria branch of the Manchester Unity, he told me that at the coming meeting of their A. M. C. they are going to remove from their Constitution a law which forbids members of any other society calling themselves Odd Fellows from joining their body. Mr. HART is a very intelligent man, and so are all their Grand Officers. We often confer together privately on subjects of mutual interest. You will also be glad to hear that about two years ago they, and the officers of other friendly societies here, paid me the high compliment of electing me chairman of a conference of all the friendly societies for the purpose of watching the progress of a Bill introduced into Parliament to amend The Friendly Societies' Act. This Bill received the Governor's sanction a few days ago, and will shortly

come, into operation.

"I perceive that some of the officers of some of your State Grand Lodges fall into the error that we are bound by all your Constitutional laws. This could not possibly be the case, as we must conform to the friendly Societies' Act. The chairman of the Committee of Correspondence of some State Grand Lodge (I forget which) gave us some very unnecessary hints, owing to his want of knowledge in reference to this matter."

Letters referring to the visit of the Special Commissioner were addressed to Grand Master GANE and Grand Secretary CURTIS, February 8th and 28th, and March 6th and 7th.

In the letter of March 6th the receipt of Grand Secretary CURTIS' letter of December 26th, which reached this office March 2d, was acknowledged, from which I quote as follows:

"I was glad to observe the cordial relations which subsist between you and Mr. HART, Gr. Sec'y of the Victoria branch of the Manchester Unity. That is right, and will do much to conciliate all good citizens. That is not only the correct policy, but is also a correct principle. Do not let the course of any of our State officers disturb your equanimity. The G. L of U. S. will do you no harm or in any way trespass upon your rights; but on the contrary will ever uphold them and advance them by all legitimate means. Above all, will it uphold you in your constitutional prerogatives, and shelter you from wrong. Of course you will be strenuously sustained in deferring promptly and thoroughly to the laws of your country, and in viewing them as paramount and obligatory."

On the 25th of July a letter was received from J. H. B. CURTIS, R. W. Gr. Sec'y, dated Melbourne June 15, 1878, as follows:

"I have the honor and the very great pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your very kind letter of 5th of March, 1878, which was delivered into my hands on Sunday, June 9th, by R.W. Deputy Grand Sire, Bro. J. B. HARMON. We had been very anxiously on the lookout for the good brother for two days previously, as we had received a telegram from Bro. BRAITHWAITE, informing us that he had started from Dunedin. Grand Master GANE, Deputy Grand Master JUDGE, two members of our Parliament, Bros. Bidston and COOK, Past Grand Masters BATCHELDOR and KIDSTON, also myself, went to Sandridge to meet the Commissioner and escort him to town. We took apartments for him at one of our best clubs. On Monday, 10th, he was entertained at a sumptuous banquet provided by P. G. M. KIDSTON, at which all the leading brothers of the Order in Melbourne, including the consul, Mr. S. P. LORD, were present.

"We have had two meetings of the Standing Committee of our R.W. G. L., at which Bro. HARMON fully propounded the manner in which he proposes to arrange matters for our more perfect government. I don't think there will be any difficulty worth mentioning in carrying out the plan. It is an enormous advantage for us to have as your Commissioner a man of so much erudition and with the legal acumen of Bro. HARMON. Although from the kind eulogium you had passed upon him in your two former letters (the receipt of which I should have acknowledged earlier), we had expected to see almost a perfect type of an American Odd Fellow, still I speak nothing more than the bare truth when I assert that our expectations have been more than realized. I know, my dear brother, that your kind heart will always cause you to say everything possible in praise of a brother, but you really could not exaggerate the merits of Bro. HARMON. He is truly a man whom to know is to love. I deeply regret that the stern necessity of bread-winning will not allow me to spend more time in his dear company; there is so much to be learned in conversing with him. He has edified and delighted us beyond measure in the Lodge-room. He performed the ceremony of initiation in the Duke of York Lodge, No. 1, on Tuesday night last, and you will be gratified to know that in comparing our manner of giving the S. W. with his perfect model, we find that we are strictly accurate. This is, of course, owing to the kindness of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States in sending us the means of securing such accuracy.

"I have a great deal that I could say to you, but am very much pressed for time, and am only writing these few lines because I know that Bro. HARMON is very busy. This morning I saw him off for Ballarat, the next place in importance to Melbourne. He is to be entertained there at a public banquet on Monday night. I send you a copy of a document that we issued, that you may see some of the arrangements.

"I can assure you that no language can adequately express our indebtedness to you and to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States for this proof of your interest in our welfare in sending to us so distinguished a Commissioner. "

The circular of Grand Secretary CURTIS is appended as follows:

I. O. O. F. GRAND LODGE OF AUSTRALIA, GRAND SECRETARY'S OFFICE, Melbourne,

12th June, 1878.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER:

It is my very pleasing duty to inform you officially of the arrival of Bro. J B. HARMON, Deputy Grand Sire,

G. L. of U. S. This distinguished brother has been commissioned by the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States to come to Australia for the purpose of placing our system of government on a more perfect basis, giving us enlarged powers, and making us harmonize with the grand model of the United States. Bro HARMON has already been present at two meetings of the Standing Committee of our R. W. Grand Lodge, and has given the amplest proof of his pre-eminent qualifications for the mission which has been intrusted to him. We have no doubt that almost every individual brother would like to have it in his power to say that he has enjoyed the honor of grasping the hand of one of the truest and most accomplished Odd Fellows in the world.

Unfortunately for us, Bro. HARMON'S stay in Victoria will be very short, as he must leave Sydney for San Francisco on the 18th July. Bro. HARMON has kindly made the following arrangements:—He will proceed to Ballarat on Saturday, 15th, and will be present at the banquet to be given by the brothers of the Ballarat District on Monday 17th. He will remain at Ballarat till the 18th. He will be at Castlemaine on Wednesday, 19th; at Sandhurst on Thursday, 20th; at Echuca on Friday, 21st. He will return to Melbourne on Saturday, 22d. On Monday, 24th, he will be at Geelong; at Winchelsea on Tuesday, 25th; at Colac on Wednesday, 26th. He will return to Melbourne on the 27th. On Monday, 1st July, a public banquet will be given to him in Melbourne, the arrangements for which will shortly be advertised. He will leave Victoria for Sydney about the 6th of July.

The M. W. Grand Master feels that it is quite superfluous for him to bespeak for Bro. HARMON the kind attention of the brothers in the districts that he visits. Bro. HARMON would desire to visit each individual Lodge, for his heart seems to revel in the society of the Lodge-room; but as it would be impossible for him to indulge this wish, it is hoped that, when he is visiting a Lodge, the brothers in the district will make it their business to go to that Lodge. He will visit some of the Melbourne Lodges on his return from the country, but he cannot yet make further definite arrangements. The Worthy D. D. G. M's in the country districts that Bro. HARMON is to visit will please arrange with the N. G. and other Lodge officers for summoning the brothers to meet Bro HARMON on the nights indicated above, when the brothers will enjoy a treat which they have never yet experienced, and which they may never again have in their life—a treat which would well repay a journey of many miles. I am, dear sir and brother,

Yours in F., L. & T.,

*J. H. B. Curtis,
Grand Secretary.*

By order of the M. W. G. M.

The letter of Bro. CURTIS was answered on the 1st of August, as follows:

"The links which bind us have incorporated ourselves not only in one body, but resolved our natures into unity. Let us thank God, then, that we have labored zealously to this grand consummation, and that our leading men and legislators may direct the auspicious promise which now smiles upon American Odd Fellowship until it shall bring together in one fold the scattered tribes of Judah. I acknowledge with great pleasure yours, dated Melbourne, June 15, 1878, and give you sincere congratulation at the very grand diplomatic results, through the agency of our talented Special Commissioner, which it announces. I am exceedingly happy that he has proved himself equal to the crisis, and that success, complete and thorough, has rewarded his labors and personal sacrifices which have been great to a brother of his professional ability. When we have been able to realize the magnitude of the service rendered by Bro. HARMON to Odd Fellowship after our experience of results in a year or two, we shall be ready to exclaim in grateful homage to all who have participated in the persistent work, 4 Well done, good and faithful servants; ye have been zealous and faithful to the end. May God remember you when he makes up his jewels.' I do not propose at this time to answer your elaborate letter, which will be reported to the G. L. of U. S., but simply to render you well-deserved thanks for the unremitted interest which you have taken in this very great subject, and to felicitate you upon its enduring success. May God crowd your temples of Odd Fellowship with new recruits, and reunite our brethren wherever divided, throughout the world."

The Proceedings of the twenty-fourth Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge of Australia, held at Melbourne, Aug. 21st, 22d, and 23d, 1877, and Minutes of the Standing Committee, November 12th, 1877, February 11th and May 6th, 1878, were duly received and supply important information. The report of the Grand Master, Bro. HUGH ROSS, is an interesting document. He speaks of his efforts to open new Lodges through correspondence with 110 members, "scattered not only through nearly every town, hamlet, and district in this Colony, but also over the other Colonies," as meeting with such success as warrants the expectation of speedily establishing many Lodges at places where none now exist. Twenty-two decisions were reported. He quotes the statistics presented in the Journal of the G. L. of U. S. to show the "progress of the Order," remarking: "It is gratifying to be able to report that the Order, both abroad and at home, has never been in such

a flourishing condition. In America, its already gigantic proportions have been considerably enlarged: while in Europe—especially Switzerland—and the other dominions into which it has more recently been introduced, it has increased to a very large extent."

The Grand Secretary, Bro. CURTIS, said, "The triumphant achievements that have adorned the year 1876-7 have been richly earned by the untiring zeal of him who has so worthily filled the highest post of honor that it is in your power to bestow. Two Lodges opened in New South Wales, five in South Australia, and four in our own Colony may well be called a 'triumph,' of which every officer and Representative of this honorable body may be justly proud." He reports the membership, March 30, 1877, in Victoria and Tasmania as 2,750, an increase of 310 during the year; the total, including New South Wales and South Australia, being 3,380. "A list of Lodges and nights of meeting for the year 1878," gives the names and location of 45 Lodges in Victoria, 3 in Tasmania, 4 in New South Wales, 9 in South Australia, making a total of 61 under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Australia, an increase of 17 during the year.

Assets of 43 Lodges in Victoria and 3 in Tasmania \$55,015, increase \$13,647

Paid to sick members 9,800 increase 147

Total receipts 44,400 increase 7,851

Expenditure from incidental fund 21,310

Funeral fund disbursed by Grand Lodge \$2,900

Sick pay disbursed by Subordinates 9,800

Total relief for the year \$12,700

General Funeral Fund of the Grand Lodge, June 30, 1877 \$21,240 00

Grand Lodge Fund in hands of the Trustees \$19,700 00

In Bank 1,110 00

20,810 00

Interest on investments received during the year 770 00

The indebtedness on Hall and Asylum amounts to 6,235 00

The published correspondence occupies 38 pages of the Journal, embracing the several letters from this office and the replies thereto. The session was apparently an interesting one, largely attended, and the business transacted in a systematic manner. The session of 1878 was to be held at Castle-maine, August 20, 1878.

The Journal of the Grand Encampment (August 21, 1877) is printed with the Grand Lodge Proceedings. It appears there are 3 Encampments in Victoria and one in New Zealand under the jurisdiction of the Grand Encampment of Victoria. The number of Patriarchs now good on the books is 120. No further statistics concerning this branch of the Order are given.

The minutes of the quarterly meetings of the Standing Committee, Nov. 12th, Feb. 11th, and May 6th were duly received, from which we learn of the institution, since the session of the Grand Lodge in August, of ten new Lodges. In the Loyal Secundus, No. 9, Adelaide, South Australia, *one hundred and twenty-two* candidates were initiated on the opening night, and on the night of institution of the Loyal Lincoln Lodge, No. 96, at the Swan Hotel, in Gertrude Street, Fitzroy, Victoria, *fifty-two* candidates were initiated. The Finance Committee "are sorry to be compelled to notice that some of the older and at one time promising Lodges have the half of their members unfinancial." At the February session Grand Secretary CURTIS made an interesting report of his visit to Sydney and Newcastle, New South Wales, under a special commission from Grand Master GANE, and at the May session G. Master GANE reported the visit of the Grand Master, and Deputy G. Master JUDGE to South Australia, where at Adelaide he had instituted the Loyal Alberton Lodge, No. 10, and the Loyal Bon Accord Lodge, No. 11, with over *sixty* members each. Since his return another Lodge had been opened, called the Loyal Excelsior, No. 12. A Lodge is about to be organized at Gawler, about 25 miles from Adelaide, also one at Charters Towers, in Queensland, and measures were taken to establish one at Abbotsford. The consideration of the subject of "clearance forms" was "postponed until the meeting of the Standing Committee, which will be held after the arrival of the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire Bro. HARMON." A committee was appointed "to receive the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire, and attend to his comfort," the Standing Committee resolved to meet immediately after his arrival, and it was also "*Resolved*, That the Brothers of the Order be invited to a demonstration to be given in Melbourne to the R. W. Deputy Grand Sire, Bro. JOHN B. HARMON."

The correspondence with the authorities of New Zealand embraces letters from JOSEPH BRAITHWAITE, G. M., dated Sept. 25, Oct. 5, and Oct. 30, 1877, also as P. G. M., Nov. 10 and Nov. 14, 1877; Jan. 31 and Feb. 28, 1878; with letters from this office dated Sept. 29, Oct. 1, Oct. 29, and Nov. 30, 1877, Jan. 3, Feb. 6, Feb. 7, Feb. 28, March 7, and March 8, 1878, to Brother BRAITHWAITE, his successor. Bro. MCGAW, and Grand Secretary WILSON.

From the letter of G. M. BRAITHWAITE, dated Sept. 25th, I quote the following:

"Our Grand Lodge has, after an animated and well-conducted debate, unanimously adopted 'Table C,' as amended herewith, respecting new rates of contributions, applicable only to members joining after Dec. 31st of

this year. Members previous to that date to pay the old rate, viz.: 1s. 3d. per week all round. Personally, the opinion held by me is, that the latter is inequitable, inasmuch as, if it is a fact, according to the four tables prepared by Messrs LESLIE and BLACK, that our rates were insufficient for the benefits we promise ourselves in the future from 26 years of age upward, then it follows, as a matter of course, that the mere fact of raising the subscriptions to a correct charge on members joining after a certain date, will not counterbalance the inadequate rates contributed by those who were members prior to that date. Many other sound arguments can be advanced proving the inequality of the arrangement. However, we made a step in advance in financial reform, and considering that all the societies here are working upon our old system, it was a hopeful sign to see that our Representatives were of one mind so far as the matter went. No doubt time will prove the anomaly created by charging two prices for exactly the same goods. Perfection cannot be obtained all at once, and I am therefore pleased to see that our Grand Lodge has commenced in its early existence to concede some points in financial reform. We can therefore rest content that from this basis all evils of a similar character will be rectified as experience points the road."

"Table C" (converting the currency of the country into United States currency) provides as follows:

"Benefits allowed after 12 months' membership: Sick, \$5.00 per week for the first six months, \$2.50 for the second, \$1.25 after 12 months. Funeral, \$100.00 on death of a member, \$50.00 on the death of a member's wife (for one wife only). Surgeon and Chemist's benefits immediately on joining.

"Initiation fees: 18 to 25 years, \$5.00. 26 to 30, \$6.25; 31 to 40, \$7.50; 41 to 45, \$10.00.

"Contributions to Sick, Funeral, and Management Funds (Management expenses limited to 15 cents per week, per member, allowance being made for Initiation and Honorary members' fees), per quarter of 13 weeks: 18 to 20 - years, \$3.80; 21 to 25, \$4.06; 26 to 30, \$4.33; 31 to 35, \$4.87; 36 to 40, \$5.41; 41 to 45, \$5.95. The amounts to be appropriated to 'Sick Fund' and to 'Funeral Fund' are specified, as of the \$5.95 from members from 41 to 45 years of age, \$2.97 are placed to the - Sick 'and 95 cents to the' Funeral Fund.' After deducting from each quarter's subscription the amount thus appropriated, the balance is to be credited to the 'Management Fund' for payment of general expenses only, including Surgeon and Chemist; also all initiation fees, including honorary members' subscriptions, are to be placed to this fund, which added together represent 15 cents per week paid by every member as working expenses. If management expenses of any Lodge exceed this rate, a levy shall be raised to meet the difference, so as to keep the Sick and Funeral Funds intact.

"During the last two years, the following are the members initiated, also ages when admitted, as far as Return Sheets show: 10 from 18 to 20 years, 60 from 21 to 25, 56 from 26 to 30, 36 from 31 to 35, 9 from 36 to 40, 5 from 41 to 45 "

In their report Messrs. LESLIE and BLACK say:

"The Tables of Sickness and Mortality used are those of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, compiled from the experience of that society in Great Britain, by Mr. HENRY RATCLIFFE, the C. S. of the Order. The reputation which these Tables have acquired renders comment on our part almost unnecessary. Such is the estimation in which they are held, that the Actuarial Commission lately appointed by the Imperial Government, have affirmed them to be the only reliable tables extant, relative to friendly societies."

They question the correctness of the assertion, that the rates of sickness and mortality experienced among friendly societies in New Zealand are less than those of England, as they have not sufficient statistics to determine the matter, but if so, that the age of members and other causes may influence the result, as the Manchester Unity in Otago (New Zealand), out of 1,583 members have not one beyond the age of 56 years, and few, if any, societies of like number in England are so favorably situated, while this society may be taken as a fair sample of the rest of the New Zealand societies.

The letter of Oct. 5th advises: "We are holding one of the most successful meetings ever held by the Grand Lodge, which has upheld the views expressed by myself to you on the 30th May, concerning the Constitution of the G. L. of New Zealand. In yours of the above date you say in effect, 'that the preamble in our law-book settles the question that the G. L. of New Zealand is subordinate to the G. L. of Australia.' We fail to observe this, inasmuch as there is no subordination of any kind mentioned therein, on the contrary it appears to be an unconditional surrender on the part of the G.L. of Victoria, A I. O. F. (afterward G. L. of Australia, I. O. O. F.), and at the same time creates us an independent body for the Colony of New Zealand without any reservations.

"According to the substance of the reservations maintained by the G.L. of U. S., respecting the Order here, no mention is made of having a uniform Withdrawal (or Clearance) Card, therefore the Lodges in America which refused to receive our brothers because the card was not the same as the American one, acted unconstitutionally."

Bro. BRAITHWAITE, in his letter of Oct. 24th, says: "The facts and figures in your yearly volumes should enlist the active sympathy of all philanthropists and induce them into the ranks of the Order. Your progress in the past has been truly most wonderful, and feelings of conscious pride animate me when I reflect that to such a worthy association of brothers I have the honor to belong. My poor efforts shall always be devoted toward the

accomplishment of what you have so often expressed, that is, the extension of the kindly offices of our Order to all parts of the civilized world, and I yet hope to live to see a Lodge of our Order planted in every city and village throughout Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. The annual report of the G. L. of Australia, received yesterday, shows rapid progress, and if continued, there is much to be said for and against the creation of Subordinate Grand Lodges for the political divisions in Australia, under the control of a Supreme Grand Lodge, to be composed of Representatives from the former, and to have functions somewhat similar to the G. L. of U. S. I cannot, however, see how the G. L. of New Zealand can take any beneficial part in it, owing to the distance of sea that divides us from Australia. Practically we are altogether a distinct island, and call for special legislation on your part respecting our Constitution. Of course the question of a Supreme Grand Lodge for Australia assumes rather a different aspect since I wrote to you on the subject, in consequence of Lodges being lately created in South Australia and New South Wales, where none existed before. If the erection of a Supreme G. L. is at all desirable, there is certainly more material now to work upon. Before this there were only two ordinary Grand Lodges, similar in their functions to your State Grand Lodges, and then they were divided by sea as before stated.

"The number of members stated in my last address only represents the actual *financial members* (owing less than three months' dues) of Lodges that sent in their returns. If the members owing over three months' subscription, and those in Lodges that failed to send in their returns were included, we would number about 825. Our progress has not been as fast as I should like, but we are determined to push vigorously for new Lodges next term. You will be pleased to hear that a Lodge will be instituted to-day in Wellington, one of our principal cities; the petition for the same having 25 signatures. We are endeavoring to organize Lodges in the other cities along the coast, viz.: Invercargill, Auckland, Napier, and Wokitika. When this is accomplished it will be an easy matter to branch off there from to the interior. We have several difficulties to contend against that you do not experience. Railways are unknown, except in a few isolated cases, but this difficulty is being remedied. The Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F, and other Orders are very strong throughout New Zealand, and it therefore requires herculean efforts to start our Lodges; but we do not despond, and we take advantage of every opportunity.

"We are assured that the apparent negligence to us was simply owing to a misunderstanding, and are doubly assured now of the undoubted interest the G. L. of U. S. takes in her young branches everywhere, especially in the welfare of the Australasian jurisdiction. We earnestly hope that our puny efforts respecting financial reform may be of some assistance to your Special Committee on Dues and Benefits. Next year our Grand Lodge will meet at Timaru, 100 miles away, the first occasion a session will have been held out of Dunedin."

October 30th, Bro. BRAITHWAITE says: "Brothers who take an interest in the welfare of our Order must regret that any of our Lodges should be unable to meet their engagements as promised to members upon entering. It is forced upon us, from time to time, whether we like it or not, that generally speaking our oldest Lodges have to meet heavy sick and funeral claims, and with past experience to guide us, these claims will increase every year. Are we to let these Lodges die out by effluxion of time and so retard our genuine progress and deprive many worthy brothers of the benefits and privileges of our institution when they most require them, or are we to take time by the forelock, and promulgate a system that will tend to check these evils. These remarks have been prompted by the able reports of your Committee on Dues and Benefits, and later still by a perusal of the last annual report of the G. L. of Australia, wherein the all-important subject is brought prominently before us. Our Order can never obtain the confidence of the general public, or even its own members, so long as Lodges do not meet their engagements, and are allowed to break up through causes that can certainly be obviated in a great measure. My desire is humbly to assist our Order to become a power for *real good* on our Mother Earth, which it is eminently adapted for, therefore I beg to submit that our society possesses within itself immense machinery for inculcating *living vital principles* necessary for the eternal welfare of mankind, but we must combine the several links in such a shape as will perpetuate our glorious institution. It is undeniable that the sickness and death rates increase the older we grow; therefore to be financially sound, it is necessary to inaugurate a graduated scale of weekly contributions according to age to the *Sick and Funeral Funds only*, and apply it to all Lodges. Our Order is unable to furnish sufficient experience of sickness and mortality, but this does not excuse us from adopting the only reliable rates published, viz.: the late HENRY RATCLIFFE'S Tables.

"The close application of the system adopted by the G.L. of New Zealand, would, it appears to me, preserve intact in every Lodge the two most important funds, viz.: the Sick and Funeral, which should be kept separate, so that no one fund shall be used for the benefit of the other. After mature thought I am convinced that a *General Sick Fund* and a *General Funeral Fund* held by each State Grand Lodge on the same principle that the Grand Lodges of Australia and New Zealand hold the Funeral Fund for the whole of the Order in each jurisdiction, would prevent the evil I have mentioned. *Unity is strength* applies to this question as well as to

many others. Many of our Lodges do not invest their funds at interest, most of which belong to the Sick and Funeral Funds. Under the plan I have suggested, each Subordinate Lodge (having better facilities) would look sharply after this, and besides would always know the *exact amount* added, as well as expended on account of sickness and death in the whole of the Lodges every year, and also know what age the members were when claiming sick allowance and funeral donations, and how many weeks each person was sick, all of which it is impossible to ascertain under the present system. This information is *absolutely* essential to enable our Lodges to legislate with a view of compiling, from their own experience, correct rates of contribution."

Bro. BRAITHWAITE suggests some objections that may be urged to this measure, but thinks there will be no difficulty in inaugurating the system. On the subject of suspensions he says: "It is grievous to perceive the large number of members that drop out for N. P. D. A good cure is to adopt the principle of paying subscriptions *in advance*. One of our Lodges here has gradually increased ever since it established this plan. The general rule is to let members run on for 13 weeks, but when a few weeks more pass a member grudges (does not care, forgets, or perhaps gets indifferent) to pay \$5.00 or more; whereas, if they paid one, two, or even three months in advance, the amount would not be so heavy, and invariably it would be paid; besides we have no right to expect the Lodge to *give us trust for 13 weeks*, for benefits and other expenses that the Lodge is liable for on our account during that time. The system is unsound. We have known Lodges to pay to members sick claims and incur other expenses for their benefit, and they never paid another penny into the Lodge, but dropped off.

"Let me congratulate the Order in America upon its immense success, and may it ever continue. It is also certainly very pleasant to read of its great prosperity in Australia, Germany, Switzerland, England, and Holland."

In his letter of Nov. 10th he acknowledges the receipt of the P. W's, and on the subject of cards remarks: "We recognize the necessity of *uniformity* and will support any legitimate steps to effect this end. You can quite understand now that we printed our own cards in ignorance of any obligation to the contrary. We feel grateful to the G. L. of U. S. for taking such a lively interest last session in our welfare, and we shall certainly do our best to give the Grand Sire or Deputy Grand Sire a fraternal welcome. Our own brothers who have visited America and returned, state that we are well up in the work. In the letter from Bro. MEACHAM, in your Daily Journal, he does not detail what powers he conferred respecting the relations that the Grand Lodges of the United -States, Australia, and New Zealand bear to each other. Remarks from him on these points would be interesting at the present time. I lately came across a volume giving a history of the Order in the U. S. from its commencement in 1821 to 1845. From a beginning of five brothers what marvelous success you have achieved, primarily through the *unprecedented* exertions of the early fathers. Many brothers of the Manchester Unity and our Order are grieved at the continued division, and believe that judicious concession on both sides, with a view to the amalgamation of the two great branches of the I. O. O. F., should be entered into, consistent with the material and moral improvement of each. Let me enjoin upon you to urge the G. L. of U. S. to put in force a sound system of dues and benefits in every Lodge, so as to enable the Order to fulfil its obligations and thereby secure the confidence of everybody. If this is accomplished our success in the future is assured."

The letters of Nov. 14th and Jan. 31st are brief, advising of the P. O. addresses of the new Grand Master and Grand Secretary, the receipt of Journals, &c.

On the 28th of February, Bro. BRAITHWAITE wrote:

"I have received a letter from Bro. MEACHAM which has given us great satisfaction. Not having heard from him since he left here, we thought he was dead. Under present circumstances I forbear to discuss the question of Charter, etc., believing that all will be settled amicably on the arrival of your Commissioner, who will then practically understand matters. Our new hall in Dunedin (a handsome structure) will be dedicated on the 23d of March next "

The letters from this office Sept. 20th and Oct. 1st transmitted the P. W's, advised that the Officers' Reports and Daily Journal had been mailed, and communicated the action of the G. L. of U. S. on matters relating to Australia and New Zealand.

On the 29th of October the receipt of an advance copy of Grand Master BRAITHWAITE'S report to the G. L. of New Zealand was acknowledged, and re-plying to his remarks concerning the position of the G. L. of New Zealand, a copy of the letter of Bro. MEACHAM, printed in the Daily Journal of last session, was inclosed with the remark that "you will perceive that your Grand Lodge, according to Bro. MEACHAM'S letter, has a vague and unsatisfactory history. Whether he established the Grand Lodge by virtue of the Victoria Charter, or whether he acted as Special Deputy of the G. L. of U. S., does not clearly appear, but certain it is, that he had no authority from the G. L. of U. S. to institute your Grand Lodge; nor was it ever for many years recognized, until its complaint appeared of neglect from the parent Grand Body, the G. L. of U. S., to which alone it desired to be subordinate. Thus it is extremely doubtful whether your Grand Lodge can substantiate the status in the American Order of which you boast. As I have already observed, Bro. MEACHAM, as agent of the Grand Lodge of Victoria and as Deputy of the G.L. of U.S., mystified things very much, and these errors we now desire

earnestly to correct. I trust you will reconsider your views in the premises, and that your Grand Lodge will consent to organize the Order anew, beginning at first principles and establishing a Supreme Grand Lodge after you have formed four or five Colonial Grand Lodges, which the Grand Sire will be compelled to do should he visit you in person, or authorize the D. G. Sire to do. I will not stop to discuss the questions which you raise about the expense, or want of advantage in the change of system, since the necessity of the case is all controlling, if you desire to conform to the wish of the G. L. of U. S., and to its established policy in relation to its form of government in foreign countries. I cannot fail to perceive that Odd Fellowship will be greatly improved by the change of system, and although it may require time to develop the improvement, yet it must eventually come as the certain fruit of the systematic federal union of your several Grand Lodges. We have the certain evidence of such results, wherever we have inspired our brethren in foreign countries with our views. I forbear to press the subject further, hoping that you will co-operate cordially with the G. L. of Australia, and such other Colonial Gr. Lodges as the G. L. of U. S. may authorize to consummate this desirable result."

The letter of Nov. 10th is in reply to Bro. BRAITHWAITE'S of Sept. 25th and Oct. 5th; that of Jan 5th acknowledges the receipt of letters of Oct. 24th, Oct. 30th, and Nov. 14th, principally on the subject of the new scale of dues and benefits adopted by the G. L. of New Zealand, and the views of Bro. BRAITHWAITE on the subject, remarking "That is truly the vital question in Odd Fellowship. It is in vain that we invite membership, unless in good faith we comply with our promises, and to enable us to do so we must adopt a scientific system, by which our risks will be adequately proportioned to the dues we receive and the relative age of the members. The G. L. of U. S., as you will observe, has been pursuing this inquiry for several years, and will continue its research until sufficient data shall have been obtained to justify a proper system.

"There is a reasonable prospect that some amicable arrangement will be made between the Manchester Unity and our Order for harmony of action and intercourse, which will bring them nearer together."

The letters of Feb. 6th and 7th, addressed to JAMES MCGAW, Grand Master, advised of the shipment of a box containing the revised Charge and Degree Books, etc., in accordance with his request made to the Grand Sire; and those of Feb. 28th to Grand Master MCGAW and Gr. Sec'y WILSON, informed them of the contemplated visit of the Deputy Grand Sire. Those of 7th and 8th of March to Bro. BRAITHWAITE, acknowledged the receipt of his, dated Nov. 10th and Jan. 31st, and commended the Commissioner to the special care and attention of the brotherhood in New Zealand.

The mail of July 25th brought the following from P. G. M. BRAITHWAITE, dated Dunedin, June 20, 1878:

"D. D. Sire, Bro. JOHN B. HARMON, before leaving here, made me promise to give you the result of his visit. I now do so with pleasure, but first beg to refer to a few matters which were left undiscussed between us in view of Bro. HARMON'S advent, the outcome of your various letters and reports.

"It would really appear as if the G. L. of U. S. did not fully understand the powers granted in the Charter of the Grand Lodge of Australia, or else if an independent and supreme continental sovereignty was meant to have been in force, why not all these years past inofficial communications have addressed the head officer thereof as M. W. Grand *Sire* instead of M. W. Grand *Master*? The error, if any, never having been once pointed out. Further, this Charter does not specifically confer the power to institute Subordinate (or Colonial) *Grand* Lodges. The G. L. of New Zealand has the very same powers in its Charter, and neither body of themselves can discover anything to the contrary; and it was this fact, among others, that led us to maintain that the two Grand Lodges held only the same privileges as your State Grand Lodges, both being subordinate to the G. L. of U. S. The officers of the G. L. of Australia and the G. L. of New Zealand were always titled the same as your State Grand Lodges, a fact you must have surely have been aware of. Next, the G. L. of U. S., at its last session, amongst other strictures directed against the Order in Australasia for printing their own cards, *resolved*, 'That one of the specifications in the Charter of the G. L. of Australia provides that all cards issued by that jurisdiction shall emanate from the G. L. of U. S.' We have also examined the Charter on this point and fail to see any such specification. All of us agree that Bro. MEACHAM instituted the best form of government possible under the difficulties existing when the affiliation with the I.O.O.F. took place, and it was the only system that we would conform to at that time. Our membership and Lodges have more than trebled in numbers since, both in Australia and New Zealand, which would have not been the case had our system of government *hitherto* been as is now proposed, because at the time of our affiliation with your Order we in New Zealand made it a condition before entering, that we must have an independent Grand Body and be relieved from paying any more dues to the G. L. of Victoria (or Australia), which was agreed to.

"It was the Grand Encampment of Victoria that instituted the Encampment here through our Bro. WHEELER, who went over to Melbourne, Victoria, for that purpose. The G. L. of New Zealand only lent the money necessary for its organization, and this is all the jurisdiction our G. L. has over the Encampment. On review of the foregoing comment's we have fair grounds to think that the brothers in Australasia have been 'more sinned against than sinning,' and that Bro. MEACHAM has received very little praise, as far as we have seen, for what he *practically* accomplished. These remarks are made with all due deference to your worthy self

and the G. L. of U. S., and in the absence of a knowledge of the records contained in your Journal when the affiliation was effected, which reports we have not seen yet.

"The circumstances upon which our arguments were chiefly based in letter of May 30, 1877, when opposing the formation of a Supreme Grand Lodge for the whole of our Colonies, have materially changed *since* that letter was written, simply from the fact that Lodges have rapidly sprung into being in the other Colonies where our Order did not exist before. There being now much more material to form such a Grand Body out of than existed hitherto, and thus our greatest objection thereto having been providentially removed, we resigned all minor considerations and past extraneous matters for the purpose of discussing the main question on its merits, and after two nights debate the Grand Lodge of New Zealand *unanimously* decided to become an integral part of a Grand Lodge for *Australasia*. I was glad for the sake of the trouble and expense that the G. L. of U. S. had gone to, that we were enabled to approach the matter more favorably than when at first presented, because had the Order existed only in Victoria and New Zealand, as has been the case all along until lately, I feel certain that the main object of Bro. HARMON'S mission would have failed.

"Our distinguished visitor arrived at Auckland, N. Z., on the 9th ult., and visited all the Lodges directly on his line of route, at Wellington, Christchurch, Temuka, Timaru, Oamaru, and Dunedin, being by far a majority of the Lodges. Bro. HARMON'S time being limited, and the other Lodges being somewhat out of the road, they could not be visited. He initiated a large number of candidates in the various Lodges and exemplified the whole work of the Order. I met him at Christchurch, 250 miles from here, on behalf of our Grand Lodge. At every place where he visited our brethren turned out strong, and in every instance feted him with banquets and other appropriate celebrations. Both inside and outside the Lodge-room our welcome visitor gave spirited addresses, all of which were enthusiastically received; in fact, we have had him at Odd Fellowship every night since he arrived in New Zealand. The last Lodge meeting in Dunedin was attended by over 80 members, when he initiated one of our principal clergymen (the first one initiated in the Order in New Zealand). The Encampment work was afterward gone through, and I was glad to see that we had the whole of the *work* nearly perfect. I forbear to say anything as to the receptions individually and collectively that were extended to our worthy visitor, preferring to leave Bro. HARMON to speak for himself. We feel extremely grateful to the G. L. of U. S. for sending, and to Deputy Grand Sire, Bro. HARMON, for coming to us, and feel assured that it will be pleasurable and profitable to all concerned. His visit has aroused the latent energies of the whole brotherhood, the outcome of which will be the propagation of our Order, and a corresponding extension of its usefulness in places where its influence was hitherto unknown. Time only permits me to give a very brief sketch, no doubt Bro. HARMON will report more fully. Our visitor left for Melbourne on June 3d, accompanied to the place of departure by a large number of brothers, all of whom heartily wished him safe restoration to his family and brother Odd Fellows in America. Please consider this letter as a reply to all your communications to me which remain unanswered."

This letter was acknowledged August 1st, as follows:

"To you, who are so earnest a devotee to American Odd Fellowship, and so zealous and intelligent an advocate of whatever is abstractly right, I need not say a word, or utter a sentiment, expressive of my profound delight and gratification of the advent of Bro JOHN B. HARMON, the distinguished Special Commissioner of the G. L. of U. S. to the Grand Jurisdiction of Australasia. May the seed that has thus been cast upon this willing and fertile furrow in your country by the Grand Lodge of the United States, I. O. O. F., through our instrumentality, lead by your valuable agency to the union of our beloved Order, and its consolidation throughout the globe. This sentiment had its lodgment in my heart ever since I was born into the Order (1829), and although I may not survive to witness its consummation, you and Bro. HARMON are among the enlightened descendants of the American and English races that more than probably will live to greet so grand an era.

"It is my great pleasure to acknowledge your very interesting favor of June 20th, dated at Dunedin, Otago, N. Z. It will be presented formally to the Grand Lodge of the United States in my annual report at the session in September next, and will be honored by that Grand Body with the most cordial respect and gratification. So momentous and long desired a consummation as the harmonious union of the Order in the two hemispheres through its instrumentality will long be hailed with joy by the American Order, and will doubtless lead to results, in behalf of mankind, which cannot now be adequately estimated. I give you sincere thanks for your active co-operation with Bro. HARMON in the diplomacy which produced this glorious result. God be praised."

The Journal of the "Fifteenth Annual Session of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, held at Dunedin, Sept. 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 26, Oct. 2, 4, 31, Nov. 2, 1877," was duly received. The report of Grand Master BRAITHWAITE states the amount to the credit of the General Funeral Fund, \$5,240.00; General Management Fund, \$250.00; stock on hand, \$250.00; total, \$5,740.00. Number of Lodges, 17; benefit members owing less than three months' dues, 515; amount expended for funerals \$475.00; for sickness as returned by 8 Lodges, \$497.50; total relief, \$972.50; aggregate value of Lodge funds exclusive of property, regalia, etc., returned by 9 Lodges, \$11,795.00. The Grand Master named six delinquent Lodges that failed to make returns, and stated the

amount due by Subordinate Lodges to be \$1,063.00, saying: "It will be your duty to initiate steps at once to alter this pernicious system of neglect. The members belonging to the Lodges in arrears for dues must surely know that if any of them or their wives die the Grand Lodge can refuse to pay their funeral claims. This neglect (mainly the Secretaries') is the bane of our society, and it is impossible through this cause, to ascertain truly how the Order stands. It is provoking to complain of this matter every session, but the evil is increasing, and at all costs it should be dealt with without further leniency. Green Island Lodge was instituted Oct. 6, 1877, and has now a membership of 24, and the Avon Lodge, Christchurch, Dec. 4, 1876, now numbering 36. During the session a telegram was received advising of the institution of the Southern Cross Lodge. Sundry amendments to the Constitution of the G. L. were proposed, to authorize the establishment of Subordinate Grand Lodges in the Provinces of New Zealand, and when six such Lodges are established, the G. L. of New Zealand to become the supreme tribunal in New Zealand." The tables of "income" and "expenditures" embrace ten columns under each head, showing the various sources of receipts and objects of payment. Another table contains forty-four items which Subordinates are required to report. Twenty-three pages of the book are appropriated to correspondence; the several letters addressed to this office with the replies, appear in full.

BARBADOS.—At the last session it was recommended "that the proper Grand Officers continue the correspondence with a view of establishing a Lodge" at Bridgeton. Under these circumstances I present such portions of the communications that have been received and transmitted during the year.

On the 26th of September, the following, dated August 22 1877, was received from E. ISAAC BAEZA:

"By the 'Victoria' this morning for New York, I hastily wrote you a few lines serving to cover petition from myself and four others (including Bro. R. J. CLINCKETT) to the G. L. of U. S., asking them to take into consideration the impracticability of any one of us being now enabled to go to your city to receive instructions in the principles of the Order, or rather working of the Order, and grant us a concession like that granted to the brethren in Australia, as you advised of. This petition we forward under the suggestions in your letter to Bro. CLINCKETT in February last, and we trust that the Representatives will see the inconvenience we would be subjected to for either of us to proceed to your city to receive the necessary instructions, besides the enormous expense of traveling from these parts it would entail, and grant us the desired permission. We see no other way to do this, and we depend upon your explanation to the Grand Lodge of the situation we are in, and using your influence toward the consummation of an object from which great good must be derived.

"The certificate forwarded from the Lodge to which we belong will be of itself a sufficient guaranty of our good intentions and motives, and we thought it advisable to obtain the same, so that the members of the Grand Lodge could see into whose hands they were placing the Order."

This letter was answered Sept. 28th, advising: "You will perceive from the Journal sent to you, that the petition was presented by the G. C. and R. Secretary, referred to the Committee on Petitions, and duly reported on. We, the Grand Officers, as the report sets forth, although quite anxious to inaugurate the system of admitting Lodges of the Manchester Unity *bodily* into our Order when satisfactorily vouched for, in view of the advantages it would afford the two Orders, in the way of reforming the one, and of elevating its morale, and of propagating the other all over the world, a desideratum greatly to be sought for, in my judgment, are powerless in the premises at present. Nevertheless, if your patience will endure a few months longer, I believe the present status of the business is quite favorable for the ultimate success of the proposed measure. You will observe 'that the proper Grand Officers are directed to continue the correspondence,' etc., which means the M. W. Grand Sire and the Grand C. and R. Secretary, who, I believe, favor the introduction of American Odd Fellowship, in the way you propose, to Barbados. The Grand Secretary recommended it in his report and the Committee on Foreign Relations did not object. The only question now is, how can we get to you a proper Odd Fellow to instruct you in our ritual and system, and inaugurate you so as to enable you intelligently to act with us as a Lodge? We are not authorized to expend any money for the purpose. We have many zealous brothers who would go if their expenses were paid, and establish you upon a firm base. If you can do anything in this direction, I think the work might be accomplished during the year. There are a good many Odd Fellows who are sea captains, in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other commercial cities, trading to your place. Among them you might make inquiry, and doubtless successfully. I write without an opportunity of conference with the Grand Sire, but will send this to him as a 'continuance of correspondence' authorized by the G. L. of U. S. I shall request him, should he concur in my views, to write to you on the subject."

The mail of November 8th brought a letter from Bro. BAEZA, dated Oct. 20th, in which, referring to a letter from this office of Sept. 13th, acknowledging receipt of the petition forwarded, he said: "You are in error in saying we wish to come under your jurisdiction intact as a Lodge of Odd Fellows. It is only as members of Amity Lodge we wish to, but we have no doubt that (with one or two exceptions) all the members of Amity will join the new Lodge, but will still remain as members of the former."

Inclosed in this letter was a slip from the *Barbados Globe* of Oct. 1, 1877, giving an "extract from the financial portion of the Auditor's Report on the accounts and affairs of the 'Amity Lodge' of Odd Fellows,

Manchester Unity, friendly society, in this city for the half year ending June, 1877." It appears the Lodge had been in existence 18 months, the membership was 25. It had received during that time, \$317.78, and disbursed for sickness, \$32.58; expenses, \$39.80; total, \$72.38, having \$245.40 on hand.

On the 9th of November a reply was transmitted, from which I quote:

"From your letter I am informed that I made a mistake in saying that you wished to come under our jurisdiction *intact* as a Lodge of Odd Fellows. That is all the better, as error, for it will avoid complication. As you have been advised, the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary are favorably disposed to the object, and only await the proper facilities and order of procedure. I fear, however, the fact that the said officers having charge of a pending proposition for the reciprocal visitation and fraternal intercommunion between the Lodges of the M. U. and our Order throughout the world, submitted to our last session by the G. M. and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity at the instance of the Grand Annual Movable Committee of England, may interpose some delay in your particular case. If, however, any opportunity should present itself to any of you, or any other eligible and intelligent citizen of your vicinity, to visit the United States and become a member of our Order and receive the several degrees, I think the Grand Sire would authorize any Lodge in the United States, with the consent of the local authorities, to perform the ceremony. Trusting you will facilitate such a procedure if practicable, I remark that inquiries are made from our Canada jurisdictions for Lodges of our Order in Nassau and other places in the British West Indies."

On the 26th of January, Bro. BAEZA'S letter of January 1st reached this office. He apologizes for delay in answering the letters of Sept. 28th and Nov. 9th, on account of severe illness which confined him to his house for five weeks, and says: "Bro. CLINCKETT and myself have fully perused your letters, and we are glad to learn there is not so much difficulty. We, however, cannot see our way toward the consummation of so much desired an object as to come within your requirements. Captain SANDERS, who was in command of the 'Victoria,' owned by Messrs. H. TROWBRIDGE & SONS, of New Haven, a regular trader here, is a member of your Order, but he is not now in command of that vessel. It is true there are scores of captain? coming this way who are members of your Order, but we are unfortunately unable to know of it until too late to act, whilst if they were regular traders to this port it would be quite easy for us to make all arrangements for accomplishing the object in view. Bro. CLINCKETT, the other petitioners and myself are quite agreed that at this time we cannot see any chance to accomplish our wishes, and must therefore wait until you are authorized to do by us as by Australia—send us the ritual and cipher to go by, institute a Lodge, and afterward get instruction in the higher branches from members of your Order who come here from time to time, or when one of our members may find it convenient to pay a visit to your country. Meanwhile we accept with pleasure the resolution passed authorizing a continuation of a correspondence, which I shall be happy to carry into effect.

"We observe your remarks respecting the proposed fraternal intercommunion between the M. Unity and your Order. It may be desired on some grounds, but as a practical thing I cannot see how it can be acted on. I am almost sure that no decision which will be liked by the Manchester Unity will be arrived at. I, of course, say this with all deference, but I am led to this opinion on looking at the past relative positions of the two Orders and their present working.

"I trust that speedily some arrangements may be concluded to effect our object."

The letter was duly acknowledged, saying: "We regret that we find no opportunity of accomplishing your and "our wishes with regard to the establishment of our Order in Barbados. We hope to learn of some member going from here or New York, through whose instrumentality a Lodge could be instituted, but have been disappointed. We do not, however, despair, as we think some means will yet be found to organize the Order on your island." He was also advised of his error concerning Australia, the Order having been introduced into that country by a qualified and specially commissioned officer.

The last letter from Bro. BAEZA, dated March 20th, reached this office April 17th, and refers principally to his non-receipt of packages of Journals mailed from this office in November and February. On the special subject of correspondence he wrote: "By this vessel a younger brother of mine leaves for the United States in search of some more lucrative employment than the position he recently held. Should he fail in obtaining such, he will be returning within three months, and an opportunity may thus present itself to accomplish our mutual object I have requested him to communicate with you if he is about to return, so that we may not lose this chance. He is a member of the 'Amity Lodge' here. I have given him letters of introduction to yourself and Bro. Ross, which will speak for themselves. I presume that if he is initiated for the purpose of bringing out the necessary instruments of organization no charge will be demanded for such initiation, and that if he is in any other city than your own you will make the necessary arrangements to have him duly initiated."

A reply was sent on the 11th of May, stating: "We think an arrangement such as you suggest, for the initiation of your brother, can be made. It will, though, depend somewhat on circumstances. If in Baltimore or Philadelphia there will probably be no difficulty in meeting your wishes."

On the 15th of June a letter was received from I. L. BAEZA, dated 231 North 12th Street, Philadelphia, 14th

of June, 1878, inclosing a letter of introduction from E. ISAAC BAEZA, the brother thinking it doubtful about his being able to visit Baltimore.

A letter from Bro. BAEZA, dated July 27th, was received August 10th, while this report was in the hands of the printer, from which I extract as follows: "I learn there is at St. Thomas a gentleman purporting to be a Commissioner from your Grand Lodge endeavoring to establish a Lodge there. Is this so? I, however, hardly think so, as a gentleman writing from that island says the man has got into very *undesirable* company, associating himself with individuals who could hardly be expected to respect the Order as it should be."

CHILE.—The correspondence with this jurisdiction has been quite limited. Since the letter of Grand Secretary Cox, which appears on pages 7278-9, Journal of 1877. in which a further letter was promised by "an early steamer," only one letter has been received, and that came on the 7th of January, from Bro. GEORGE S. BROWN, D. D. Grand Sire, dated Nov. 30, 1877. He wrote: "I am very sorry that I cannot report that progress in our Order which I could wish. We are now in the midst of a commercial crisis, and business of all kinds is at a stand still. Recently the bank of D. Thomas, in which was deposited the larger part of our funds, failed, and the loss to the Order was some \$7,000.00, of which I think we may recover about forty per cent. This and the very dull times combined will retard in a measure the growth of the Order for some time, although in the Chilean Lodges initiations are frequent.

"The Encampment branch does not seem to thrive at present, but I cherish the hope that when business revives all branches of our Order will again flourish. One thing is very certain, Odd Fellowship is planted forever in this country and there are plenty of good men who will work for its progress. I hope in my report in January to have better news to communicate "

Letters were written from this office as follows:

To W. J. Cox, G. Sec'y, Sept. 27, 1877, advising that the papers transmitted by him were presented to the Grand Lodge and of the action had thereon. Dec. 29th, to the same, advising of shipment of Revised Journal for 1877, etc. Jan. 8, 1878, to GEO. S. BROWN, D. D. G. Sire, in reply to his letter of Nov 30, 1877, expressing regret that the Order in Chile had met with such a heavy loss of funds, and the general depression in business. June 7th, to the same, advising: "We have been anxiously looking for the report of the Grand Lodge of Chile for 1877; also for the report of Southern Watch Encampment, No. 1," and requesting in case the reports have been forwarded, that he would send duplicates.

We are unable to account for such silence on the part of the authorities in Chile, where heretofore they have been noted for extraordinary promptness in their correspondence and transmission of reports.

DENMARK.—On the 17th of April a petition was transmitted by the Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, as follows:

*To the M. W. Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire,
Mr. J. C. PRAETORIUS, Hannover:*

The undersigned, two of whom are Past Grands, and whose Withdrawal Cards are herewith inclosed, and the remaining three who are not attached to the Order, but acquainted with its principles, consider it will be conducive to the interest of the Order to institute a Lodge of the I. O. O. F. in this city, and respectfully request that you will grant authority for the institution thereof.

As it will require both time and money for a regular initiation of the three undersigned who are not connected with the Order, we beg for a dispensation empowering an informal initiation of the three indicated and pray that you may grant all such powers as will enable us to work under the jurisdiction of the German Empire; and we inform you that the Lodge, which designs working in the German language, will be opened under the name of Denmark Lodge, No. 1, of Denmark.

Dated at Copenhagen, 21st March, 1878.

Julius Meyer,

Past Grand of Andrew Johnson Lodge, No. 433, New York City.

Andrew Holck,

Past Grand of Naomi Lodge, No. 117, Pomeroy, Ohio.

*Chr. Soeling,
P. G. Osterly,*

Ludwig Meyer.

A few days subsequently, and before the necessary papers were transmitted, a letter from F. MEYENDORF, G. Secretary, dated Berlin, March 26th, advised: "I have discovered that besides the petitioners there are three Odd Fellows who have neither Withdrawal Cards nor Certificates from the Lodges to which they were attached. I have, therefore, undertaken through you to secure for them the proper credentials. According to reliable information they are men of marked respectability, who will exert themselves zealously in our cause. They are prepared to settle any dues that may be standing against them and forward as directed. They all request an expeditious transmission of their Withdrawal Cards that they may be enabled to join the Lodge in Copenhagen. The names of these brothers are: S. HOFFMEYER, P. G., of Pacific Lodge, No. 2, Lahaina, formerly Danish Consul to the Sandwich Islands; C. TRATZ, 5th degree, Sumner Lodge, No. 180, Jersey City, New Jersey, now in Copenhagen, str. Kougensgade 21; JOHN RATH, initiatory, Omaha Lodge, No. 2, Omaha, Nebraska, formerly Danish Consul there, now in Copenhagen, Hyharn 13."

The necessary steps were at once taken to procure the cards, and prompt responses were received from Sumner and Omaha Lodges. Pacific Lodge, No. 2, Sandwich Islands, being defunct, and having been under the immediate jurisdiction of the G. L. of U. S., Bro. HOFFMEYER'S certificate was prepared at this office. The proper papers authorizing the institution of the Lodge were forwarded May 23d to Bro. J. C. PRAETORIUS, M.W. Grand Sire, Hannover, Germany, and reached their destination in due time, as Bro MEYENDORF advised in letter dated Berlin, June 13, 1878. A letter of Bro. CHARLES TRATZ, one of the petitioners, dated Copenhagen, July 12th, addressed to the Assistant Grand Secretary, was received July 31st, and advised of the institution of the Lodge. The following extract is presented, believing that it will doubtless interest the brotherhood:

"Your highly esteemed letter of May 23d was received in due time, and to-day I take great pleasure in informing you that the first Lodge of the I. O. O. F. in this country, under the name of Denmark Lodge, No. 1, was instituted on the 29th of June by Bro. J. C. PRAETORIUS, M. W. Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, assisted by G. Secretary MEY DORF and a delegation from the Lodge of Hamburg. Of course, we are not yet in full working order, but we hold our meetings regularly, and have very fair prospects of success. As with all young Lodges, we are 'hard up for cash,' as the expense of establishing has been nearly \$1,100.00, and we number about 35 members only. We hope to receive some money by the admission of new members, but the heavy expense of procuring By-Laws, receipts, cards, etc., have to be met now, and we should be glad to have some pecuniary assistance, if possible, from the Grand Lodge of the United States.

"I am greatly obliged to Bro. W. W. LAWRENCE, D. D. G Master, of New Jersey, for his kind words concerning me, and I beg to assure him and all my dear friends and brothers that I shall always work with a good will for our noble cause.

"We had a very pleasant time at the institution, having a grand dinner got up in the finest style, with decorations of flowers, etc., and a full band of music playing.

"We shall be very glad to meet with brothers from the U. S., and as every summer some of them visit our city, you will oblige me by giving publicity to the fact that Denmark Lodge, No. 1, meets Wednesday evenings, at Oestergade 15, and that ANDREW HOLCK, N. G., resides at Fredriksberg Alle 21, JUST M. CAEN our Conductor, at Amagerton 27, and my address is Str. Kongersgade No. 21, Copenhagen. We all speak English, as does our worthy Secretary, Bro. JOHN RATH, Nyhair 13, and many of our members.

"The press has mentioned us in very complimentary terms, but I fear that our Masonic brethren do not look upon us in the friendly and kind manner that we should like. The Jews are not admitted to membership in Masonic Lodges here; if they belong to Lodges in foreign countries, of course, they can visit, but that is all We admit them to membership, of course, if there are no other objections than their religion, and we have already received some of the very best of this class of people. Denmark, politically, has nearly as free a Constitution as the United States, and all systems of religion have equal rights in this country.

"If the G. L. of U. S. can aid us, it will be a great step to the advancement of the Order here. I shall feel much obliged for information on any matters relating to our beloved Order and you may be assured that I will do all in my power to promote its interest."

The mail of August 5, 1878, brought letters from the Grand Sire and Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, relating to the institution of Denmark Lodge, No. 1. The Grand Sire writes as follows:

"In compliance with the honored commission vested in me, and referring to the communication directed to you by the Grand Secretary, Bro. MEYENDORF, I have the honor to submit the following report:

"Assisted by the Grand Secretary, Bro. MEYENDORF, and two brothers from Hamburg, I instituted Denmark Lodge, No. 1, of Denmark, on the 29th of June. On the 30th the hall was dedicated, candidates initiated, the different degrees conferred, and the necessary instructions pertaining thereto given. You will please find in the annexed report the names of the elective and appointed officers.

"Although it was previously proposed that Denmark Lodge, No. 1, should work in the German language, I

am of the opinion, after fully considering the question in all its bearings, that it is not only in the interest of our Order, but also absolutely necessary to do the work in the Danish tongue, to give an opportunity to the whole of the members to participate in the proceedings.

"As the demand in this case was urgent, and presupposing that my action would be sanctioned by the G. L. of U. S., I have authorized Bro. HOLCK to translate the text of the regular work (opening of the Lodge, duties of officers, etc.), and also to keep the minutes and records in the Danish language.

"You will be pleased to sanction these acts, being the necessary result of existing circumstances. You will please also to notify me if the documents and books of our Order are already printed in the Danish language. In the latter case you will be kind enough to transmit them without delay, to PASTOR A. HOLCK, Fredericksborg Allee 21, Copenhagen

"I am also charged by the brothers to request that more time be given for deliberation whether to place their Lodge under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of G. E. or the G. L. of U. S.

"I venture the prediction, that with the foundation laid by Denmark Lodge, No. 1, of Denmark, a grand future for the Order will be inaugurated. Its members are both capable and enthusiastic, and I hope that the banner of our beloved Order will soon float over all Denmark. Sweden, and Norway, and that noble-minded men will clasp their hands in brotherly love.

"I would respectfully suggest that the Lodge should be partially reimbursed for the outlay in the installation of officers, dedication of the hall, etc. I should think that \$100 would be sufficient, and I would recommend the granting of this sum on the part of the G. L. of U. S., and that I be authorized to transmit this sum to Denmark Lodge, No. 1, of Denmark. In the interest of the Order I can safely assert that this amount could not be donated for a better purpose.

"I hereby return documents transmitted to me on the 22d of May to be filled out. and in conclusion, would respectfully ask that my suggestions may be duly considered and acted upon, my sole motive being the welfare and interest of our beloved Order."

The following is from the letter of Bro. MEYENDORF, Grand Secretary:

"You will be in possession of the report of the M. W. Grand Sire of the G. L. of G. E., and the special communication of the S. D. Grand Sire for Denmark Lodge, No. 1, both represented by Bro. PRAETORIUS, notifying you of the institution of that Lodge.

"Having had the honor to be instrumental in the founding of the same, I have now had the pleasure to become personally acquainted with the brothers in Copenhagen, and I may here state that their work promises well for the future, and that soon it will be allied to a number of other Lodges in the North.

"My connection with this Lodge, directly as well as officially, would necessarily cease for the present, being under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of U. S., but there remain some little arrangements to be settled which have been made under the supposition that eventually the Northern Lodges would come under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of G. E. In relation to these matters, I refer to my letter of May 31st, and respectfully request an answer to my inquiries contained therein; also to inform me what your charges will be for Charter and books, and whether these are to be transmitted directly to the parties, or through my office.

"As I have already reported in my last-named letter, the brothers of Copenhagen have paid me 60 marks, according to the Constitution of the G. L. of G. E., and I have provided them accordingly with working books, I have also provided them with a copy of the transactions of the G. L. of U. S. of the years 1873 to 1877 inclusive, to serve as a nucleus for a library. The brothers would feel greatly obliged to you if you would be pleased to transmit to them from your stock on hand the Proceedings of past years. It is essential that Denmark Lodge, No. 1, of Denmark, should receive forthwith a copy of the Constitution of the Subordinate Lodges of the G. L. of U. S., so as to be able to frame its By-Laws. Be kind enough to transmit the document directly to Copenhagen. The three Withdrawal Cards have not been received as yet, either by me, the M. W. Grand Sire Bro. PRAETORIUS, or the brothers in Copenhagen; but as you have advised me of the transmission of the cards by letter, I have, notwithstanding their non-arrival, proceeded with the institution of the Lodge.

"After having transacted all the routine business, it only remains for me to express to you my most sincere wishes for the welfare of our beloved Order."

GERMANY.—As heretofore, the correspondence with Bro. F. MEYENDORF, R. W. Grand Secretary, has been of the most friendly character, and highly- satisfactory. The letters have been transmitted with the promptness which has in the past characterized the intercourse of the officers of the two Grand Bodies. Such portions of the letters received and sent as are of special interest are herewith submitted.

The letter of September 29th to Grand Secretary MEYENDORF acknowledged the receipt of his communications of July 30th and August 29, 1877, and recited the action of the G. L. of U. S. on the subjects presented, viz.: the permission asked to print their own supplies, and the right to authorize Subordinates to suspend the payment of benefits. The G. Secretary was informed that "the first and second resolutions on page 7459 were indefinitely postponed (p. 7504), for the reason that your Grand Lodge has the constitutional power

to act in the premises, and the third resolution (p. 7460) authorizing supplies to be sold to the G. L. of the German Empire at cost was adopted. You now have the whole subject of benefits in your own power, and I trust will soon be able to place yourselves beyond the penalties prescribed in Section 29, Trespasses, of the laws of your country. There is the most liberal and generous feeling in our Grand Lodge toward the G. L. of G. E., and no reasonable request would for one moment have been interfered with, but it was considered too perilous to venture in the direction indicated. From my experience in the matter of printing our supplies, I think you will soon congratulate yourselves that you can purchase them at cost, and have no trouble or expense in printing them."

On the 29th of September Bro. MEYENDORF'S letter of September 12th was received, acknowledging receipt of letter from this office of August 24th, and transmitting extracts from German newspapers concerning "a merchant named BRY, represented to be an Odd Fellow, who some weeks ago was accidentally killed. The affair sounds somewhat improbable, but being constantly interrogated in regard to it, I venture to ask whether you know anything about it, in which case I would thank you to give me some information." The publication of August 29th states the manner of accident and refers to "the truly munificent manner in which the American Grand Lodge relieves the families of deceased brethren," etc. The issue of August 30th states that the Lodge referred to "belongs to the Order of Odd Fellows, which has its domicile in America, and is simply a relief association," etc., and the notice of September 4th says: "Reports have reached us about the nature of that society, its aims and its organization, which are in direct contradiction to each other, and we therefore refrain from giving them, not being in a position to decide between them." This was answered October 6th, regretting our inability to furnish any information on the subject, and on the 11th of October we returned to the Grand Secretary the papers in the case of Dr. HAUSLEUTNER. October 19th the letter of the G. Secretary of September 30th, advising of the transmission of 28 copies of Journal of the G. L. of G. E., was acknowledged, and the same day the P. W's were sent to Bro. J. C. PRAETORIUS, M. W. G Sire, saying: "In performing this agreeable duty, allow me to call to your attention especially the necessity and importance of causing the information to be made known to the Subordinates in your jurisdiction, that the P. W's are positively in force on and after January 1, 1878. I dwell upon this point for the reason which will appear by the accompanying papers of complaint to this office."

The mail of November 21st brought a letter from Bro. MEYENDORF, dated October 30th, in which he wrote: "I regret the necessity of returning to you once more the appeal of Bro. Dr. HAUSLEUTNER. We did not intend to evade the regular course of appealing, but the address of the G. Master of Illinois is not known to me. Please forward the papers to the proper party and favor me in due time with further communications on the subject."

"The charge books I ordered, I suppose are printed in accordance with our new German translation. We return our sincere thanks for the privilege of purchasing supplies at cost, a favor we did not expect, and did not even hope for. I agree with you that such arrangement is more to our advantage than would be the publishing of the same in Germany, as it would require more capital than the small demand would warrant."

The appeal papers were forwarded, December 6th, to JOHN LAKE, M. W. G. Master, Rockford, Illinois, who on the 8th of December acknowledged the receipt of the same, saying: "I will give the matter immediate attention, and advise you of the result as soon as the facts are ascertained," and on the 13th of February, 1878, they again reached this office, and were immediately forwarded to Bro. MEYENDORF.

Bro MEYENDORF was informed December 7th of the disposition of the papers, and that "the charge books are printed according to our own text, the G. Lodge not having authorized any change as yet. It will be necessary, as you will readily understand, that the translation made in Germany shall be critically examined by competent parties and be approved by the G. L. of U. S., before it can be printed. I regret exceedingly that the late hour of the session at which the translation was received (as you will perceive at page 7511, Journal), rendered it impossible to give to that subject the proper attention. No power exists under these unfortunate circumstances anywhere to intervene, until the next Annual Session."

"I am happy to know that you agree with me in the reasoning employed to sustain the recommendation to the G. L of U. S. on the subject of furnishing to your Grand Lodge supplies at cost."

On the 24th of November a letter was received from J. C. PRAETORIUS, M.W. Grand Sire, dated Hannover, November 1, 1877, acknowledging receipt of the P. W's sent to him October 19th, and saying: "I will endeavor, to the best of my ability, to further the interest of our beloved Order, and will make every effort to gain for it that position in Germany which it is truly and fully entitled to by virtue of its intrinsic excellence, and hope that Heaven may prosper it."

"I notice the complaint from Virginia, and will take care to have the A. T. P. W. communicated to the Subordinates in due time."

The above was duly acknowledged on the 7th of December.

November 28th a letter from the G. Secretary, dated November 10th, requesting a Withdrawal Card for SIMON MUELLER, of Farragut Lodge, No. 265, was received and acknowledged, and December 21st the G.

Secretary was advised of the shipment of 10 German Digests and 51 copies of Revised Journal of 1877.

A letter of Bro. MEYENDORF, dated December 12th, reached this office on the 29th of the same month, advising of the receipt of charge books, etc., per his order of August 29th. He also wrote: "On the 18th of November a new chapter in the history of Odd Fellowship was begun, as we then dedicated to the principles of humanity the beautiful hall erected on our own ground for Lodge purposes. Although in the present depressing state of business it was particularly difficult to accomplish an undertaking that involved an outlay of 320,000 marks (\$80,000), the possession of such a building is the more agreeable, and we all hope that the enterprise may serve to elevate and increase our beloved Order. Even now, after so short a time since its occupancy, an additional and gratifying activity pervades the new hall."

On the 1st of January, 1878, the letter was answered as follows:

"I am rejoiced to learn that our brethren of Berlin have dedicated their new Odd Fellows' Hall, which enterprise, in view of the present commercial depression and scarcity of money, is a great success. Henceforth they may congratulate themselves at having provided 'a local habitation and home' for our beloved Order in that great city. It was a wise measure on their part, and will at once elevate the Order in public sentiment, as well as greatly promote its business facilities and comforts."

From a letter of January 22d, received February 13, 1878, I extract the following:

"I make use of this opportunity to send a circular of Wildey Lodge, No. 21, Texas, through the G. Lodge of Texas, which has been transmitted to the G. Lodges of Hannover and Württemberg, and handed to the Grand Sire of the G. L. of G. E. for further authority. In view of the fact that the Lodges of Germany have been recently instituted, they are not so financially situated as to be able to render the assistance requested. Besides, we have in Germany many Lodges that need help, and it was therefore deemed inexpedient to recommend the Lodges to aid Wildey Lodge, No. 21, in rebuilding their hall. We sympathize with the Lodge on account of the heavy loss, yet I am compelled to inform them through the G. Lodge of Texas that it is impossible to obtain any assistance from the Lodges in Germany."

G. Secretary MEYENDORF was immediately informed of the reception of the letter, and the transmission of its contents to the G. Master of the G. Lodge of Texas. He was also advised that "the papers this day received from the G. Master of the G. Lodge of Illinois, viz.: Appeal of Dr. HAUSLEUTNER; Copy of letter from JOHN LAKE, G. Master; Letter of Eclipse Lodge, No. 404, Illinois, to G. Master LAKE; and letter of AMOS HENDERSON, P. G. M., to G. Master LAKE, are inclosed herein."

On the 2d of April the Dismissal Certificate issued by Farragut Lodge, No. 265, New York, to Bro. SIMON MUELLER, was forwarded to the Grand Secretary.

On the 1st of May the following was sent to Bro. J. C. PRAETORIUS, M. W. Grand Sire, Hannover, Germany:

"I inclose a letter from Bro JOHN W. STOKES, M. W. Grand Sire, authorizing the institution of a Lodge at Copenhagen, Denmark. The necessary papers are prepared and await the cards from Omaha, Nebraska (JOHN RATH), and Jersey City, New Jersey (CHARLES TRATZ), which have been applied for. The card for S. HOFFMEYER will be issued from this office, Pacific Lodge, No. 2, at Lahaina, Sandwich Islands, having surrendered its Charter several years ago. You will have five petitioners holding Withdrawal Cards and Certificates, a number sufficient to institute a Lodge without 'making' Odd Fellows for the purpose. I will send the documents as soon as possible, and ask you to procure the 2 Charge, 2 Degree, and 2 Rebekah Degree Books (German) from G. Secretary MEYENDORF, and we will replace them in first shipment to him from this office."

On the 23d of May he was advised:

"Some delay has occurred to prevent the transmission of the documents required to institute Denmark Lodge, No. 1, at Copenhagen, until now. I mail with this a petition to be signed by the applicants for initiation for the purpose of organizing a Lodge; commission authorizing the Special Deputy to initiate and confer the degrees; petition to be signed by the applicants for the Lodge; commission authorizing the institution of the Lodge; petition for the Lodge to be placed under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of the German Empire to be signed by the N. G. and Secretary (or all the members) after the Lodge is organized, attested by the seal (if they have one), and a Charter in blank. All of these documents please have properly filled and, with the exception of the Charter, return to this office as soon as possible."

On the same day a letter was addressed to Bro. F. MEYENDORF, G. Secretary, in reply to his communication of March 26th (noted under "Denmark"), advising him of success in obtaining the cards requested, the transmission to G. Sire PRAETORIUS of all documents required to institute Denmark Lodge, and requesting him to "send as soon as convenient a statement of the condition of the Order in the German Empire, January 1, 1878, for publication in the report of the Grand Secretary."

The following extract from a letter of Bro. MEYENDORF, dated May 31st, which was received June 15th, is published as requested to correct an error in the pamphlet report of the Grand Sire of the German Empire from

which the translation was made.

"In the printed Proceedings of the R. W. G. L. of U. S., of the session of 1877, page 7513, Schiller Lodge, No. 3, in Stuttgart, is recorded as having surrendered its Charter This is an error, doubtless caused by the report to the Representatives in the G. L. of G. E., of the then Grand Sire, Bro. ELSASSER, and embodied in the proceedings of the G. L. of U. S. It was not Schiller Lodge, No. 3, in Stuttgart, but Liebig Lodge, No 3, in Munchen, that surrendered its Charter. This is properly stated in the report of the G. Sire, as printed in the Journal of the G. Lodge of the German Empire. At the request of Schiller Lodge, No. 3, I request that you will make the proper correction in your Proceedings.

"I also request, as Denmark Lodge, No. 1, is to be instituted by the authority of the G. L. of U. S., information as to the transmission of the fee for the Charter and books, and what amount will be required. They have been notified that they will have to pay other fees, and I hereby advise you that the customary fee of GO marks (\$15.00) has been received by me from the parties concerned. On account of the limited time, I will supply them with books from the supply I have on hand; that is, sell them without making any special claim on you for their restitution. I acknowledge the receipt of the card for Bro. MUELLER. "

The following, also from the G. Secretary, dated June 13th, was received June 29th:

"In acknowledging the receipt of yours of May 23d, I take the opportunity of expressing my warmest thanks for the prompt dispatch of the favors requested, as advised by Bro. Ross, Assistant G. Secretary. The formation of the Lodge at Copenhagen is progressing, and in a very short time we shall be able, through the documents transmitted by you to our M. W. Grand Sire, Bro. PRAETORIUS, to undertake the institution. The G. Sire is of opinion, that, as there are few Odd Fellows in Copenhagen, and they anticipate having fifty candidates, it will be necessary for some brother to accompany him from- Germany to assist in the ceremonies. As it is provided by the law in Section 1244, Digest, that all traveling expenses must be paid by the Lodge to be instituted, a very heavy burden will be laid upon the shoulders of this young Lodge, in defraying the expenses of the two officers for this long journey. In view of the fact that the G. L. of the German Empire is at the present time so financially situated that it not only has no funds on hand, but must even carry on its labors with a deficit, I take the liberty of requesting that the G. L. of U. S. kindly reimburse Denmark Lodge for the traveling expenses incurred in the institution.

"I am this day authorized by the M. W. Grand Sire, Bro. PRAETORIUS, to mention a matter, which, in the interest of our Order here and abroad, should elicit a free conference and interchange of opinions. Frequently, but more particularly of late, brothers of American Lodges, provided with Traveling or Withdrawal Cards, have visited Germany, and immediately after their arrival applied to Lodges or the members here for relief; and even when they make no claim for assistance or benefits they represent their object to be the restoration of their health through some sort of a cure, for the payment of which they do not possess the means. One Lodge even recommended a certain brother, as without means, to the German brotherhood. This one had traveled from the United States under circumstances which made it clearly apparent that immediately upon his arrival here he would be obliged to apply to the German Lodges for assistance. Our Lodges, on account of their recent institution, are not so financially situated as to be able to spare sufficient money out of their Lodge funds for the relief of needy brothers, as their means are barely sufficient to pay the guaranteed benefits in addition to the other expenses, therefore the applicants from abroad must be assisted by voluntary contributions. As only the regular frequenters of the Lodges are subjected to such collections, it will not surprise you to learn that, however self-sacrificing the Lodges and individuals of the Order in Germany may be, complaints in reference to this matter have been loudly expressed, by reason of the frequent occurrence of such cases. I do not design, indeed it is not in my power to present every case to you; it will be sufficient to cite a few in proof of what I have written, and that the complaints are well founded.

"Bro. BERNHARD JACOBY, of Mount Sair Lodge, No. 336, New York, arrived here sick, accompanied by his wife, in order to be cured. They were supported here for nine months, and being cured he was supplied with money for his traveling expenses.

"Somewhat similar was the case of Bro. MEYER, of Franz Deak Lodge. He was assisted from time to time, and unfortunately was robbed, when we were obliged to raise 90 marks (\$22.50) in order to send him to his home (Pesth, in Hungary. Since that time he has given no evidence of his existence, although he promised that upon reaching his home he would return the amount advanced to him.

"At the present time, Bro. ISRAEL ROSANSZKY, of Admiral Lodge, No. 577, New York, is again here. He possesses the third degree, is entitled to one dollar a week benefits; is afflicted with chronic inflammation of the membrane of the brain, and was sick when he left New York. It is true that he refuses benefits (which would be repaid by his Lodge), without being able to afford proof of his ability to support himself. He is seeking to have his health restored through some kind of an institution, but for this he will be obliged to pay a large sum.

Through circumstances of the character named continually occurring, the disposition to liberality of our brothers here has been considerably lessened. There have been also cases brought to my notice where brothers

have visited Germany, and under the mantle of brotherhood have committed acts calculated to bring the Order into disrepute. For the sake of example we were obliged to take from a brother,——HAUSLEIN (of Admiral Lodge, if I do not err), his Traveling Card because he was guilty of gross violation of the laws. Besides this, a letter from Bro. BAUER, the M. W. G. Master of the G. Lodge of Württemberg, has just been handed to me by the G. Sire, warning the Order against an Ancient Odd Fellow from America, by the name of GLASS, who has acted most treacherously toward the brethren in Switzerland and Southern Germany, and who, on account of his rascality, was published in the papers and is now an inmate of the jail at St. Gallen. I am not aware of the name of the Lodge to which he belonged.

"In our German jurisdiction, where Odd Fellowship is just being developed, occurrences like those mentioned must create an unfavorable influence upon the membership. A dozen of such transactions as I have recorded will place our Order in such a light, that, while its existence may not be terminated, yet its advancement will be seriously retarded, if not entirely prevented. In the interest of our beloved Order whose success is so dear to all our hearts, I request of you, honored brother, to use your influence with the Grand Lodge of the United States to make such arrangements in reference to the granting of Traveling and Withdrawal Cards as will protect our Order from the disrepute that may be brought upon it by unworthy holders of such certificates. By order of our Grand Sire I have directed all our jurisdiction to prove strange brothers thoroughly.

"Although it grieves me to bring such occurrences to the attention of the G. L. of U. S., I feel it a duty, as it becomes the true Odd Fellow to strive for the removal of all evils that affect our great and glorious Order."

Some delay was experienced in procuring translations of the letters of 31st May and 13th June, and the reply was not sent until the 19th of July, when the G. Secretary was informed that his request for the correction of the error concerning Schiller Lodge, No. 3, at Stuttgart, would receive attention by a proper notice in the report of the G. Secretary to the G. L. of U. S. He was also advised that "the fee for Charter and books for a Subordinate Lodge is \$30.00 (about 120 marks), Digest, Section 653 (Constitution, Article XIV.). The books accompanying a Charter, are 2 Charge, 2 Degree, and 2 Rebekah Degree books. You have been requested to furnish Denmark Lodge with the books, as above named, which we will replace in the first shipment from this office to you, and we request that you make no claim on the Lodge at Copenhagen for the value of the same.

"In your favor of June 13th you prefer the request 'that the G. L. of U. S. kindly reimburse Denmark Lodge for the traveling expenses incurred in the institution.' I shall take great pleasure in presenting this subject to the consideration of the G. L. at the session in September, but suggest that the amount of such expense be named, in order that the committee may know the extent of the appropriation asked for.

"We are pained to learn that the Lodges in the German Empire have been subjected to such serious annoyance, and in several cases, as you recite, to imposition at the hands of holders of cards issued by Lodges in the United States. The evil, as you represent it, is serious indeed, and we are surprised to learn that any Lodge in this country should expect one of its members to be supported by the Lodges in your jurisdiction. You may rest assured that the subject will be presented to the G. L. of U. S. at its next session, with the hope that adequate legislation may be secured to prevent such great injustice in future as it is evident has been inflicted upon the Lodges under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of the German Empire. In the meantime I beg to call your attention to the law of 1874, Journal, 6310, 6326 (Digest, Section 1691a), which was intended to compel members to conform to their promises or suffer the punishment prescribed for failing to return money loaned to them. Of course, as recited, this law applies only to those holding 'unexpired Visiting Cards.'

"Your Grand Sire has acted wisely in directing that all visiting brothers shall be thoroughly proved. This is, indeed, important at all times, but especially when the visitor is an applicant for assistance."

On the 24th of December a letter was received from Bro. EUGENE GRIMM, Leipzig, December 3, 1877, desiring information in relation to two persons, one residing near Cincinnati, Ohio, and the other at Jersey City, New Jersey. Steps were taken to obtain the particulars asked for, which were promptly communicated to this office and transmitted to Bro. GRIMM. This brother is the publisher of "Der Odd Fellow," a semi-monthly paper, eight pages quarto, and in the letter above referred to advised of sending a bound copy of the first volume for the library of the Grand Lodge of the U. S. The book was received on the 27th of December and duly acknowledged.

The mail of March 23d brought another letter from Bro. GRIMM, dated March 2, 1878, as follows:

"For your kindly communication in reference to Mr. WEISE, of New Jersey, who, however, is dead, I return my warmest thanks, as well as for the great interest you have taken in behalf of the German brethren, and especially in the efforts of our Lodge and our paper, as so kindly expressed in the letter addressed to each. We will take the liberty, therefore, of forwarding hereafter, as before, 'Der Odd Fellow,' and request for it a continuance of your much valued encouragement."

The numbers of the paper (Vol. II., 1 to 20), October, 1877, to August, 1878, have been regularly received. Under date of July 16th, Bro. MEYENDORF wrote:

"Referring to my communication of June 13th, I hereby transmit report of the condition of the Order from

January 1 to December 31, 1877.

"I am sorry to state that the number of members has slightly declined, the receipts have fallen off, and the disbursements have been large, all, undoubtedly, owing to the depressed condition of commerce and trade.

"In the formation of new Lodges, two useless classes of members retard its success, namely: those who seek what they cannot find, and those who are not qualified for our cause. The latter class, especially, hinder the proper development of our Order in all its beneficent influences, and they must be under all circumstances eliminated from the organization. However, we have added to our list of existing Lodges, one Grand Lodge and four Subordinate Lodges, and we hope in the ultimate success of our cause, as this year has already witnessed the institution of several new Lodges "

Report of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877.

Grand Lodges, 4; Subordinate Lodges, 46; increase, 4. Members, Jan. 1, 1877, 2,024; initiated 275; admitted by card, 57; reinstated, 10; total, 2,366. Withdrawn, 194; suspended, 138; expelled, 63; deceased, 21; total, 416. Members, Dec. 31, 1877, 1,950; decrease, 74. Brothers relieved, 103; widowed families relieved, 19; paid for relief of brothers, \$1,869.70; widowed families, \$335.50; education of orphans, \$212.88; burying the dead, \$495.45; special relief, \$145.32; total relief, \$3,058.85. Amount of the annual receipts, \$18,615.11. Encampments, 5. Members, Jan. 1, 1877, 185; initiated, 35; reinstated, 1; total, 221. Withdrawn, 3; suspended, 36; deceased, 1; total, 40: Members, Dec 31, 1877, 181; decrease, 4.

Charter of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire.

As this document has not heretofore been published, I insert a copy from the duplicate on file in this office, so that the exact terms of the Warrant may appear in our printed Journal:

I. O. O. F.

Friendship, Love, and Truth.

To all whom it may concern:

Know Ye, That the Grand Lodge of the United States of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, the source of all true and legitimate Odd Fellowship in the United States of America, and by virtue of its constitutional power authorized to organize Lodges and Encampments, Grand and Subordinate, in foreign countries, doth hereby, upon application of Germania Lodge, No. 1, Borussia Lodge, No. 2, Teutonia Lodge, No. 3, Templar Lodge, No. 4, Concordia Lodge, No. 5, Humboldt Lodge, No. 6, of Prussia; Württemberg Lodge, No. 1, Donau Lodge, No. 2, Schiller Lodge, No. 3, of Württemberg; and Saxonia Lodge, No. 1, of Saxony, create and erect into a distinct sovereignty in Odd Fellowship the said Lodges, under the name and title of "The Grand Lodge of the German Empire," with independent power in all matters relating to Odd Fellowship within the said jurisdiction, except as follows:

FIRST.—The said Grand Lodge shall not at any time hereafter, in anywise alter or repudiate any of the signs, tokens, passwords, lectures, or charges, or any other portion or part of either the written or unwritten work of the Order, as known and practised within the jurisdiction of this Grand Lodge.

SECOND.—This Grand Lodge reserves to itself the right to give said Grand Lodge of the German Empire the annual traveling password to be used within the jurisdiction thereof, and to prescribe the form of card; and both jurisdictions shall use the same traveling password.

THIRD.—That said, "The Grand Lodge of the German Empire," shall have power, subject to the exceptions hereinabove provided, to establish and grant Charters to other Subordinate Lodges and Encampments, and to other Grand Lodges and Grand Encampments within the German Empire, and within such other Germanic European countries as may hereafter be attached to said jurisdiction by consent of this Grand Lodge; and when such other Lodges or Encampments, Subordinate or Grand, shall be so established, they shall sustain the same relations to said "The Grand Lodge of the German Empire "as like Lodges and Encampments sustain to this Grand Lodge; and Farnsworth Encampment, No. 1, at Berlin, Prussia, is hereby placed under the jurisdiction of said "The Grand Lodge of the German Empire." if and when established.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Grand Lodge of the United States, at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, this nineteenth day of September, 1872, and of our Order the fifty-fourth.

Fred. D. Stuart, Grand Sire.

JAMES L. RIDGELY, G. Cor. and Rec. Secretary.

GREAT BRITAIN—The correspondence with this newly-established jurisdiction has been by no means

encouraging during the past year. In fact, at present, we are in doubt whether Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1, and Anglo- American Encampment, No. 1, instituted at London, England, by Special D. G. Sire R. H. MORRISON, of Michigan, under flattering circumstances, have not each succumbed to the adverse circumstances of their position. The disappointments which these two bodies sustained and the severe trials to which they were subjected from time to time had the effect to reduce the membership and to materially diminish the zeal of the few who remained. An attempt was made to re-organize the Lodge under a new name. An informal meeting was called, at which it was suggested that the name be changed from Thomas Wildey Lodge No. 1, to that of Victoria Lodge, No. 1, and it was so agreed by the few who attended the meeting. Due notice was forwarded to the M. W. G. Sire of this movement, who advised the members of the irregularity and illegality of the proceeding without the special assent of the Grand Lodge of the United States. It was not doubted but that the local popularity of the Lodge would be advanced by the change of name suggested; yet the constitutional impediment which secured the inviolability of the name of a Lodge, except by leave of the Grand Lodge, was insurmountable.

In the absence of information to the contrary, it is feared that the organizations in England set on foot two years ago have gradually died out. Thus the attempt on the part of the G. L. of U S to introduce American Odd Fellowship to England adversely, has signally failed for a second time.

It is to be regretted, that our former experience in this field had not sufficiently enlightened us on the subject. The truth is, that the effort on our part to enter upon a quasi adverse jurisdiction in England in Odd Fellowship was unwise, when the authorities of the Order in that country were friendly disposed to us, and were fraternally approaching us, to negotiate, with a view to an interchange of Lodge visitations or some kind of satisfactory fraternization of the two Orders, the object evidently being to reunite the two Orders in England and America and throughout the world, if practicable; and if such idea should prove impracticable on account of the diverse system of our work, to introduce such a spirit of sympathy between us, as would gradually ripen into a closer fellowship the two largest and most powerful beneficial and benevolent secular organizations in the world, now numbering in the aggregate more than a million of members. The G. L. is aware that this subject is now in the hands of the Grand Master and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity and of the M. W. G. Sire and Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the United States, by reference of the Grand Annual Movable Committee and the Grand Lodge of the United States respectively. It is undoubtedly of sufficient importance to challenge the gravest attention of that joint conference, and it is suggested that the subject be at present considered by a special committee with a view of presenting the matured views of this Grand Lodge in the premises to the conference. Certainly the importance of the issue involved to the interest and welfare of the two Orders would justify an earnest effort to harmonize, if not unite, two such powerful benevolent organizations, having a common origin and parentage.

To arrive at a correct understanding of the situation, I present extracts from the several letters received and sent during the year, as follows:

Bro. LUDWIG KLAJE. under date of October 3, 1877, advised, that the documents sent enabled him "to make the acquaintance of Bro. FAIRLIE, who appears to be a very zealous brother. Bro. CUSSANS, who has procured the two rooms, is unfortunately ill and out of town, and until his return in three or four weeks we cannot call the brothers together. Bros. FAIRLIE and NEWTON are gratified with all they have seen of the Order, and I have no doubt of success. There has been some disappointment, but the brothers have promised to forget all the disagreeable affairs of the past and work with renewed energy for the Lodge. They will not, however, start under the name of 'Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1,' saying they never had a meeting, the life of the Lodge was too short and the memory too disagreeable. They will take as the name for the new Lodge 'Victoria, No. 1,' and they have selected this name because it is their Queen's name. Of course. Thomas Wildey was a man of whom without doubt the Order is justly proud, but he was unknown here, and the failure of the Lodge attempted to be organized by that name makes it distasteful to them. I hope you will use your influence to make this change acceptable to the G. L. of U. S. I was unable to learn whether the entire set of regalia, necessary books, cards, etc., have been received I think it will be better to have Bro. OSTHEIM for D. D. G. Sire. In his last letter he promised to come to London to see me."

This letter was received on the 14th and answered on the 17th of October, thanking the brother for his interest in the Lodge at London, and saying: "I am of opinion that no trouble will interpose itself in the change of name, and perhaps on that subject all impediment would be removed by chartering a new Lodge as 'Victoria Lodge, No. 2,' to consist, of course, of as many of the former organization as would join in the new enterprise. However, as I have said, that will not interrupt the change of name, which may be arranged hereafter to suit the parties, and to avoid possible objection I will send your letter to the M. W. Grand Sire, who will doubtless give you a cordial appreciation for the interest you manifest in the success of our English enterprise, and he will probably appoint Bro. OSTHEIM to the position of D. D. G. Sire for Great Britain.

"Continue to interest yourself in this good cause, and be assured your efforts will confer a lasting obligation

upon our Order."

The opinion of the Grand Sire was also communicated, that "I have no doubt that Bro. KLAJE will be of great value to us in London, particularly so, if his friend OSTHEIM co-operates with us as we expect. In reference to a change in the name of the Lodge from 'Thomas Wildey' to 'Victoria' you might say that there would not be any trouble, for I do not think that the G. L. of U. S. would hesitate a moment." He was also informed that "the Journal of the G L. of U. S. will show that the regalia, books, etc., for the Lodge were forwarded from here to the proper parties."

On the 17th December another letter from Bro. KLAJE, dated the 2d, came to hand, who advised: "We had the first meeting last Friday, November 30th, in the office of the Anglo-Californian Bank, where, a staircase higher we shall have the Lodge-rooms offered by Bro. CUSSANS, Secretary of the said bank. Unfortunately only three brothers were present, but we, notwithstanding, commenced. The following is a minute of the proceedings: 'Victoria Lodge, No. 1, London, the 30th of November, 1877. At a meeting of the above Lodge, called by requisition of Bro. L. KLAJE, there were present Bros. JOHN E. CUSSANS, ARCHIBALD FAIRLIE, and L. KLAJE. Bro. KLAJE presided. A letter from Helvetia Lodge, No. 1, Zurich, Switzerland, congratulating Victoria Lodge, No. 1, on its inauguration was read and unanimously ordered to be placed on the minutes of the Lodge. Bro. KLAJE having presented a photograph of the emblems given by, Bro. JEAN GIST, Zurich, the same was gratefully accepted and the chairman was requested to return the thanks of the Lodge to the donor. It was resolved that Bro. ARCHIBALD FAIRLIE be requested to place himself in communication with Bro. JOSEPH MORRELL, with the object of procuring the necessary furniture for the Lodge-room L. KLAJE, Chairman.'

"It was privately agreed to change the name and start under the name of 'Victoria Lodge, No. 1.' Please inform the M. W. Grand Sire, and I hope he will accept. The brothers are very glad to observe the interest the foreign jurisdictions take in the establishment of the Order in Great Britain. The furniture for the Lodge is expected to be finished in about four weeks, and it is important that Bro. OSTHEIM comes to England at the beginning of next year, as the brothers expect to have from 12 to 16 friends who ought to be initiated when he visits them. I have the utmost confidence that our Order will now succeed here, as it is in good hands. I am, contrary to my expectations, about to return to Zurich to reside, and regret that I shall be unable to meet with the brothers. I will, however, before I leave, assemble them and give further instructions in the written and unwritten work."

A reply to the above was mailed on the 27th of December, advising that his letter was "transmitted to the M. W. Grand Sire, who informs us that he has written to Bro. FAIRLIE, a member of Thomas Wildey Lodge, upon the subject, considering it better that he should advise the Lodge directly. If you will consult with Bro. FAIRLIE, he will doubtless put you in possession of the Grand Sire's views as to the irregularity of some of the proceedings had. It is always better, although it may cause delay, to proceed in order in all we do. I have not heard from Bro OSTHEIM, who was appointed D. D. G. Sire for England. He at first declined to act, but was urged to withdraw his declination."

This letter reached Bro. KLAJE, at Zurich, to which place he had returned, and from whence he wrote on the 27th of January as follows:

"I am greatly disappointed that I could not carry out my intention to establish our Order in old England. I ought to have done it during my residence in London, but it was a very difficult matter, and required more time than I had at my disposal. I have written to Bro OSTHEIM, giving him all necessary particulars, and he has promised me that he will go to London whenever the brothers there desire his presence, and I hope he will finish what I began. I cannot conceal from you that I feel a little disregarded that the M. W. G. Sire did not write to me about the irregularities, as I was the cause of the action, and the brothers in London will not understand what manner of irregularities occurred. I feel, however, too great an interest in our institution to be offended by a personal disregard. Please oblige by informing me what was not regular. I intend to return to London in a month or two, for a visit, and you can imagine that I shall be happy to find our Order established and be able to speak to brothers in a sacred Lodge-room."

On the 28th of February Brother KLAJE was informed:

"Your favor of 27th ult. reached this office on the 11th inst. and was immediately sent to the M. W. Grand Sire, who returned it yesterday with the remark that he had thought over the subject and was satisfied that his course in communicating directly with the members of the Lodge was correct. Had you been D. D. G. Sire the case would have been different, but being a member of a Lodge in another jurisdiction and holding no commission, he could not find any authority for advising *you* that the proceedings in London were irregular. He begs to assure you that he meant no disrespect, nor did he intend in any way to slight you; on the contrary he highly appreciates your labors in London and regrets that your business has obliged you to leave that city. at the same time he was compelled to recognize you simply as a volunteer, not clothed with authority, but laboring earnestly in the cause.

"I am unable to forward a copy of the letter of the Grand Sire to Bro. FAIRLIE, but presume it will be a

sufficient answer to your question 'what was not regular?' to say that a Lodge must work under the name by which it was chartered, until the Grand Body to which it is subordinate authorizes a change. It is not in the power of a Subordinate to change its name or number."

Several letters from brothers who have advised of their intention to visit England have been received, but we were unable to furnish any satisfactory information concerning the London Lodge. Bro. R. C. T. SCHROEDER, P. G., of St Louis, announced his intention to visit Great Britain in June, and promised to transmit early information as to the situation of affairs in connection with Thomas Wildey Lodge, and on the 21st of August the following was received:

138 ASHWORTH ST, ROCHDALE, LANCASHIRE. ENGLAND,

July 9, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGELY. Esq, Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—I have just returned from London, where I remained a week or more. Concerning the Order there I would simply say that all operations are for a time entirely suspended, there being no Lodge in existence so far as I could learn. I called upon Bro. ARCHIBALD FAIRLIE. of 48 King William Street, who appears to be the leading spirit in the Order here, and was very kindly received and most courteously treated. Bro. FAIRLIE informs me that owing to a bad impression having been created at the time of the organization, a disinclination has arisen amongst the members to resume affiliation until all stigma shall have vanished from the name of the Order. Much as I deprecate the idea of a scandal, still its baneful influence has had a bad effect upon all would-be members, and until some counteracting element is brought into requisition to dispel the cloud, Odd Fellowship in England will remain a nonentity. Another thing which militates greatly against the Lodge holding its meetings and the accession of members, is that London is one vast metropolis and our members are generally business men whose residences are from seven to ten miles from the city, who must therefore, at great personal inconvenience, stay in town on Lodge nights.

It appears that the members have not been properly or thoroughly instructed in the secret work of the Order, though the information that has been imparted has fallen upon fertile soil. A great many men have asked me if our Order is not the M. U. without its conviviality. I have replied that it is the pure American Order, remodeled and revised from the M. U. I have found many who are willing to become members of Lodges in the vicinity of their residences, but none who will go more than five miles to attend a meeting. Contrary to my expectations the Manchester Unity exhibits no opposition to our Order here. Their time is chiefly occupied with their own troubles, as there are numerous splits and departures here from their organization.

Bro. FAIRLIE seems to have hopes of the resurrection of our Order here, and appeared quite sanguine of ultimate success if the subject is properly canvassed and brought before the public, and I think with an energetic and live brother at the head, with one or two to canvass the districts, a fine harvest of worthy and noble brothers might be reaped. I hope in my next to be able to give you the exact status of the Order in England, as I am awaiting the information from Bro. FAIRLIE.

I shall be glad to execute any command or service the Grand Sire may see fit to intrust me with, and I hope the time is not far distant when the "three links" shall be emblazoned on the four quarters of the globe.

Fraternally yours,

Richard C. T. Schroeder,

P. G. of Missouri Lodge, No. 11, St. Louis, Mo.

On the 19th of October, 1877, Bro. F. S. OSTHEIM, of Elberfeld, Germany was commissioned D. D. G. Sire for Great Britain and Ireland, also for the Netherlands, but in a letter of November 5th felt compelled to decline the appointments. He was urged to withdraw his declination, and on the 17th of December reluctantly consented to accept the positions. He has not, however, so far as we can learn, been able to visit London, indeed it was not his intention to go until invited by the brethren of Thomas Wildey Lodge.

NETHERLANDS.—The condition of the Order in this jurisdiction is entirely satisfactory. Mount Sinai Lodge, No. 2, was instituted at Amsterdam by Bro F. S. OSTHEIM, D. D. G. Sire, on the 17th of January, 1878, and has met with extraordinary success, having admitted to membership in less than six months, 38 by initiation, and 4 by deposit of card, making the membership, June 30th, 47. Paradise, No. 1, in the same time initiated 10, giving them a membership of 33; total in the jurisdiction, 80.

The correspondence with D. D. G. Sire OSTHEIM embraces letters from him dated Sept. 21st, Nov. 5th,

Nov. 20th, Dec. 17th, Dec. 24th. 1877; Jan. 23d, Feb. 7th. Feb. 9th, Feb. 25th, Feb. 26th, March 1st, March 4th, March 17th, March 19th, March 22d, March 23d, April 20th, April 23d, and July 16th, 1878; and replies from this office Oct. 2d, Oct. 8th, Oct. 17th, Dec. 1st, Dec. 11th, 1877; Jan. 16th, Feb. 11th, Feb. 28th, March 8th, March 30th, April 5th, June 20th, June 23d, and July 31st, 1878.

These several letters relate to the translation of the ritual into the Holland tongue, the condition and prospects of the Order in the Netherlands and in England, and the action of the G. L. of U. S. at the last session in appropriating \$100.00 to Bro. OSTHEIM. On the latter subject I submit the statement of the D. D. G. Sire of the expense incurred by him, in his efforts to introduce the Order into the kingdom of the Netherlands. It is but justice to Bro. OSTHEIM to say that the statement was sent in reply to a request that inasmuch as he regarded the appropriation insufficient he should furnish an account of his expenditures. The letter, dated Elberfeld, 22d March, 1878, is as follows:

"Pursuant to your demands to send you a statement of the expense I incurred and which I advanced during the time I acted as District Deputy Grand Sire, which office I kept since nearly two years, I herewith submit to you and through you to the R. W. G. L. of U. S. the following statement of my advances, viz.: 1876, in June and October; 1877, January, March, May, July, and November; 1878, January and March, including my expenses and sojourning, as well as my correspondence (postage, etc.) with the jurisdiction intrusted to my care, and with America, \$994.00. Received from Paradise Lodge, at the time of institution, \$42.00, and from Mount Sinai Lodge, at the time of institution, \$33.00, total \$75.00, leaves a balance of \$919.00 in my favor. You observe that I traveled nine times to Amsterdam, sojourning there always for such length of time as I found necessary. The correspondence I entertained during the two years with the Netherlands, lately with England and the United States, is quite voluminous, and included in the expenses. The charges I made are my actual advances. Considering, however, the immense loss of time, it is easily to be inferred that my sacrifices are by far greater than above stated; in fact so great, that I shall feel the effect from it for quite a length of time, if not forever. To fill honorably my mission I did not stop to sacrifice my very existence, and preferred rather to neglect my vocation than to neglect the Order, the dignity of which I always considered and shall continue to consider paramount to life itself. While submitting to you, as above stated, the bill for my advances, viz., \$919.00, I should be glad to receive this amount as soon as you are at liberty to send the same to me.

"You wish me also to state what sum of money should be appropriated to meet the exigency and to justify me in continuing as D. D. G. Sire for England and for the Netherlands. Firmly contending that, at least for the first two years it is as necessary to travel variously to England as it proved to be to the Netherlands, an annual sum of \$1,000.00 ought to be appropriated. A D. D. Grand Sire appointed for such far distant countries, where the Order is in its infancy yet, incurs expenses nearly every day; he is obliged to use his personal influence and by his repeated presence to promote the interests of the Order and its maintenance in such new, but—if properly encouraged and cultivated—fertile fields."

This subject was referred to the M. W. Grand Sire, who promptly responded, inclosing his letter to this office, which was forwarded by the G. C. and R. Secretary to Bro. OSTHEIM, April 22d, with the following:

"Your letters of March 19th, 22d, and 23d have been duly received. In view of the grave tenor of which I without delay transmitted them to Philadelphia for the official consideration of the M. W. Grand Sire. I have this day received his reply, with return of the original letters to be filed in this office. The advice and opinions of the Grand Sire, which I herewith forward to your address, are so clear, concise, and well supported by the fundamental laws and principles of the Order, and are so consistent with our settled doctrines upon the subject of propagation, over and over again reiterated, that I am at a loss to understand how so intelligent an officer as Bro. F. S. OSTHEIM could have involved himself personally in expenses amounting to \$1,000.00, in and about two Subordinate Lodges in the Netherlands, which *by our laws* were required to incur such expenses themselves. With sincere regret that such a state of circumstances should exist, I cannot perceive anything in the facts connected with the transaction which should even remotely be regarded as a source of actual or constructive encouragement in the premises."

On the 16th of July Bro. OSTHEIM advised that he again went to Amsterdam and installed the officers of Paradise Lodge, No. 1, and Mount Sinai, No. 2, receiving their reports and dues for the term. He reports: "Both Lodges, over which I exercise a most watchful eye, are in a flourishing condition, and Mount Sinai, No. 2, has been lately recruiting first-class and highly intelligent members, while Paradise Lodge, encouraged by the thought that the same is considered as the mother Lodge, rivals with the daughter in maintaining the ascendancy over the Order in the jurisdiction. Although I wished to authorize a Past Grand to proceed with the installation, for the purpose of not estranging me from my vocation, it was considered of the highest moment to perform this office personally, and instil the minds of the brethren with renewed courage, warning them at the same time to live in peace and harmony. We separated at a late hour direct from the Lodge-room to our dwelling; and I conferred with the leading members of both Lodges in behalf of the future of the Order in their country the following day, before I left for Elberfeld again.

"I failed to answer your letter of April 22d, my feelings having been deeply wounded by its tenor. I still answer the same with some reluctance, but time, healing all wounds, has gained a triumph, and far from being tempted into any complaints I proceeded with double zeal in the exercise of my duties toward the G. L. of U. S. as their District Deputy, but still more in the exercise of humanity and philanthropy. Your sense of justice prompted you to demand at my hands a specification of my expenses from the time of having received the office as District Deputy and I have followed your wishes, the more so, as I found them plain and natural. My expenses were not incurred by instituting, as you allude to, one Lodge in Holland, but by my travelling to and from that country during 1876, 1877, and 1878, nine times, exclusively for the purpose to demonstrate that the introduction of the Order into the Netherlands was not a vain experiment, which undoubtedly it would have proven to become, if not all my mental energies and personal influence were exercised by repairing to that section whenever the Order was in danger, and if not every possible sacrifice would have been extended from me to keep the Order alive.

"On the 20th of April I transmitted to you the translation of the Initiatory Charge Book in a registered letter. The five degrees are nearly completed, and will be ready for my revision about the end of this month, so that very likely the translation will reach you a little before or during the session.

"Your letter, including the sentiments of the M. W. Grand Sire, concerning the Order in Switzerland, has been duly received. I forwarded the same (translating the text into the German language) to the Grand Secretary, Bro. H. VOGEL, at Zurich, and gave the most explicit instructions, as wished for by your suggestions and those of the Grand Sire. If the G. L. of U. S. at their session should grant their petition to began independent body, under similar provisions as in Germany, I am confident that such a privilege will be appreciated in a manner as to satisfy you that the action of your Worthy Grand Lodge will prove both correct and salutary to the interests of the Order."

In acknowledging the above on the 31st of July, the G: C. and R. Secretary said: "You complain of my last as being aggressive to your feelings. I disclaim all such purpose, having only spoken as I think was my duty, certainly with no intention to wound your feelings. I could not, of course, recommend the payment of expenses incurred, without knowing their character, and the authority under which paid. It is only necessary for you to verify legitimate claims against the G. L. of U. S., contracted in the proper manner, to enlist my official approval. In that event I will cheerfully indorse them in the discharge of my duty, otherwise you cannot reasonably expect this office to pursue any other course than to withhold approval. However, if you will transmit your account in due form, I will present it to the next session."

In a letter of November 20th, Bro. OSTHEIM advised: "A brother, one of the Charter members of Mount Sinai Lodge, asks whether it was permitted to cause the pamphlet, 'Odd Fellowship—what is it?' to be printed in the Holland language? The same has already been translated, and I request you to notify me whether there is any objection to printing this essay in Holland." He was informed that, "I cannot see the slightest objection to it."

Another matter remains unsettled. In 1877 a blank report was transmitted to Paradise Lodge, No. 1, with a request that it be filled up merely as a memorandum to exhibit the condition of the Lodge on the 1st of July, 1877, the annual report not being required until January, 1878. The Lodge construed it to mean that no dues were required for the fractional term ending June 30, 1877, and when a demand was made through the D. D. G. Sire for the dues, he replied, March 17th, as follows: "The dues you charge per report to July 30, 1877, \$46.65, must rest upon an error. Your worthy Assistant Grand Secretary informed Paradise Lodge at the time you sent the blank report, on the margin of one of them, with the following words: '*Nothing will be required until after January the 1st, 1878.*' Guided by these remarks the Lodge either thought you did not reserve the privilege to collect until that time any dues, or you did not wish to collect at all. I inferred the same deductions from the above assertion and fully coincided with Paradise Lodge. The latter one thought herself only entitled to pay dues as per December 31st, as transmitted to you, and if the liberality of the Grand Body assumed a shape as not to charge anything before that time, as the above remark distinctly expresses, Paradise Lodge felt the more grateful, as the fitting up of their room, etc., exhausted their means in a manner as to acknowledge the more your action in the premises. I fully devised their views, but I request you to inform Paradise Lodge that they labored under a mistake if they conveyed to the remarks of the worthy Assistant Secretary an interpretation which I asserted myself was entirely correct, but seems not to correspond with your views. You may enlighten me upon the subject also, but under the circumstances I cannot help but return your memorandum as the dues as understood to be due are already paid and sent to you, while one part of the memorandum is founded upon an error on your part according to the above remark."

Bro. OSTHEIM'S *premises* are not correct, as instead of the indorsement being as he states, "*nothing will be required until after January the 1st, 1878,*" an examination of the report now on file, will show that the following is the indorsement that was made when the blank was sent from this office: "*Memorandum only; no report due until December 31, 1877.*"

On the 30th March, the G. C. and R. Secretary informed Bro. OSTHEIM: "I inclose Bro. Ross' explanation of the subject of the accounts of Paradise Lodge, with which he has become somewhat complicated by the memorandum to the Lodge on the subject. You will perceive by his present statement that his memorandum has been mistaken and misinterpreted by the Lodge and now explains specifically the situation. I trust this very specific and perspicuous statement will dispel all misunderstanding on the subject, and will restore the proper feeling in the case."

The Assistant G. Secretary wrote Bro. OSTHEIM as follows: "I have read with great surprise of the construction placed upon the pencil memorandum I made on a blank sent to Paradise Lodge, No. 1, Netherlands, about a year ago, with the intention of obtaining a statement of the condition of the Lodge on the 1st of July, 1877. Referring to the report, I find the memorandum as follows: '*Memorandum only; no report due until December 31, 1877.*' If these words can in any way be construed to mean that the Lodge was released from the payment of dues from the date of institution to the 1st of July, 1877, I confess I am unable to appreciate the force of language.

"Article III. of By-laws (Digest, 1732a) requires returns to be made annually. Article XXVI. requires reports to December 31st. Constitution, Article XIV., Section 3, provides that Subordinates shall pay ten per cent. on their receipts to the G. L. of U. S. As the G. L. of U. S. meets only in September, you will see that it was not in the power of any one in this office to remit the dues of a Subordinate. You will, I feel sure, on reflection, be satisfied there was nothing in the words written on the margin of the blank that justified the construction that the dues were remitted. I therefore return to you the statement, with proper credit for the remittances, and send a duplicate of the same to Paradise Lodge.

"1876, May 13, Cards, etc \$10 00

1878, Feb. 11, Dues per report to June 30, 1877,

Fl. 1211.62 @ 38½ cts. say \$466 47 @ 10% 46 65

Dues per report to Dec. 31, 1877, \$132 58 13 25

\$69 90

Cr.

Feb. 26, By Cash \$10 00

Feb. 27, By Cash P. O. Money Order, \$13, sent as 13 25

23 25

Due G. L. of U. S \$46 65

Being for dues from institution to June 30, 1877."

On the 20th of April, Bro. OSTHEIM advised: "Confirming your letter of March 30th, I suggested to Paradise Lodge that according to the letter of the worthy Assistant G. Secretary they were owing yet for dues to the G. L. of U. S. that little amount which they, as well as myself, interpreted was not required by that Grand Body to be paid. I have no doubt it will be paid as soon as the statement from the Assistant G. Secretary will reach Amsterdam."

On the 10th of June a better dated Amsterdam, May 26, 1878, signed JACOB WIENER, A. L. VAN HINDEN, S. K. LIEKENOPPARSSEN, with the seal of Paradise Lodge, No. 1, attached, was received at this office, and appears to refer to this subject. It is written in the Holland language, and after several days fruitless search for a translator, the writers were informed on the 21st of June, that "We are unable to get the letter translated, and request that you will repeat the contents in English. Your letters heretofore have been written in English and were satisfactory, and we hope you will continue to send them in that way. I notice, however, a passage in English in your letter which appears to be quoted, viz.: 'Nothing will be required until the first day of January.' If you intend this as a quotation from my letter of June 2, 1877, to JACOB WIENER, N. G., copied on Letter Book 4, page 852, I beg to say that you have made a mistake. I wrote: '*You will understand this is only a memorandum report,—your regular return will not be due until January, 1878.*' If what I wrote is not *clear*, that the memorandum asked for was a *memorandum only*, I don't know how to make it so. I said, further, 'We desire this that we may present your condition in the report of the Grand Secretary to the G. L. of U. S. in September.' The dues are payable in accordance with the laws of the G. L. of U. S.—*ten per cent, on receipts, and ice cannot say that you need not pay them.*"

February 22d a letter was received from a committee of Mount Sinai Lodge, No. 2, addressed "To the M. W. Grand Lodge of the United States," returning thanks for granting their Charter, etc. Also on the 16th of March a letter from the officers, dated Feb. 25th, accompanying "the photographs of the five institutors of Mount Sinai Lodge, No. 2 "These letters were duly acknowledged and are respectfully submitted with the entire correspondence with this jurisdiction.

July 19th, a letter was received from JACOB WIENER, desiring some diplomas in the Holland language The brother was informed that "the G. L. of U. S. has not authorized the diplomas printed in the Holland language; the demand would be too limited to justify the publication; still, if you will agree to purchase one hundred

copies (fifty dollars), and furnish a translation free of expense to the G. L. of U. S., the amount would about pay the cost, and it is probable the printing of a hundred copies or more in the Holland language may be authorized. The question will be submitted at the next session, but in order to obtain a favorable report it will be well for you to state the number of copies you will agree to purchase."

PERU.—Our advices and correspondence with this jurisdiction have been agreeable and satisfactory. The general monetary and business stringency, which prevails throughout the world, is more complained of in South America than in most other business centres. The Order has therefore correspondingly suffered, and the check to our progress in Peru from this cause, reported last year, has continued during the present year. Nevertheless we have reason to congratulate ourselves upon the annual reports of the Subordinates.

In consequence of the exorbitant rate of exchange in paying Lodge dues, by the Subordinates in Peru, to the Grand Lodge of the United States, the subject of the proper relief under the circumstances to be extended to them was considered at the last session, and upon the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the recommendation of the M. W. G. Sire, it was ordered, "that the rate of exchange actually paid by the Lodges in Peru be credited to them, and that the Grand Secretary be authorized to give the Subordinate Lodges located in that Republic, credit for the balances appearing against them." Information to this effect was communicated to D. D. G. Sire HURWITZ, 27th September, 1877 and it is believed was *entirely satisfactory to the Subordinates, affording the desired relief asked*. The present annual returns are highly encouraging; the condition of the jurisdiction is as follows:

Lodges, 4; members, Dec. 31, 1876, 110; increase during the year, 31; receipts, \$3,822.16; relief, \$78.00. Encampment, 1; members, 19; loss, 1; receipts, \$259.50. Ten per cent, on the receipts of the Subordinates amounted to \$408.16, while the amount remitted was \$209.26, about fifty-one per cent, or a little more than five per cent, on the receipts. The accounts were balanced in accordance with the legislation of the last session.

The letters from this office were of Sept. 27th, heretofore referred to; Oct. 19th, transmitting P. W's and commission; Oct. 22d, statement of credits to balance accounts of Subordinates; Dec. 29th, acknowledging receipt of D. D. G. Sire HURWITZ'S letter of November 20th, and transmitting invoice of supplies; April 2, 1878, acknowledging the reports, remittance, and letter of the D. D. G. Sire of March 18th.

On the 20th November Bro. HURWITZ advised that certain members of Atahualpa Encampment, No. 1, had been "suspended for non-payment of dues and fees," and the adoption by the Encampment of a resolution, that as the said members "have refused to pay their admission fees, although they agreed, at the time of instituting the Encampment, to pay whatever sum may be fixed by this Encampment, the names of the said brothers be stricken from the list of Charter members, and the R. W. Grand Secretary of the G. L. of U. S. be informed of the fact." He also requested Charters for Lodges Nos. 1 and 2 and the Encampment similar to the documents furnished to Lodges 3 and 4, meaning those printed on blank diplomas. Bro. HURWITZ was informed that the Encampment had no right to erase any of the names from the Charter; "for a failure to fulfil their promises the parties may be arraigned as provided by the laws of the Order." Duplicate Charters, corresponding in form, date, etc., with the original Warrants were forwarded. A few copies of the Spanish Charge and Degree Books were forwarded, with the hope that Lodges in that language might be organized, Bro. LOGAN having expressed the opinion that Peru would prove a good field for Lodges working in the Spanish language.

Under date of March 13, 1878, Bro. HURWITZ advised of the receipt of letter from this office of December 29, 1877, together with the supplies, journals, etc. He transmitted the reports and dues, remarking: "The amount due the G. L. is 408.14 soles, Peruvian currency, which I transmitted to Columbia, and it was from there forwarded to you in a U. S. Gold bill, sixty days, \$209.26, which is about 25 per cent, better than I could have done here. The act of the Encampment in striking certain names from the Charter was annulled, on learning that the proceeding was unlawful.

"I have lately been applied to by some of the Past Grands for a Grand Lodge, but as yet have not given the subject any consideration. I will soon bring it to the notice of the Lodges, and should they desire it, will make a move in that direction. My opinion is that the numerical strength of the Order in this jurisdiction will hardly be able to sustain a Grand Body. Please give me your opinion on the subject, as perhaps I look at the dark side of the picture. The Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows are opening a Lodge in this city. They made a move in that direction about a year ago, when I made some overtures to them, but it seems I did not succeed. As far as I can learn, their present candidates whom they offer to initiate for 5 soles each, are not of a desirable class of the foreigners here, and I have therefore not troubled myself much about them."

The above was answered April 2d, expressing the opinion that "it is wise to discourage the formation of a Grand Lodge until you have a larger number of Lodges and membership. In general I approve and encourage the formation of Grand Lodges wherever the strength of the constituency will justify the increased expense and responsibility, but in a community like yours, whose growth and progress is slow, although healthy, I think your advice is sound and judicious. Your progress is gradual, and I think your Grand Lodge, when formed, will be better prepared for its responsibility after a delay of another year or two, when the presumption is, that times

and business will be better."

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—As will appear by the extracts from the correspondence with Bro. W. C. PARKE, D. D. G. Sire for this jurisdiction, and Bros. C. S. BARTOW and D. N. FLITNER, former efficient officers, harmony has been restored, and the two Lodges are pursuing the even tenor of their ways undisturbed by the unhappy differences which it was feared would prove the ruin of the Order in this remote country.

Letters to the D. D. G. Sire were mailed on the 19th of October with P. W's and commission; Dec. 20th, on the subject of the Order at Honolulu: March 7, 1878, acknowledging receipt of letter of Feb. 9th with reports and dues; March 8th, advising of the proposed visit of D. D. G. Sire HARMON to Australia and his probable call at Honolulu; March 28th, acknowledging letter of 8th of March; May 4th, advising of letter of April 15th and August 8th, in reply to letter of June 26th.

The District Deputy, in letter of Dec. 1, 1877, referring to the receipt of commission, etc., said: "I should have preferred that the brethren here had selected another than myself for the office, but I shall endeavor during my incumbency to promote that good feeling which the Order inculcates." February 9th he advised of the installation of the officers of Excelsior and Harmony Lodges and Polynesia Encampment, transmitted the returns and dues and advised that: "The Order here is progressing favorably; the very unpleasant feeling existing between the two Lodges has, in a great measure, subsided, and I shall use my utmost endeavors to obliterate the same and promote the friendship which the Order inculcates. What a loss to the Order at large the death of Bro. PORTER will be! We in this out of the way spot feel as if we had lost a personal friend, and so, I presume, will be the sentiment in other places. None of our members who visited San Francisco and met his kindly grasp will soon forget him; and should I ever visit the Grand Lodge again I shall miss his warm welcome, as he was a true friend of mine;" and March 8, 1878, acknowledging letter from this office of 20th of December, he remarked: "What a loss the Order has sustained in the death of Bros. PORTER and STUART; they have left a record which we may well take for an example. I am proud to say, that in my opinion, the Order has been a power for good in this jurisdiction. Any person known as a member of the Order here has a passport recognized by the best society. We have contributed our share to the advancement of the people. As a matter of course, we have had black sheep in our fold, but not to remain any length of time. The Order has been foremost to relieve distress when called upon, and I hope we shall be able to do more for the cause of humanity. I am glad to be able to report a better feeling existing in the two Lodges, and I shall not weary in my efforts to promote harmony among the brethren in this jurisdiction. We were looking forward with pleasure for a visit from the Grand Sire on his way to Australia, as the steamers touch here, and had a committee appointed to receive him. I now see that Bro. J. B. HARMON, D. G. Sire, will go on the mission, and I hope that we can persuade him to spend a week or more with us, for his visit will do the Order good. It will be the first time the Lodges have had the honor to entertain a Grand Officer. We felt a little hurt that this jurisdiction was not thought of in sending a Grand Officer to Australia, by resolution of the Grand Lodge, for we are on the road. Is it hoping too much when we look forward to a consideration of the color question at the next session of the Grand Lodge? We should be allowed to initiate Hawaiians, whom we meet daily in society."

This letter was answered March 28th, saying: "Bro. HARMON proposes to stop at your island, and make such delay as circumstances will permit. It was no want of respect for your Lodges, or want of interest in their welfare, which comparatively ignored your jurisdiction in sending a Special Commissioner to Australia, particularly as you are upon the highway to that country; but it was not the subject of special thought. The M. W. Grand Sire has, however, taken care to cause the Special Commissioner to tarry by the way at your island, and render such service to the Order there as may be in his power. Touching your suggestion on the 'color question,' I reply that I fear the Grand Lodge of the United States will not depart from what appears to be its fixed policy. A great deal has been wrought in the matter of public opinion on the subject, but much more remains for time and enlightenment to accomplish."

A letter from D. D. G. Sire PARKE, April 15th, refers to an error in the report of Lodge No. 1, and his letter of April 23d advised of the arrival of Bro. HARMON, and his stay of a few hours, with a promise to remain a longer time on his return. The latest advice is dated June 26th, inclosing a corrected report of Excelsior Lodge.

Brother C. S. BARTOW, Sept. 3, 1877, advised: "The disputes and discord which seemed for a time to threaten a dissolution of the Order have subsided, and for the present we dwell together in harmony;" and Bro. D. N. FLITNER, on the 8th of October, said: "The Order here is still on the increase, and the prospects for the future appear encouraging;" and on the 5th of November he advised: "No further change has taken place in the position of affairs here, and I look anxiously forward to the time when the last obstacle to a warm and fraternal regard for the welfare of each other shall be removed from between the two Lodges." On the 4th of December he advised of the receipt by Bro. PARKE of commission as D. D. G. Sire, and spoke in strong terms of commendation of the ability of the new officer and the wisdom of the selection, and a final letter, dated April 13th, was received May 4th, which advised that he had for some time been in bad health.

These letters were duly answered Sept. 29th, Dec. 1st, 1877; Jan. 2d and May 5th, 1878.

SWITZERLAND.—We received the annual report of the Grand Lodge of the Republic of Switzerland, for the year 1877, on the 23d of March, which presents the Order in that jurisdiction in a highly satisfactory condition, notwithstanding the trying ordeal to which the times have subjected every beneficial organization, in this as in other countries. Some matters of importance have been the subjects of correspondence, as will appear by the extracts from the numerous letters received and answered during the year, herewith submitted.

Bro. HERMANN VOGEL, R. W. G. Secretary, wrote September 11, 1877 (received September 27th), acknowledging letter from this office of July 30th, and said: "We lately heard that the R. W. G. L. of Germany has sent you a petition for permission to print the books and cards in Germany. The G. L. of Switzerland joins heartily in this petition."

In reply, Bro. VOGEL was informed that "the G. L. of U. S. declined to grant permission to the G. L. of the German Empire to print the books and cards, hence supplies must be procured from this office."

September 22d, the G. Secretary advised of forwarding copies of the "Herz und Hand," of August 15, 1875, and June 1st and 15th, 1876, containing the Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Switzerland at the Annual Sessions of 1875 and 1876. He also stated that in October two Lodges would be instituted, viz.: No. 8 at Luzern and No. 9 at Schaffhausen.

October 19th, Commission and P. W's were sent to Bro. RUDOLPH ASCHMANN, D. D. G. Sire.

November 3d, Bro. VOGEL acknowledged receipt of letters from this office, and remarked: "Several weeks ago we learned that the G. L. of G. E. was refused the privilege of printing the books, cards, etc., in Germany, but were granted the favor of receiving those articles at cost price. As we consider ourselves entitled to the same privilege for the Swiss jurisdiction, we request you very kindly to apply the above resolution, as an exception, retrospectively to our account, as the prices of the books and cards, especially of the Charge and Degree Books, were, in comparison with our rates here, enormously high and exaggerated, considering that the books for which we have to remit two dollars each (besides the expense for freight and duty) could be had here for two francs, that is one-fifth of your rate. You will please remember that we have to furnish these books to new Lodges which are taxed very heavily for the necessary preparations for working, and they find the charge of 44 francs for the four books (your last consignment, including freight and duty, amounted to this sum) very onerous and discouraging. The monetary affairs, wages, etc., are here entirely different from the United States, and the Order in Switzerland is yet young and financially weak. Besides, our Grand Lodge, during the three years of its existence, has had so many expenses, that with the best intentions, it has been impossible for it to assist new Lodges by reducing the Charter fees. We therefore beg leave to request you kindly to furnish us hereafter with books and cards at cost price, the same as the G. L. of the German Empire, and extend the same favor to the two last bills, July, 1875, and July, 1877. Trusting this request will be granted, and desirous of remitting without further delay the proper amount due the G. L. of U. S., I beg you will inform us what reduction will be made on those two invoices. We regret the necessity of informing you that the Grand Lodge was compelled to dissolve Rousseau Lodge, No. 4, at Biel, on the 7th of October, for inability to fulfil their duties, as upon examination it was found that the financial condition and local causes required the Lodge to be closed.

"I have the pleasure of informing you that Waldstaetter Lodge, No. 8, was instituted at Luzern, October 27th, in the presence of guests from all parts of Switzerland. This Lodge is founded on a solid basis and justifies the most favorable expectations. Rheinfall Lodge, No. 9, will be instituted this or next month, and the indications are that it will become a flourishing nursery for our beloved Order."

On the 7th of December, Bro. VOGEL was informed that "the request that the resolution to furnish supplies at cost to the G. L. of G. E. be extended to your Grand Lodge *retroactively*, so as to include the outstanding amount, however equitable may be the claim for it, and however ably presented in your argument in its behalf, I regret to say, is by no means within my power. The Grand Lodge alone has power in the premises to deal with the subject to the extent to which you ask relief, which virtually means to discharge the debt. So far as regards giving you the benefit of cost prices for future supplies, we would not hesitate to place all foreign jurisdictions which would ask it, upon such equal footing. But beyond that, we dare not presume to venture The bill, therefore, of July, 1875, amounting to \$50, must be paid, unless you apply to the G. L. of U. S. for the relief sought, which I presume, if placed upon the ground taken in your letter, will be generously considered."

Under date of November 22, 1877, Bro. RUDOLPH ASCHMANN, D. D. G. Sire, acknowledged receipt of commission and P. W's.

December 21st, Bro. vOGEL was advised of the shipment of Revised Journal of 1877.

On the 26th of January, Bro. VOGEL wrote: "We regret to learn that you cannot grant any reduction upon the cost of the books and cards sent to us, and that our only recourse will be to petition the G. L. of U. S. to furnish us supplies at cost price. We therefore send you a draft for \$50 to balance your account against us for the 20 books, 40 cards, and express charges paid on the same, furnished us July 6, 1875, and we hope to be excused for so long delaying this matter.

"I now advise you that Rheinfall Lodge, No. 9, was instituted at Schaffhausen, December 8th. The interest manifested by the Swiss and German Lodges rendered the occasion one of considerable importance.

"I received on the 19th inst. the Revised Journal of G. L. of U. S., and on the 15th I sent to you a copy of the 'Herz und Hand,' containing the Proceedings of the G. L. of Switzerland, October 7, 1877. The Proceedings, as I informed you Sept 22d, have not been printed in pamphlet form, on account of the expense, the Grand Lodge having decided to publish them in the 'Herz und Hand.' At the next session (April) I will offer a motion for annulling the said resolution, upon the ground chiefly that foreign Grand Lodges send their Proceedings to us in book form and expect ours in return in the same form for their libraries. Mere newspaper copies are of little use, as in the first place they contain much more than our Proceedings, and in the next place the actual Proceedings are generally given in a condensed form. I will strive in the future to meet your wishes in this particular."

On the 19th of February the Grand Secretary was informed that "I think you misunderstood the letter from this office of Dec. 7, 1877. If you will refer to the document, you will see that the G. C. and R. Secretary expressed a willingness to place all foreign jurisdictions *upon an equal footing as far as future orders are concerned*. To make the reductions apply to bills contracted previous to September, 1877, was not in our power, and such concession has not been made to any jurisdiction. I repeat, therefore, that *such books, cards, etc., as you may now order will be sent to you at the same prices as we charge the Grand Lodge of the German Empire*. The copy of 'Herz und Hand,' mentioned is received. We concur in your views concerning the publication of the Journal of your Grand Lodge, as we are satisfied a pamphlet copy will be more satisfactory than a newspaper sketch of the transactions."

Grand Secretary YOGEL'S letter of March 8th, accompanying the annual report of the Grand Lodge of Switzerland, reached this office March 23d. He said "You will perceive that our dear Order is in good standing in Switzerland, and is making favorable progress notwithstanding the very hard times through which we are passing. I did indeed misunderstand your letter of December 7th concerning the price of supplies, and in the name of the Grand Lodge of Switzerland I thank you for placing us on equal footing with the G. L. of the German Empire."

The above was duly acknowledged on the 30th of March. On the 6th of April we received the following letter:

Office of the G. Secretary of the G. Lodge of Switzerland, Zurich,

March 23, 1878.

I had the honor to write to you on the 8th inst., and on account of a sad occurrence am obliged to again address you.

Our Grand Lodge, Fellenberg Lodge, No. 3, at Berne, and the entire Order in Switzerland have met with a great loss by the death of our dear friend and brother, RUDOLPH ASCHMANN, Grand Representative and D. D. G. Sire, who departed this life on the 18th inst, after a brief illness of a few days' duration, at Richtersweil (Lake of Zurich), aged 41 years. He occupied for eleven years the position of Secretary of the Legation of the United States at Berne, and the day of his decease there arrived from Washington advice of his nomination for Consul of the United States at Berne. He was buried at Richtersweil on the 21st inst., his funeral being largely attended by people from all parts of the country, as he was highly esteemed by everybody for his pure character and generous sympathies.

Yours very truly in F., L. & T.,

HERMANN YOGEL, Grand Secretary.

This letter was immediately acknowledged, expressing great regret for the loss of so distinguished an Odd Fellow and fellow-citizen, and advising that the G. Sire would in due time appoint a D. D. G. Sire to fill the vacancy.

The following from Bro. VOGEL, dated April 20th, addressed to the officers and members of the Grand Lodge of the U. S., was received May 6th:

"I inclose a duplicate report of the Grand Lodge of Switzerland, from which you will see that the past year has been quite favorable, notwithstanding Rousseau Lodge, No. 4, with 27 members, was dissolved. The actual increase in this jurisdiction was 46, and but for the unexampled stagnation of business we would have been able to present a still more favorable exhibit. During the year 82 have been admitted to the Order, certainly a good work considering our limited opportunities and the great difficulties we have had to contend with in introducing our Order among a class of people prejudiced against all associations, and particularly against secret societies.

Even now, our undertaking has succeeded only in the Cantons composed of Germans and Northern people. We shall not, however, cease our efforts, and we hope, with more favorable times, to add both the French and Italian Switzerland to our jurisdiction. To this end I respectfully inquire whether there is any of our literature in the French language, that by the distribution thereof we might gradually introduce our principles among the French Swiss. I am aware that our ritual has been published in French, and I will avail myself of this advantage as soon as there is an occasion for the use of such books.

"With regard to the quality of our membership we can report most favorably. Our brethren seem disposed to become acquainted with the true intent of the Order; to adopt its principles as their guide and to exhibit the effects thereof in their everyday life. All the Lodges, especially the younger ones, are raising the standard of membership and are adding to the Order reliable active Odd Fellows. If less precaution had been used with reference to the admission of members, we could certainly have exhibited a much larger roll, but it is questionable if its welfare would have been correspondingly benefited, 'Slowly but surely advances our enterprise.'

"With the exception of the dissolution of Rousseau Lodge, the Grand Lodge was not troubled with any business of an unpleasant character, such as appeals, etc. The Grand Lodge takes pleasure in commending the Subordinates for punctually and faithfully fulfilling all their obligations, and for their zeal and self-sacrificing disposition. The Subordinates have been engaged with the project of an 'Assurance Fund,' and the plan will be presented to the Grand Lodge at its session, April 27th, at St. Gallen.

"We hope to present a better report for the current year than our last, and I shall continue as heretofore to present more detailed reports of our condition and working than were given until within the last year. We find it impossible to be represented at the Annual Sessions of the G. L. of U. S. on account of the expense. Perhaps we may secure a Representative at less cost in the person of a brother who resides in your country.

"As brothers who understand the English language are not often with us, our correspondence with you has been exceedingly difficult and necessarily curtailed; we therefore ask the favor of corresponding with you in German as does the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, and of receiving our answers in German."

On the 23d of May, Bro. VOGEL was advised: "Your very interesting communication of April 20th, addressed to the officers and members of the G. L. of U. S. will be presented to that body at its next session, September 16, 1878. I have no knowledge of any publications of the Order in the French language. I mail to your address some copies of the Standard Tract, 'Odd Fellowship—what is it?' It may be advisable to have it printed in the French language.

"A Representative from your jurisdiction would undoubtedly be gladly received by the G. L. of U. S. and we hope you will be able to arrange for the attendance of one of your members.

"Your letters written in English heretofore, have been perfectly satisfactory, but if it will suit you better to write in German we cannot object. Our letters to the German Empire are written in English for the reason that we cannot depend upon getting a satisfactory translation of them *here* into the German language."

Bro. VOGEL'S letter of the 9th of May, advised that "the election for officers of Grand Lodge of Switzerland took place at the Annual Session held at St. Gallen, April 28th, and resulted in the choice of GOTTLIEB MAEDER, No. 185, Schwanengasse, Berne, for Grand Master; CARL IMFELD, Ronca, Luzern, D. G. Master; JACQUES WEISS, Basel, G. Warden; HERMANN VOGEL, Parkringstrasse, No. 5, in Enge, Zurich, G. Secretary; JACQUES HUERLIMANN, Zurich, G. Treasurer. We await the appointment by the Grand Sire of a D. D. G. Sire for this jurisdiction."

This letter was answered June 10th, and on the 11th a commission appointing G. Secretary VOGEL, D. D. G. Sire, to fill vacancy caused by the death of Bro. ASCHMANN, was transmitted.

The mail of June 13th, brought a letter from Bro. F. S. OSTHEIM, dated Berne, Switzerland, May 29, 1878, as follows:

"While on a trip to Southern Germany, I received a request from the G. Secretary of the G. L. of Switzerland to visit Helvetia Lodge, at Zurich, for the purpose of reciting the unwritten work and giving advice in matters concerning the Order in that jurisdiction. On the 25th inst. I repaired to Zurich and found the Lodge-room crowded with members and delegates from the different Lodges in Switzerland, who listened with the utmost attention to the words I uttered. I found that a determination to adhere strictly to our divine principles actuated every brother. The Past Grands of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 alluded to the necessity of forming a Grand Lodge similar to the G. L. of the German Empire, and they desired me to be the interpreter of their wishes. They suggested that the G. L. of U. S. may now be more inclined to grant their prayers than before, when such a request was refused, on the ground that the number of Subordinates was insufficient to justify such proceeding. I informed them that one of the difficulties in the way of organizing such a Grand Lodge was the fact that they were not in possession of the Encampment degrees, and therefore the 'work and diagrams' of these exalted degrees could not be placed in their hands until an Encampment is instituted. Considering the expense of such a movement, and their desire to see the Subordinate degrees more developed,

the brethren are not very anxious to establish Encampments, and they wish to be informed if there is any prospect of the G. L. of U. S., upon proper petition, granting a Charter for a Grand Lodge like that of the German Empire, without their organizing Encampments, that is, if some means cannot be devised by the G. L. of U. S. to fulfil their wishes. I was unable to give them any assurance of success, and submit their request to you with the hope that you will enlighten the brethren upon this subject. They are, however, if necessary, determined to establish an Encampment and will prepare a petition to the G. L. of U. S. as soon as your answer reaches them. The Order in Switzerland is advancing rapidly, and to reconcile the legislation to the manners and customs of this country the brethren desire the work and diagrams, and hope that the G. L. of U. S. may see proper at the next session, to grant them a new Charter.

"Please consult with the M. W. G. Sire, and inform G. Secretary VOGEL of the result of your deliberations as soon as you find it convenient to do so."

On the 23d of June the following was transmitted to Bro. OSTHEIM:

"I lost no time in communicating the contents of your letter to the G. Sire, whose reply, dated 21st inst., is before me. He says, 'I would not hesitate to encourage the brethren in Switzerland to have an application before the G. L. of U. S. at the next session for a Grand Lodge Charter as an independent jurisdiction. The Book of Diagrams can be divided to be independent of the Encampment work. At any rate, it would be a proper subject for the action of the G. L. of U. S.' Thus you will discover the G. Sire's sentiments on the subject of which you write, and you will be wise in conforming the course of the brethren to these views. I think them eminently practical and in conformity to our best judgment. Your plan of movement is plain, and your intelligence will direct your course in the premises. Let the G. L. of Switzerland, with each of its Subordinates unite in a formal application to the next session for such a Charter, and I feel assured that the G. L. of U. S. will interpose no obstacle. Of course the Encampment branch will have to be included and provided for."

Bro. VOGEL, on the 18th of June, said, "We wait with some anxiety your answer to the letter of Bro. OSTHEIM concerning the establishment of an Encampment in Switzerland, etc.," and on the 6th of July he was advised of the letter to Bro. OSTHEIM on the subject.

On the 11th of July, Bro. VOGEL acknowledged the receipt of commission as D. D. G. Sire, and advised of the transfer to him of the papers of the office, by the family of our deceased Bro. ASCHMANN; also that he had sent to this office 30 copies of Journal of G. L. of Switzerland, to be forwarded to certain Grand Lodges that he named. He also said: "We anxiously await your answer to our petition for an Encampment in Switzerland, sent you the 28th of May by Bro. OSTHEIM, P. G. Sire, as we desire to take immediately the Encampment degrees at Stuttgart."

A reply to the above was mailed August 3d, remarking, concerning his reference to a petition for an Encampment: "The paper you refer to, is, we presume, a letter from Bro. OSTHEIM, dated May 29, 1878, but no *petition* was sent, consequently there was nothing on which to act, as he only asked for an opinion, which was communicated in a letter from this office, dated June 23d. I beg to suggest, however, that *seven* or more who desire to organize an Encampment should connect themselves with an Encampment at Stuttgart, or elsewhere, as may be most convenient, procure their Withdrawal Cards and sign the enclosed petition (after filling the blanks), and mail all to this office, or if thought advisable, and a competent brother can be found to proceed to Zurich (or wherever the Encampment is to be located), the M.W. Grand Sire may, on the reception of a proper petition, specially commission a brother to confer the Encampment degrees."

The mail of August 28th brought a letter from Grand Secretary VOGEL, dated August 14th, as follows:

"Bro. OSTHEIM transmitted to our Grand Lodge your letter of June 23d, containing the answer of M.W. Grand Sire STOKES to our request for the independence of Swiss Odd Fellowship. The G. L. of Switzerland held at Luzern, on the 21st of July, an extraordinary meeting on this subject, and adopted the following: 'Resolved, That an application be made to the G. L. of U. S. at its next session for a Charter for a Grand Lodge as an independent jurisdiction in the same manner and analogous to the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, and the G. L. of U. S. be requested to exempt the Order here from organizing an Encampment, if possible. If, however, that Grand Body shall deem the institution of an Encampment indispensable, the Grand Officers of Switzerland are authorized to the all that may be required.'

"The petition is now being circulated among the eight Swiss Lodges, and is (according to the instructions of Bro. OSTHEIM) of the following tenor:

"The petition of the undersigned Representatives and Officers of the Grand Lodge of the Swiss Republic and their respective Lodges, respectfully represents that at present they work under a Warrant granted by your Grand Body and they have 33 Past Grinds in good standing. They are of opinion that it would be of advantage to the Order to establish a Grand Lodge, in the same manner and analogous to the G. L. of G. E., in Switzerland. They therefore pray your R. W. Body to grant a Charter for such a Grand Lodge in the Republic of Switzerland, to be located at Zurich. There is no Encampment at present in this country. Provided the R. W. G. L. of U. S. should deem it necessary, we shall petition for an Encampment previous to receiving the Book of

Diagrams and the secret work in case a Warrant should be granted.'

"This petition is now in circulation throughout Switzerland, and will be regularly signed by the Past Grand Masters of Switzerland, Officers and Representatives of our Grand Lodge with the seal, Past Grands not forming part of the Grand Lodge, Noble Grands and Secretaries of the Subordinate Lodges with the respective seals. I shall send you the document soon as possible, and I hope it will be found all right and without any mistake in the form. I fear, though, that it will not arrive in time for your session in September, as the circulation of it through the Lodges to get the signatures requires much time. In case the petition does not arrive in due time we request the G. L. of U. S. to authorize its Grand Officers to act in the matter according to circumstances, and at all events to take action on the subject.

"All expenses attending the Warrant and the Encampment shall be promptly paid as soon as I am informed of the respective amounts. We hope that the Grand Lodge, in consideration of our limited means, will reduce as much as possible these expenses.

"I send the cordial greetings of the Swiss Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States."

Grand Annual Movable Committee, Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., England.

The subject of "a reciprocation of courtesies between the two Orders" (the M. U. and the G. L. of U. S.), has been noticed elsewhere in this report, and I now present the full text of the official correspondence with the M. U. authorities, as follows:

Office Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, R. W. G. L. of U. S., Baltimore,

Dec. 1, 1877.

James Spry, Esq., Prov. C. Secretary, Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., Balmoral House, Plymouth, England:

Dear Sir and Brother,—I have the pleasure to have received from you a copy of Quarterly Report of Board of Directors, October 1, 1877, for which please accept my fraternal thanks.

"While writing, allow me to say that I send you copy of the last Annual Report of the Grand Officers of the R. W. G. L. of U. S. and the Proceedings of that Grand Body, from which you will perceive that the Grand Sire and Grand C. and R. Secretary are charged with the duty of negotiating with the G. M. and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity upon the important subject suggested by the latter body to it in relation to some satisfactory mode of interchanging visitations between Subordinate Lodges under the two jurisdictions.

Yours fraternally,

Jas. L. Ridgely, C. S.

OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., Baltimore,

December 4, 1877.

JOHN SCHOFIELD, Esq., Corresponding Secretary p. t. of G. Master and Board of Directors Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., England:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—We have the honor to transmit to you a copy of the Revised Journal of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States for the G. M. and Board of Directors, Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F. You will perceive upon examining the various subjects discussed and decided by that honorable body, that the matter submitted from your Board in reference to a system of social and Lodge visitations between your Order and the American Order, has been favorably received and referred to the Grand Sire and Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary to agree with your Board upon a suitable plan, to be reported to the next session of the G. L. of U. S. The undersigned, therefore, very respectfully submit to your Board, that they cordially co-operate in the suggestion which has been made for a reciprocal and mutual Lodge visitation and interchange of fraternal salutations, and will do all on their part to facilitate and harmonize in such purpose, provided a satisfactory and feasible plan can be suggested. They, therefore, very respectfully submit, that they are ready to receive any views on that subject which you may have to propose, and to give them their earnest and friendly consideration. Believing that there should exist between these two great organizations in the interest of humanity, the most cordial relations, and that in fact they ought never to have been separated, they will readily unite with the mother Order in any feasible means of accomplishing the object proposed.

Yours fraternally,

J. W. Stokes, Grand Sire.

Jas. L. Ridgely, Cor. and Rec. Secretary.

*INDEPENDENT ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS, MANCHESTER UNITY FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Bradford, Yorkshire, England,
December 20, 1877.*

James L. Ridgely, Esq., R. W. Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of Revised Journal of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States for the G. M. and Directors of the Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., for which, on their behalf, I beg to thank you.

I have noticed in the reports the subject referred to in your letter, and the decision come to by your honorable body in reference to some system of social and Lodge or members visitations between the two Orders, and am of opinion if something could be done whereby members of your honorable Order coming to England could visit the Lodges here, and our members going over to your country were allowed to visit the Lodges in America, I feel certain it would create a feeling of fraternal and brotherly love.

I will lay your communication and the Proceedings before the G. M. and Directors at their next meeting, for them to report what you have done in the matter to the next A. M. C., which will be held at Exeter in Whitsun week.

With my best wishes for the continued success of your great Order, believe me,

Yours sincerely and fraternally,

John Schofield, Car. Sec. M. U.

OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., Baltimore,

January 8, 1878.

JOHN SCHOFIELD, Esq., Cor. Secretary, Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F.:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Yours of the 20th of December, 1877, has been received. I concur with you in the opinion which you express, that if a satisfactory plan could be devised for mutual visitations by the members of the Lodges under your jurisdiction and ours, it would promote the cause of Odd Fellowship at large. No argument, it appears to me, is necessary to establish this fact. Our combined force now exceeds a million; our position in society constitutes a moral power, which is felt in the community as one of the great forces of the masses. The talent and influence which it exerts, superadded, strengthen our arms immeasurably. In the cause of humanity, improved civilization, and general benevolence which follow, who shall say what such an alliance would accomplish! If you feel such an interest in the subject as its importance challenges, send a Commissioner to us charged with power to enter into and conclude a treaty on the subject with us. He will be cordially and fraternally received.

Yours truly,

Jas. L. Ridgely, Cor. Secretary.

ODD FELLOWS' OFFICES, 97 GROSVENOR STREET, CHORLTON-ON-MEDLOCK, Manchester, England,

February 18, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGELY, Esq., R. W. Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—I have submitted the correspondence received from you upon the question of a mutual arrangement of visitations between the members of the respective Orders in the two Hemispheres, to the

Grand Master and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, England. They desire to express their best wishes to the Grand Sire, your-self, and the members of your Order, and to inform you that the correspondence will be brought before the next A. M. C. of our Order. Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

John Schofield, Cor. Secretary, Bradford, Yorkshire.

OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, R. W. G. L. OF U. S., Baltimore,

March 2, 1878.

JOHN SCHOFIELD, Esq., Corresponding Secretary, Manchester Unity, I. O. O. F., 97 Grosvenor Street, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester, England:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Yours of February 18th has been received. You state that you have submitted the correspondence received from me upon the question of a mutual arrangement of visitations between the members of the respective Orders in the two Hemispheres to the G. M. and Board of Directors of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, England. Allow me to express my satisfaction that you have given this subject an evident earnest of business attention and promptitude. I am happy to receive the kind wishes of the G. M. and Board of Directors for the G. Sire, myself, and the Order at large, and desire cordially to reciprocate them.

Yours very truly,

Jas. L. Ridgely, Cor. Secretary.

The meeting of the Annual Movable Committee was, it is presumed, held as usual on Whit-Monday, June 10, 1878. After waiting some weeks for information on the subject, which the Cor. Secretary advised in his letter of February 18th would be presented to the attention of that body, the following was transmitted:

OFFICE GRAND CORRESPONDING AND RECORDING SECRETARY, R W. G. L. OF U. S., Baltimore,

July 20, 1878.

JOHN SCHOFIELD, Esq., Corresponding Secretary, Bradford, Yorkshire, England:

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—In your favor of February 18th last, you inform me that the correspondence relating to mutual visitations will be brought before the next A. M. C. of your Order.

Allow me at this time to express my earnest hope that your Annual Movable Committee has considered this subject with all the intelligent calmness and liberality which its magnitude and importance invites. The influence which every step taken in this direction may exert on the two great Orders of Odd Fellows in the two Hemispheres, in view of the vital interests involved, is highly important.

Let me hear of the action had by your A. M. C. on the subject, in order that I may report officially to the G. L. of U. S., which assembles at Austin, State of Texas, September 16. 1878,

Yours, fraternally,

Jas. L. Ridgely, Cor. Secretary

Nothing further on this subject has been received from the authorities of the Manchester Unity, but a letter from Bro. E. ISAAC BAEZA, dated Barbados, July 27th, has the following: "I notice by the English newspapers, that the Annual Movable Committee of the Manchester Unity gave the Board of Directors further powers in relation to the intercommunion of the two Orders"

We have received from Bro. JAMES SPRY, Prov. Cor. Secretary, Plymouth District, the quarterly reports of the Board of Directors, October 1, 1877, and April 1, 1878. From the latter we learn, that January 1, 1878, the M. Unity had 526,802 members, an increase of 8,432 for the year 1877. Travelers were relieved at 6,128 places, at an expenditure of \$1,305.00, an average payment of \$5.00 per member.

Library.

Few volumes have been added to the library during the year; as heretofore stated the want of some of the

Journals of Grand Bodies, making it in advisable to have the Proceedings bound until the sets can be completed. The importance of preserving in the archives of the G. L. the entire printed records of the several jurisdictions has been so frequently urged, that I deem it unnecessary to add anything further. The catalogue is continued as follows:

Miscellaneous Pamphlets Received.

- Constitution and By-Laws of The Shakespeare Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows, Instituted, December 23, 1806; Revived, December 23, 1818; New York, printed by G. SINGLETON, 1819, pp 12; presented by JOHN MEDOLE, P. G. Representative.
- Constitution and By-Laws of Franklin Lodge, No. 2, of Independent Odd Fellows; instituted, Jan. 27, 1821; New York, 1821, pp. 24; presented by JOHN MEDOLE, P. G. Rep.
- Seventh Annual Report of the I. O. O. F. Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia, January 1, 1878, pp. 10.
- Fiftieth Semi-Annual Report of the General Relief Committee, I. O. O. F., of San Francisco, California, July 8, 1877—January 6, 1878, pp. 28; and Fifty-first Semi-Annual Report, January 6, 1878—July 7, 1878, pp. 28.
- Twenty-third Annual Report of the Odd Fellows' Library Association of the City and County of San Francisco for 1877-8, pp. 26.
- Annual Report of the Treasurer of the Odd Fellows' Hall Company, of Wilmington, Delaware, January 16, 1878, pp. 26.
- Historical Review; read by CHARLES B. MOORES, at the twenty-fifth Anniversary Celebration of Chemeketa Lodge, No. 1, Salem, Oregon, December 6, 1877.
- Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Manchester Unity, Friendly Society; Quarterly Report, October 1, 1877, pp. 152; and April 1, 1878, pp. 160; from Bro. JAMES SPRY, Prov. Cor. Secretary, Plymouth District, England.
- Congressional Directory for the Forty-fifth Congress, corrected to October 18, 1877. From Bro. R. B. NIXON, P.G., Washington, D. C.
- Proceedings of the Twelfth Great Sun Session of the Great Council of California, Improved Order of Red Men, San Francisco, July, 1877, pp. 72.
- Journal of Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Session of the Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, held at Cleveland, Ohio, August, 1877, pp. 140.
- Reports of the Grand Officers and Historiographer of the Grand Lodge of Ohio, embracing the first ten years of Odd Fellowship in Ohio, by H. P. GRAVATT, pp. 130.
- Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools of Baltimore, pp. 84.

Journals of Grand Bodies Received.

- *Grand Lodges.*
- Alabama, February and March, 1878; pp. 1269-1324
- Arkansas, October, 1877; pp. 61-124.
- Australia, August, 1877; pp. 1-114.
- British Columbia, February, 1878; pp. 95-122.
- California, May. 1878; pp. 795-1060.
- Chile. *Want 1877 and 1878.*
- Colorado, October, 1877; pp. 623-710.
- Connecticut, May, 1878; pp. 299-348.
- Dakota, October, 1877; pp. 123-176.
- Delaware, October, 1877; pp. 1369-1468.
- District of Columbia, 1876 and 1877; pp. 93-178.
- Florida. *Want 1878.*
- Georgia, August, 1877; pp. 311-372.
- Germany: German Empire, August, 1877; pp. 1-188.
- Brandenburg, July, 1877; pp. 1-50. July, 1878; pp. 1-50. *Want 1875 and 1876.*
- Hannover, July, 1878; pp. 1-36. *Want 1877.*
- Saxony. *Want all Proceedings.*
- Württemberg. *Want 1875, 1877, and 1878.*
- Illinois, October, 1877; pp. 221-458.

- Indiana, November, 1877. pp. 283-466. May, 1878; pp. 467-608.
- Iowa, October, 1877; pp. 335-456.
- Kansas, October, 1877; pp. 1861-2076.
- Kentucky, October, 1877; pp. 2983-3124 (bound volume).
- Louisiana, January, 1878; pp. 1377-1480.
- Lower Provinces, August, 1877; pp. 63-136.
- Maine, July, 1855; pp. 243-268. August, 1857; pp. 289-322. August, 1877; pp. 1037-1124.
- Maryland, April, 1878; pp. 271-398.
- Massachusetts, August, 1877; pp. 943-1074. February, 1878; pp. 1-182. May and August, 1878; pp. 183-296.
- Michigan, February, 1878; pp. 1-200.
- Minnesota, June, 1878; pp. 1-68.
- Mississippi, July, 1877; pp. 1-106. *Want 1875 and 1878.*
- Missouri, May, 1876; pp. 377-486. May, 1878; pp. 1-162.
- Montana, April, 1878; pp. 1-80.
- Nebraska. *Want 1877.*
- Nevada, June, 1877; pp. 1151-1238. *Want 1878.*
- New Hampshire, October, 1877; pp. 769-856.
- New Jersey, November, 1877; pp. 173-340.
- New York, August, 1877; pp. 1-248.
- New Zealand, September, 1877; pp. 1-60.
- North Carolina, May, 1878; pp. 1-114.
- Ohio, May, 1878; pp. 1911-2216.
- Ontario, August, 1877; pp. 1827-2078.
- Oregon, May, 1878; pp. 3103-3240.
- Pennsylvania, November, 1877; pp. 599-732. May, 1878; pp. 1-146.
- Rhode Island, February and August, 1875; pp. 475-660. February and August, 1877; pp. 208-362. February and August, 1878; pp. 363-536.
- South Carolina. *Want 1877 and 1878.*
- Switzerland, 1875, 1876. 1877 (newspaper). April, 1878; pp. 1-46.
- Tennessee, October, 1877; pp. 2129-2238.
- Texas, February, 1878; pp. 1238-1372.
- Utah, April, 1878; pp. 283-346 (in bound volume).
- Vermont, February, 1876; pp. 1-68. February, 1877; pp. 70-149. February, 1878; pp. 150-233.
- Virginia, April, 1878; pp. 1-80.
- West Virginia, October, 1877; pp. 1055-1184.
- Wisconsin, December, 1877; pp. 2629-2806.
- Wyoming, October, 1877; pp. 45-90.

Grand Encampments.

- Alabama, February. 1878; pp. 251-268.
- Arkansas. *Want all Proceedings.*
- California, May, 1878; pp. 1461-1554.
- Colorado, October, 1875; pp. 85-114. *Want 1877.*
- Connecticut, October, 1877; pp. 609-636.
- Delaware. *Want 1876 and 1877.*
- District of Columbia, Year 1877; pp. 303-328.
- Georgia, August, 1877; pp. 187-202. *Want 1878.*
- Illinois, October, 1877; pp. 69-144.
- Indiana, November, 1877; pp. 89-132. May, 1878; pp. 133-172.
- Iowa, October, 1877; pp. 301-336.
- Kansas, October, 1875; pp. 271-312 March, 1878; pp. 443-496.
- Kentucky, October, 1877; pp. 825-872.
- Louisiana. *Want 1861 to 1873, 1876, 1877, and 1878.*
- Maine, August, 1877; pp. 371-432.
- Maryland, May and October, 1877; pp. 47-116.
- Massachusetts, August, 1877; pp. 301-364. July, 1878; pp. 365-440.

- Michigan, February, 1876; pp. 685-762. February, 1877; pp. 1-118. February, 1878; pp. 1-74.
- Minnesota, June 1877, and June, 1878; pp. 97-136.
- Mississippi July, 1877. *Want* 1878.
- Missouri, May, 1878; pp. 45-92.
- Nebraska. *Want* 1877.
- Nevada, June, 1875; pp. 1-46. June, 1876; pp. 47-96. June, 1878; pp. 137-204.
- New Hampshire, October, 1877; pp. 343-372.
- New Jersey, November, 1877; pp. 621-678.
- New York, February, 1878; pp. 51-146. *Want* 1876 and 1877.
- North Carolina, May, 1878; pp. 1-20.
- Ohio, May, 1878; pp. 1487-1572.
- Ontario, August, 1876; pp. 203-254. July, 1877; pp. 257-314. *Want* 1878.
- Oregon, May, 1876; pp. 53-96. May, 1877; pp. 1-26. May, 1878; pp. 1-32.
- Pennsylvania, November, 1877, and May, 1878; pp. 373-504.
- Rhode Island, March, 1878; pp. 455-518.
- South Carolina. *Want all Proceedings*.
- Tennessee, October. 1877; pp. 755-798.
- Texas, February, 1877; pp. 465-526. February 1878; pp. 527-584.
- Vermont, February. 1878; pp. 1-44.
- Victoria. August, 1877 with Journal of G. L. of Australia).
- Virginia, April, 1878; pp. 1-40.
- West Virginia, October, 1877; pp. 335-356.
- Wisconsin, December, 1877; pp. 801-886.
- The Journals noted as wanted are generally those of sessions since 1874. Those of previous years, required to complete sets, are specified on pages 6064 and 15065 of Journal of 1874, a very few which have been received.

Periodicals Received.

- *The Companion and American Odd Fellow*, Columbus, Ohio; octavo, monthly, October, 1877—August, 1878. (See bound volumes.)
- *The Odd Fellows Talisman*, Indianapolis, Indiana; octavo, monthly, October, 1877—August, 1878.
- *New Age*, San Francisco, California; weekly, Vol. 13, No. 35, September 1, 1877—Vol. 14, No. 35, August 31, 1878
- *Der Fuhrer* (German), New York; weekly, Vol. 5, No. 23, September 7, 1877—Vol. 6, No. 22, August 30, 1878.
- *The Odd Fellows' Chronicle*, Centreville (now Greenfield), Indiana; weekly, Vol. 4, No. 42, Sept. 1, 1877—Vol. 5, No. 31, August 31, 1878. No. 47 of Vol. 4, Nov. 3, 1877; Nos. 2, Dec. 22, 3, Dec. 29, 1877, 4, Jan. 5, 8, Feb. 2, 1878, of Vol. 5, *failed to reach, this office*.
- *The Mystic Jewel*, Cincinnati, Ohio; bi-weekly, Vol. 7, No. 15, September 15, 1877—No. 35, August 15, 1878.
- *The Odd Fellows' Register*, Providence, Rhode Island, weekly, Vol. 1, No. 1, Nov. 3, 1877 -No. 34, August 28, 1878.
- *Herz and Hand* (German), Berlin, Prussia; semi-monthly, Vol. 6, No. 23, August 27, 1877—Vol. 7, No. 22, August 15, 1878.
- *Der Odd Fellow* (German), Leipzig, Germany; semi-monthly, Vol. 2, Nos. 1-22, October 14, 1877—August 25, 1878. (See bound volumes.)
- Occasional numbers of the Odd Fellows' Banner, Michigan Odd Fellow, The Guardian, and The Southern Odd Fellow, have been received, and Nos. 9-12 of Volume 1, and Nos. 1-6 of Vol. 2, October, 1877, to July, 1878, of the Knights' Sword and Helmet, published at Fort Madison, Iowa.

We are indebted to Bro. J. GRISWOLD, P. G. Rep. and P. G. Marshal, for a large number of magazines and newspapers of the Order, many of which will be valuable in completing the imperfect files in the office. It is thought unnecessary to present a detailed list of the collection.

Warrants Issued During the Recess.

UNITY LODGE, No. 8, instituted at Sherbrooke, Province of Quebec, Canada, October 29, 1877, by G. VAREY, P.G., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of nine brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

RANIER LODGE, No. 11, instituted at New Tacoma, Washington Territory, February 9, 1878, by H. G. STRUVE, P. G. M., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of six brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

SNOHOMISH LODGE, No. 12, instituted at Snohomish, Washington Territory, April 23, 1878, by H. G. STRUVE, P.G.M., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of five brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

FRIENDSHIP LODGE, No. 13, instituted at Port Gamble, Washington Territory, June 17, 1878, by H. G. STRUVE, P. G. M., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of five brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

COLFAX LODGE, No. 14, instituted at Colfax, Washington Territory, June 13, 1878, by E. L. POWELL, P.G., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of eight brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

ERIN SPRINGS LODGE, No. 4, instituted at Erin Springs, Indian Territory, June 29, 1878, by ISRAEL W. STONE. P. G., Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of six brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

DENMARK LODGE, No. 1, instituted at Copenhagen, Kingdom of Denmark, Europe, June 29, 1878, by J. C. PRAETORIUS, M. W. Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, Special Deputy Grand Sire, on the petition of five brothers holding Withdrawal Cards.

MOUNT SINAI LODGE, No. 2 (Charter granted at last session), was instituted January 17, 1878, at Amsterdam, Province of North Holland, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Europe, by F. S. OSTHEIM, P. G. Sire of the G. L. of G. E., Special Deputy Grand Sire.

Returns from Subordinates.

The annual reports from Encampments and Lodges under the immediate jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the United States, have generally been transmitted with commendable promptness. It will be seen, however, by referring to the correspondence and the tables accompanying this report, that Arizona Lodge, No. 1, at Prescott, Arizona; Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1, London, England; North Star Lodge, No. 2, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Southern Watch Encampment, No. 1, Valparaiso, Chile; Anglo-American Encampment, No. 1. London, England; Milicete Encampment, No. 11, St. John, N. B.; Harmony Encampment, No. 1, Winnipeg, Manitoba, have failed to report.

Annual Reports of State Grand Bodies.

A reference to the correspondence will show the date of the reception of the several reports, and I do not deem it necessary to again repeat what I have so often urged concerning the importance of a prompt transmission of the returns, to avoid the necessity of changing the figures in the tables after they have been carefully prepared and sent to the printer. Such alterations are required every year by the delay of one or more reports to reach this office until August or September. The tables show that with the exception of the Grand Lodge of Chile, and the Grand Encampment of South Carolina, returns have been received from all the Subordinate Grand Bodies.

Deaths.

The mortality in this Grand Body has been unusually large during the current year. Among the names on the roll will be recognized some of our most zealous and useful, as well as life-long laborers and devoted members. All have been eminent in the service of the Order, and have endeared their memories for marked interest in the cause.

We have been advised of the demise of the following Representatives, P.G. Representatives, and P. G. Officers since last we met, viz.:

ROYAL G. MILLARD, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Encampment of New York, November 15, 1877, aged 60 years.

JOSEPH D. TRAPP, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky, November 22, 1877.

JOSEPH S. JONES, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, December 29, 1877.

WM. STEDMAN, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, January 9, 1878, aged 70 years.

PETER FRITZ, R. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, August 9, 1878, aged 77 years.

ALBERT CASE, P. D. G. Sire and P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of South Carolina, aged 69 years.

ST. JOHN GOODRICH, G. Rep. of the Grand Encampment of Nebraska, January 16, 1878, aged 68 years.

WM. L. G. SMITH, P. G. Rep of the Grand Lodge of Northern New York, February 12, 1878.

JOHN H. PHILLIPS, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Encampment of New Jersey, March 1, 1878, aged 64 years.

SAMUEL W. BOND, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Encampment of New Jersey, August 1, 1878, aged 69 years.

WILEY WILLIAMS, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Georgia, April, 1878.

RUDOLPH ASCHMANN, G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Switzerland, March 18, 1878.

Besides these we have had notice of the death, previous to the last session, of CHARLES PERKINS, P. G.

Rep. of the Grand Encampment of Illinois, August 26, 1877, aged 67 years; and STEVENS S. JONES, P. G. Rep. of the Grand Lodge of Illinois, March 15, 1877.

All were illustrious senators of the Order in their day and generation, and of each, their surviving Representatives will take occasion to make honorable mention at the appropriate time and place.

There remains however to be added to the honorable death-roll the names of two distinguished members, whose services to the Order claim at our hands special notice, as eminent co-laborers in our great cause.

Bro. NATHAN PORTER, Representative of the Grand Encampment of California, and Bro. FREDERICK D. STUART, P. G. Sire, have each deceased since last we met in this Grand Body. The comparatively sudden taking off of these two brethren, the one at his post of official duty as an honored senator of California, at the city of Sacramento, January 6, 1878; the other at his home in the city of Washington, D. C., January 25, 1878, honored and beloved by his brethren and fellow-citizens, was flashed across the continent almost contemporaneously by the telegraph, diffusing sincere sorrow at the severity of the calamity inflicted by the removal of two illustrious actors from our general field of benefaction.

Never since the death of the Great Founder has the Order received a more severe and all pervading shock!

Death is at all times the terrific enemy of life. A mighty power, he rules with inexorable law, sparing from his desolating sweep none of the children of men.

Generations of the race have appeared and disappeared on this beautiful earth, and will continue to disappear from its face under his *fiat* God has so ordained it! It belongs to existence! Death is, and ever will be, inseparable from life. It is the antagonist of life. Without death there can be no life, hence philosophically, logically, and spiritually, they are inseparable. The terms are correlative Death is always present, although mankind shuns its appearance, and seldom dwells upon the event until it, as in the instance before us, arrests attention, commands a check abruptly to the business of life, and the cherished plans and relations of men. How sad the contemplation, yet how admirable in this connection the just law of compensation, that God has implanted immortality in the soul of man, which shall live always, and that death is not more certain, than is that future life which beyond controversy, consoles, comforts, and uplifts the stricken and bereaved, and reconciles to the sting of death

Our brothers who have departed, although dead, are alive; let us rejoice that the same law which exacts the death of the body, assures endless life in another and better world. Yet in the death of illustrious men, humanity mourns, whilst experience registers the sacred monition upon the dial of time, that "in the midst of life we are in death."

Our dearly beloved brethren, as Odd Fellows, had thoroughly grasped and approved its system. They had each drank deeply at its crystal fountain, were profoundly imbued with its philosophy, and were each Odd Fellows in spirit and in truth, not alone in name.

In this connection several incidents intimately connected with the death and memory of our illustrious departed brethren worthy of commemoration are annexed.

One is a presentation to the G. L. of U. S. by SAMUEL YORKE ATLEE, P. G. Rep., of a beautiful cabinet-size photograph of Bro. NATHAN PORTER, G. Rep. of the Grand Encampment of California, with accompanying remarks; another is a communication from Bro. A O. H. P. SEHORN, P.G. Rep. of Tennessee, to the G. Cor. and Rec. Secretary, of the proceedings of Strangers' Refuge Lodge, No. 14, of Tennessee, in testimony of its high appreciation and admiration of the life and character of our deceased brother, FREDERICK D. STUART, P. G. Sire; another is a floral memorial from the coffin of our beloved deceased brother STUART, preserved in enduring form and presented by Bro. J. T. GIVEN, G. Rep. of the District of Columbia, which now mournfully graces the Grand Secretary's office.

WASHINGTON CITY,

Feb. 7, 1878.

DEAR BROTHER RIDGELY:

The Order has reason to deplore the death of Bro. NATHAN PORTER.

Diligent in his vocation, zealous in Odd Fellowship, without reproach in his domestic relations, unblemished in his morals, and absolutely free from any vicious or degrading habit, he was, as an upright and useful citizen, excelled by none of his contemporaries.

As a legislator and administrator he was sagacious and skilful, and the parliamentary annals of Rhode Island and of California and the Journals of the Grand Lodge of the United States prove the industry, punctuality, and fidelity with which he discharged his duties.

The Journals of the Grand Lodge of the United States, of which body he was for eight years a continuous member, display innumerable evidences of the force of his abilities and of the influence of his character; and

exhibit in his honor, an official and personal biography which hardly any one has equaled and which no one has surpassed

While his colleagues and his associates survive, no monument is required to keep his virtues in remembrance; but when all who have known our deceased brother shall have followed him to the grave, posterity will seek some bodily portraiture of one who had done the Order so much service; and to gratify that desire, I offer, through you, to the Grand Lodge of the United States, this likeness of Bro. PORTER.

It was a gift from him to me, and while he lived, I should never have parted with it; but his death, although enhancing its value, admonishes me that my custody of it is uncertain; and that, before it be too late, I should find for it a permanent and more appropriate place of deposit. With that view I offer it to the Grand Lodge of the United States, in whose gallery of distinguished Odd Fellows it will, I trust, be an ornament from generation to generation.

Respectfully, and in F., L. & T.,

Samuel Yorke Atlee.

MURFREESBOROUGH, TENN.,

Feb. 20, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGEY, Gr. Cor. and Rec. Secretary:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Strangers' Refuge Lodge. No. 14, I. O. O. F., appointed me as a committee of one to correspond with you in relation to the action of said Lodge, on learning of the death of Past Grand Sire STUART; you will therefore accept this as a sufficient apology for this communication

Under the head of "The Good of the Order," P. G. Rep. SEHORN spoke as follows:

"Although we know that death is the inevitable lot of us all, yet it is sad to contemplate the death of the great and noble hearted, and ever faithful workers for the advancement of American Odd Fellowship. There is not an Odd Fellow old or young, high or low, in our beloved Order, that has not heard of the untiring zeal and great work done for Odd Fellowship by FREDERICK D. STUART, P G. Sire; but alas! his noble spirit has taken wings, and his earthly form lies still and pulseless in the grave.

"He died in Washington, D. C., January 25th. Although he is dead, yet his noble works are left as monuments, more enduring than any granite shaft erected by man. His efforts in behalf of American Odd Fellowship will be felt by the yet unborn millions of our race, and therefore, as a slight token of the high esteem in which P. G. Sire STUART was held by the members of this Lodge, be it

"Resolved, That we extend our heartfelt sympathy to the family of our distinguished and deceased brother.

"Resolved. That P.G. Rep. SEHORN be appointed a committee of one to convey the foregoing to Grand Secretary RIDGELY, and request him to communicate the same to the children of Bro STUART."

May God bless you and yours, my dear brother, is the wish of yours

A. O. H. P Sehorn, Committee.

A beautifully engrossed tribute to the memory of P G. Sire STUART has been presented to the G. L. of U. S. by Potomac Lodge, No. 38, Alexandria Virginia, and will be appropriately framed and carefully preserved.

Dropping or Suspending for Non-Payment of Dues.

This has been a source of serious loss of membership for many years, and particularly of late, caused, doubtless in a great degree by the depressed and deranged condition of commerce and the industries of the country. Some effort should be made to check this growing drain upon the Order, by legislation which will mitigate the stringency of our existing laws, yet will not interfere with their necessary and proper enforcement. Few are aware of the actual loss incurred through this channel, and the figures when aggregated are simply appalling.

By reference to the tables found in the Journals of the G. L. of U S from 1866 to 1877 inclusive, pages 3907, 4103, 4280, 4530, 4777, 5083, 5367, 5670, 6088, 6090, 6440, 6441, 6444, 6445, 6836, 68837, 6840, 6841, 7286, 7287, 7290' 7291, and the present report of the G. Cor. and Rec. Secretary, it will be found that 280,458 brothers have been *suspended*. The Grand Lodge of Ohio failed to report, in 1866 and 1867, the number suspended, but referring to the Journal of that Grand Body, I find Journal of 1866, page 14, "dropped 816," and Journal of 1867, page 24. "dropped 815," which makes the total number of suspensions from July 1, 1865, to December 31, 1877 (twelve years and six months), 282,089, nearly one-third of the entire number

initiated since 1830. The same tables show that 58,076 members were reinstated and others have doubtless renewed their connection with the Order through the medium of "Dismissal Certificates," but as only 18,700 of such certificates have been issued from this office, if *all* had been used in that way (a very improbable conclusion) the fact remains that 205,313 members suspended within the period of thirteen years have been lost to the Order.

Without making a particular calculation of the ratio of "reinstatements" to "suspensions" it may be stated in general terms that for the years 1865- 1866, they amounted to nearly *one-half*; for 1867 and 1868 to about *one-third*; for 1869, '70, and '71, to about *one-fourth*; for 1872, to about *one-fifth*; for 1873, '4, and '5, to about *one-sixth*; for 1876, to about *one-seventh*; for 1877, to about *one-eighth*; the suspensions in 1877 being 41,804; the reinstatements, 5,058, or a fraction more than 12 per cent. For the year ending June 30, 1866, the suspensions, including 816 in Ohio, were 6,731, and the reinstatements 3,213, being about 47¾ per cent.

The subject is one of vital character, and demands thorough examination and careful decision. Our attention has been invited to this important matter, especially by our worthy brother SCHUYLER COLFAX, P.G. Representative, whose views, so clearly expressed, are worthy of the earnest attention of this Grand Lodge. From his letter, dated South Bend, Aug. 10, 1878, I quote the following:

"All Odd Fellows have witnessed with regret, that during the past few years our losses of those dropped from membership for non-payment of dues have been so large, and it is evident enough without argument, that the steadily increasing stringency of the times for the past five years has been the most potential cause for the losses. A member finds it difficult to pay his dues promptly and also all his family expenses. He falls in arrears; first loses his right to benefits, then becomes irregular in attendance, and when the year expires is dropped from membership, losing his former interest in the Lodge, and is thus, in a large majority of cases, lost entirely to the Order.

"It has seemed to me that many out of this one or two hundred thousand dropped Odd Fellows might again become contributing and working members in good standing, if a simultaneous and earnest effort in that direction was made throughout the jurisdiction, and this conviction has been strengthened by the well-known fact that the prosperity of the Order in California can be traced back to the facilities the G. L. of U. S. gave for the readmission into the Order there of the thousands of Eastern brethren, who going thither for gold and unable to attend Lodges regularly, had become, without any offence against our laws, *Ancient Odd Fellows*.

"If this strikes you favorably, your long experience in the administration of our laws would suggest to your mind the proper method of bringing about the auspicious result contemplated in this fraternal letter; but if you were to ask me what I would advise, I would suggest, as one out of several plans, to authoritatively recommend to the Subordinate Lodges, that between New Year's and our Sixtieth Anniversary, they notify every ex-Odd Fellow within their jurisdiction, who has been dropped for no other cause than non-payment of dues (and I would add all who had dropped out from expiration of final card), that the Lodge by a waiver of the law limiting their reinstatement within one year from their suspension, would consider an application for restoration, if accompanied by the payment of one year's dues. The Order would thus take the initiative, and open the door through which many would return, who might feel it difficult to take the initiative themselves.

"Lecturing over the country from New England to California, I have conversed with so many ex-Odd Fellows, who have told me they did not apply for restoration because the year had expired, or because the Lodge did not seem to feel any further interest in them, I am quite sure, if some such plan as I have indicated received the favorable sanction of the G. L. of U. S., a large proportion of these brethren could be restored to our rolls as working members, a consummation most devoutly to be wished.

"Excuse these suggestions, prompted only by earnest interest in the prosperity of our Order."

Translation of the Ritual into Foreign Languages.

As heretofore stated in this report, at the last session the Grand Sire and the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary were authorized to have the manuscript translation of the ritual in the Holland language, presented by D. D. G. Sire OSTHEIM, "thoroughly and critically examined, and when found to be correct, that the same be printed." The Grand Lodge also authorized a translation into the Bohemian language and a new translation into the French language, "to be done under the authority and superintendence of the Grand Corresponding and Recording Secretary, provided that the same be done without expense to this Grand Lodge, such translations to be reported to the next session." On this important subject I have to report, that shortly after the close of the last session, Bro. OSTHEIM requested a return of the manuscript furnished by him, for the purpose of revising and collecting the same. The translation was accordingly mailed to him, and was duly received and acknowledged. As appears by the correspondence, he returned the manuscript of the charge book on the 20th of April, and it is now presented to the Grand Lodge. No steps have been taken to have the work printed, because of the incapacity of the Grand Officers to cause the same to be critically examined and its

merits passed upon.

A translation of the charge book into the Bohemian language was transmitted by Rep. HASKINS, of New York, and is herewith submitted to the Grand Lodge.

On the last day of the session of 1877 (Journal, 7511), a German translation was received from the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, and the same is herewith presented to the Grand Lodge.

Normanna Lodge, No. 260, La Crosse, Wisconsin, proposes to furnish, in time for presentation at this session, a translation into the Norwegian language.

It is respectfully suggested that a proper compensation be voted to procure translations of the ritual into such foreign languages as may be thought proper, and that the scholarship, character, and standing of the author be deemed a satisfactory guaranty of the fidelity and sufficiency of the work when performed, to which end no person be employed except avouched for as amply proficient for the purpose.

Life Insurance.

I deem it my duty to call the attention of the Grand Lodge to the several communications on the subject of "life insurance," "endowments," or "enlarged funeral benefits," as the matter is referred to under these several heads by Grand Secretaries. It is asserted that new institutions possessing the feature of assuring by the Grand or Supreme Body, to the family of a member, a stipulated sum in the event of his death, are making serious inroads upon the ranks of the Order. The failure of a number of incorporated life insurance companies has doubtless given an impetus to insurance of this character, as members who have suffered by the collapse of the companies to which they had contributed for years, believe their interests are safer in such institutions as our Order than in the hands of corporations that have too frequently proved unworthy of confidence.

The remarks of the Grand Secretaries of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Minnesota, Ontario, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, deserve careful examination and consideration.

Degree of Rebekah.

The complaint is general that Lodges of this degree are not meeting with the success that was hoped for when such bodies were authorized. Grand Secretaries advise of their inability to procure correct returns, and many abandon the task. The legislation authorizing Charters to be forfeited for failure to report has not been generally heeded, and Lodges though virtually defunct for years are still kept on the roll. With the exception of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont, where anything is said on the subject it is asserted that there is no interest in the Lodges, and in many instances the project is pronounced a failure.

The New Diploma.

The steel plate for a new certificate of membership was completed early in April, and the following circular dated April 15, 1878, was issued:

The R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States in 1875 authorized a new Diploma, or Certificate of Membership, to be prepared, but the committee deterred action on the same until about a year ago, when, in order to meet a pressing demand for a new Diploma, a contract was made for a certificate from an original design presented by Bro. WM. H. DOUGAL, of Georgetown, D. C. The steel plate has been completed, and impressions from the same on heavy plate paper, 19x24 inches, will be ready for delivery on and after May 1, 1878.

The engraving is about 15x20 inches, and is thus described by Bro. WM. H. DOUGAL, the artist:

"At the top, above all, is 'The All-seeing Eye;' immediately beneath it a shield with monogram 'F. L. T.,' encircled with the motto: 'Friendship, Love, Truth.' On the right and left of the shield are outspread wings, signifying Power and Dominion; they symbolize the universal spread and powerful protecting care of the Order.

"At the base on the right the genius of Odd Fellowship is represented Educating the Orphans, and on the left engaged in ministering to the Sick and Distressed. Above these figures are clusters of Palm and Olive branches, typical of Victory and Peace.

"All the emblems of the Order are beautifully and systematically displayed and grouped in the engraving."

This certificate is adapted for members of Lodges or Encampments, and is regarded, by those who have examined it, as a handsome specimen of the skill and taste of an accomplished artist, and it is believed will be generally acceptable to the members of the Order.

Book of Odes With Music.

The Committee on Printing Supplies, as authorized by the Grand Lodge, caused "the Odes as now

prescribed to be printed with suitable music," and the work, a book of 48 pages, was ready for delivery in June. A variety of tunes are presented, and, so far as advised, the selection of music meets with general approval.

Digest.

I have heretofore suggested that the Grand Lodge now needs an entire new Digest of its laws. We ought to have a work that will present, in a compact and connected form, an entire Digest of our laws as they now exist. This should appear in a single volume, free from extraneous, repealed, modified, or obsolete subjects interpolated with the text, presenting the law as it is, distinctively and authoritatively. Instead of such a reliable system of jurisprudence, we have in the present Digest and Supplement a mass of repealed and modified law, made so by the necessity of continuously progressive legislation during many years, by which the Digest is loaded down, and the research for the correct law is often rendered as tedious and difficult as is the separation of wheat from the chaff. The Grand Cor. and Bee. Secretary accordingly recommends the preparation of a new and appropriate Digest. The present work is condemned for no special fault. It has done good service in its day, and only now is required to give way to a better work, by reason of the circumstances of its position. The legislation has outgrown the situation, and can only be adequately adapted to the altered exigency by the publication of an entire new work. At the last session this subject was referred to the Committee on Printing Supplies, who will present their views, and I respectfully suggest that a special committee be appointed to report at this session a plan for a new Digest or Code of existing laws.

Journal of the Grand Lodge.

Volume VIII. contains the proceedings of the sessions of 1874 and 1875, with a general index of the Journals from 1868 to 1875 inclusive, being Volumes VI., VII., and VIII. It is respectfully suggested that the proceedings of 1876, 1877, and 1878, with a proper index, will make a volume of suitable size, and should be published as Volume IX. I recommend that this subject be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Grand Secretary's Office.

The books of this office are kept, as contemplated by the Committee on Printing Supplies in 1873, "in a systematic manner," that is, on the principle of double-entry, as the Journals of 1874-5-6-7 attest. This system, generally considered the only reliable method of book-keeping, exhibits in the balance-sheet annually published the entire operations of the office for the year.

There are some laws in existence, which, while they do not conflict with any system of book-keeping, yet, in order to comply with their provisions, special books must be prepared, and much additional labor is thereby entailed, and in the opinion of the G. C. and R. Secretary the repeal of such legislation will be a wise measure. I allude to the law of 1855 (Digest, Section 30), as follows: "It shall be the duty of the Grand Secretary to open an account in his books with each specific appropriation, charging to such appropriations severally the amount reported by the Finance Committee, and placing to the credit of such amount all payments made on account thereof; and in no case shall such payments exceed the amount of the specific appropriation on account of which they are made, nor shall any transfer of appropriation be allowed without the consent of this Grand Lodge." A single instance, of many that might be adduced, will show that the enforcement of this law would seriously retard the progress of the Order and cripple the finances of the Grand Lodge. In 1873 (Journal, p. 5943), an appropriation was made "for printing odes and cards, \$500.00." The report of the Grand Secretary in 1874 (Journal, p. 5085, shows, among other expenditures, for odes, \$431.56; visiting and withdrawal cards, \$1,106.08; Rebekah cards, \$66.65; dismissal certificates, \$52.75; total, \$1,657.04. I also note that in 1873 there was no appropriation for diplomas, yet the report of the Grand Secretary in 1874 (Journal, p. 6086) shows that the expenditure on that account was \$178.51. It is manifest that, the above law ought to be rescinded, for it is inapplicable to the business of the Grand Lodge, it being impossible for any committee, however competent, to determine the amount that will be required for certain articles of supplies during the year.

A resolution, found in Digest, Section 31, requests the Grand Secretary "to arrange in his tabular statement of receipts, in *parallel columns*, the amounts for each specific purpose received from each Grand Jurisdiction and Subordinate Lodge and Encampment under this Grand Body. This request has been complied with by the annual publication of such a tabular statement as was indicated in the resolution, though the advantage of such arrangement has never been apparent, and every useful purpose, it would seem, might be subserved by stating the aggregate amount of receipts from each body, thus saving considerable expense in printing and lessening the labor of preparing the financial tables at a period when there is little time to devote to such work. Or, if the receipts for odes, cards, etc, are placed under the general head of "Supplies," the matter embraced in eight or nine columns may be presented under the several heads of Balance, Supplies, Representative Tax, and Total,

and save the expense of three or four pages of "rule and figure work." As the tables are now prepared, it. will be seen that unless a separate book is kept, or the ledger is specially ruled with columns for the several items, the amount of each payment must be divided among the various objects at the close of the year.

I beg, therefore, to suggest that the Committee on Finance consider the propriety of rescinding the resolutions referred to.

Finances.

The tables exhibiting the details of the receipts for the year are herewith presented. The amount has been paid to the Grand Treasurer, as appears by his report and the vouchers which will be handed to the Committee on Finance.

RECEIPTS of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

GRAND LODGES. BALANCE, SEPT. 11877. Postage and Freight Charter Odes. CARDS. Alabama \$0 90 \$ 4 20 \$ 6 60 Arkansas 12 50 90 00 British Columbia \$76 27 90 California 165 00 290 00 Chile Colorado 2 35 10 00 30 00 Connecticut 65 10 30 228 70 Dakota 2 92 3 50 32 75 Delaware 5 00 60 00 District of Columbia 150 00 05 1 25 21 95 Florida 77 48 50 9 00 30 40 Georgia 1 00 30 20 German Empire Illinois 84 90 00 700 00 Iowa 37 60 582 40 Indiana 10 37 18 500 00 Kansas 95 00 Kentucky 150 00 120 00 Louisiana 20 00 Lower Provinces, B N A 10 00 20 00 Maine 35 00 366 50 Maryland 7 50 55 00 Massachusetts 780 00 Michigan 50 00 380 00 Minnesota 2 25 14 90 120 40 Mississippi 2 50 13 70 Missouri 25 00 360 00 Montana 1 40 5 80 Nebraska 150 00 25 00 170 00 Nevada 1 10 5 00 1 40 New Hampshire 539 00 New Jersey 25 00 300 00 New York 117 00 676 00 North Carolina 10 22 40 Ohio 88 95 20 920 15 Ontario 15 00 270 00 Oregon 2 40 117 60 Pennsylvania 90 00 740 00 Rhode Island 50 7 50 130 00 South Carolina Switzerland 114 00 Tennessee 80 00 Texas 1 00 8 00 42 50 Utah 1 80 20 20 Vermont 1 75 59 80 Virginia 1 25 Washington \$30 00 West Virginia 150 00 30 8 40 70 00 Wisconsin 40 00 355 00 Wyoming 213 24 2 71 3 00 23 80 \$1,080 99 \$24 90 \$30 00 \$978 78 \$9,477 25

Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878.

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

GRAND LODGES. Diplomas. Books. Representatives Tax. Total Alabama \$ 2 00 \$15 80 \$29 50 Arkansas 159 00 \$150 00 411 50 British Columbia 8 25 85 42 California 10 00 275 00 150 00 890 00 Chile Colorado 62 50 150 00 254 85 Connecticut 3 00 101 00 150 00 493 65 Dakota 27 25 75 00 141 42 Delaware 63 50 150 00 278 50 District of Columbia 75 174 00 Florida 22 00 28 50 75 00 242 88 Georgia 2 00 9 70 150 00 192 90 German Empire Illinois 15 00 234 50 150 00 1,190 34 Indiana 25 00 263 90 150 00 1,058 90 Iowa 180 40 150 00 867 68 Kansas 81 25 150 00 326 25 Kentucky 150 00 420 00 Louisiana 21 00 150 00 197 50 Lower Provinces, B N A 82 50 150 00 262 50 Maine 130 50 150 00 682 00 Maryland 3 50 36 45 150 00 252 45 Massachusetts 100 00 287 75 150 00 1,317 75 Michigan 2 00 294 50 150 00 876 50 Minnesota 72 90 150 00 360 45 Mississippi 7 25 150 00 173 45 Missouri 122 50 150 00 657 50 Montana 24 00 75 00 106 20 Nebraska 89 50 150 00 584 50 Nevada 7 50 150 00 165 00 New Hampshire 173 75 150 00 862 75 New Jersey 5 00 119 25 150 00 599 25 New York 5 00 298 75 150 00 1,246 75 North Carolina 27 50 150 00 200 00 Ohio 9 00 107 50 150 00 1,282 73 Ontario 12 50 108 50 150 00 556 00 Oregon 120 00 150 00 390 00 Pennsylvania 50 00 288 75 150 00 1,318 75 Rhode Island 8 00 19 25 150 00 315 25 South Carolina Switzerland 15 00 129 00 Tennessee 12 50 92 50 Texas 32 50 328 50 150 00 562 50 Utah 3 00 75 00 100 00 Vermont 11 50 150 00 223 05 Virginia 36 50 150 00 187 75 Washington 30 00 West Virginia 28 40 150 00 407 10 Wisconsin 205 00 150 00 750 00 Wyoming 1 00 12 50 256 25 \$307 50 \$4,603 80 \$5,700 00 \$22,203 22

RECEIPTS of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

GRAND ENCAMPMENTS. BALANCE, SEPT. 1, 1877 POSTAGE AND FREIGHT. ODES. CARDS. Diplomas. Alabama Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware \$0 10 \$0 50 District of Columbia \$75

00 \$9 00 Georgia 75 00 Illinois 75 \$2 50 100 00 6 00 Indiana 45 00 Iowa 40 00 Kansas Kentucky 150 00
Louisiana Maine Maryland 3 00 Massachusetts 140 00 Michigan Minnesota 9 60 Mississippi Missouri 30 00
Nebraska 75 00 Nevada 25 New Hampshire 150 00 New Jersey 1 00 New York 150 00 70 00 North Carolina 1
00 Ohio 167 00 Ontario 1 20 28 80 Oregon Pennsylvania 50 00 Rhode Island South Carolina Tennessee 10 00
Texas Vermont Victoria (Australia) Virginia West Virginia 20 00 Wisconsin \$525 00 \$2 05 \$3 75 \$870 40 \$9
50

Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878.

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

GRAND ENCAMPMENTS. Books. Representatives Tax. Balance Credit. Total. Alabama \$16 00 \$16 00
Arkansas California 10 00 \$150 00 160 00 Colorado 75 00 75 00 Connecticut 150 00 150 00 Delaware 12 75
75 00 88 35 District of Columbia 4 50 88 50 Georgia 75 00 150 00 Illinois 18 00 150 00 277 25 Indiana 75 00
150 00 270 00 Iowa 52 00 150 00 242 00 Kansas 75 00 75 00 Kentucky 150 00 300 00 Louisiana 75 00 75 00
Maine 30 00 150 00 180 00 Maryland 18 00 150 00 171 00 Massachusetts 17 75 150 00 307 75 Michigan 20 00
150 00 170 00 Minnesota 24 00 75 00 108 60 Mississippi 75 00 75 00 Missouri 20 50 150 00 200 50 Nebraska
16 00 75 00 166 00 Nevada 24 75 75 00 \$75 00 175 00 New Hampshire 150 00 300 00 New Jersey 150 00 151
00 New York 12 0 232 00 North Carolina 1 75 75 00 77 75 Ohio 59 00 150 00 376 00 Ontario 40 00 150 00
220 00 Oregon 60 00 75 00 135 00 Pennsylvania 12 00 150 00 212 00 Rhode Island 150 00 150 00 South
Island Tennessee 10 00 20 00 Texas 54 00 150 00 204 00 Vermont Victoria (Australia) Virginia 75 00 75 00
West Virginia 75 00 95 00 Wisconsin 150 00 150 00 \$608 00 \$3,825 00 \$75 00 \$5,918 70

RECEIPTS of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

SUBORDINATE LODGES. BALANCE, SEPT. 1, 1877 POSTAGE FREIGHT. Charter. ODES. CARDS.
Diplomas. ARIZONA Arizona No 1 DENMARK Denmark No 1 GREAT BRITAIN Thomas Wildey No 1
INDIAN TERRITORY Caddo No 1 Tishomingo No 2 \$3 00 McAlister No 3 Erin Springs No 4 \$18 00
MANITOBA Manitoba No 1 North Star No 2 NETHERLANDS Paradise No 1 \$10 00 1 25 Mount Sinai No 2
18 00 NEW MEXICO Paradise No 1 \$0 05 3 00 PERU Lima No 1 40 00 \$97 50 Callao No 2 Fortschritt No 3
Chalaco No 4 QUEBEC Mount Royal No 1 \$4 00 6 00 St Lawrence No 2 3 00 Mizpah No 3 13 00 Duke of
Edinburgh No 4 9 00 Albert No 5 14 3 36 5 50 Beaver No 6 7 50 75 Pioneer No 7 50 4 25 Unity No 8 50 18 00
2 00 7 50 SANDWICH ISLANDS Excelsior No 1 Harmony No 2 WASHINGTON New Castle No 8 Mount
Baker No 9 Patit No 10 Ranier No 11 3 00 18 00 3 00 Snohomish No 12 3 20 18 00 2 00 3 00 Friendship No 13
3 51 18 00 2 00 6 00 Colfax No 14 3 06 18 00 Sundry Lodges 97 26 25 Individuals 9 85 80 50 \$10 00 \$24 78
\$126 00 \$13 36 \$115 00 \$205 00

Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878.

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

SUBORDINATE LODGES. Books. Dues. Balance to Credit. Total. ARIZONA Arizona No 1 DENMARK
Denmark No 1 GREAT BRITAIN Thomas Wildey No 1 INDIAN TERRITORY Caddo No 1 \$16 85 \$16 85
Tishomingo No 2 12 03 15 03 McAlister No 3 39 30 39 30 Erin Springs No 4 \$12 00 30 00 MANITOBA
Manitoba No 1 62 25 62 25 North Star No 2 NETHERLANDS Paradise No 1 13 00 24 25 Mount Sinai No 2 12
00 30 00 NEW MEXICO Paradise No 1 1 00 54 05 58 10 PERU Lima No 1 42 03 179 53 Callao No 2 26 32 26
32 Fortschritt No 3 36 13 36 13 Chalaco No 4 91 36 91 36 QUEBEC Mount Royal No 1 106 30 116 30 St
Lawrence No 2 37 40 40 40 Mizpah No 3 88 26 101 26 Duke of Edinburgh No 4 35 47 44 47 Albert No 5 45
97 54 97 Beaver No 6 49 69 57 94 Pioneer No 7 63 43 68 18 Unity No 8 15 00 23 20 66 20 SANDWICH
ISLANDS Excelsior No 1 87 78 87 78 Harmony No 2 52 32 52 32 WASHINGTON New Castle No 8 87 05 87
05 Mount Baker No 9 50 00 50 00 Patit No 10 Ranier No 11 12 00 62 00 62 00 36 00 Snohomish No 12 12 00
38 20 Friendship No 13 12 00 41 51 Colfax No 14 12 00 \$3 06 36 12 Sundry Lodges 176 25 203 47 Individuals
59 95 150 30 \$324 20 \$1,182 19 \$3 06 \$2,003 59

RECEIPTS of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

SUBORDINATE ENCAMPMENTS. Balance Sept 1, 1877 Postage and Freight. Odes. BRITISH COLUMBIA Harmony No 1 \$4 26 CHILE Southern Watch No 1 DAKOTA Royal Purple No 1 Yankton No 2 Hesperian No 3 FLORIDA Florida No 1 \$0 08 Aucilla No 2 Excelsior" 4 Key West" 5 GREAT BRITAIN Anglo-American No 1 IDAHO Idaho No 1 15 LOWER PROVINCES, B N A Stuart No 10 Milicete No 11 Halifax No 12 Port La Joie No 13 MANITOBA Harmony No 1 MONTANA Rocky Mountain No 1 Golden Star No 2 NEW MeXICO Centennial No 1 PERU Atahualpa No 1 \$2 00 QUEBEC Montreal No 1 SANDWICH ISLANDS Polynesia No 1 WASHINGTON Unity No 2 3 69 WYOMING Wyoming No 1 Hope No 2 \$7 95 \$0 23 \$2 00
Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878.

Receipts of the Grand Secretary for the Fiscal Year from September 1, 1877, to August 31, 1878

SUBORDINATE ENCAMPMENTS. Cards. Books. Dues. Total. BRITISH COLUMBIA Harmony No 1 \$4 26 CHILE Southern Watch No 1 DAKOTA Royal Purple No 1 \$2 23 2 23 Yankton No 2 \$2 50 11 12 13 62 Hesperian No 3 6 99 6 99 FLORIDA Florida No 1 \$2 00 5 50 7 58 Aucilla No 2 3 37 3 37 Excelsior No 4 10 65 10 65 Key West No 5 1 00 20 25 21 25 GREAT BRITAIN Anglo-American No 1 IDAHO Idaho No 3 00 1 00 13 92 18 07 LOWER PROVINCES, B N A Stuart No 10 3 07 3 07 Milicete No 11 Halifax No 12 8 80 8 80 Port La Joie No 13 39 28 39 28 MANITOBA Harmony No 1 MONTANA Rocky Mountain No 1 30 70 30 70 Golden Star No 2 18 30 18 30 NEW MEXICO Centennial No 1 12 15 12 15 PERU Atahualpa No 1 13 42 15 42 QUEBEC Montreal No 1 28 90 28 90 SANDWICH ISLANDS Polynesia No 2 30 43 30 43 WASHINGTON Unity No No 2 2 29 87 33 56 WYOMING Wyoming No 1 3 00 14 06 17 06 Hope No 2 13 35 13 35 \$8 50 \$4 00 \$316 36 \$339 04

Recapitulated.

The revenue (adding amount due) is \$5,475.69 less than for the year ending August 31, 1877. This is accounted for by the fact that the balance due Sept. 1, 1876, was \$7,795.10 (Journal, page 6814), and the balance Sept. 1, 1877, was \$2,602.54, a difference of \$5,192.56, to which the canceled indebtedness of the Grand Lodge and Grand Encampment of South Carolina, \$413.00, being added, the amount is \$5,605.67, so that there is little difference between the amount of actual revenue for the two years. The number of orders for supplies, received and executed, is 533 (many of them for single books or diplomas), exceeding by 195 the orders for the preceding year.

In addition to the foregoing statement of receipts, tables showing the details of receipt and disbursement of supplies, the balances appearing on the Ledger after the close of the books, and a balance-sheet, exhibiting the entire transactions for the year, are presented. The last column of the latter shows the actual condition of the Grand Lodge, and it will be seen that the assets have decreased from \$70,661.88 in 1874 to \$48,300.12 in 1878. As a matter of comparison, the following table, exhibiting the assets in 1874, 1877, and 1878, as printed on pages 6087, 7285, and in the present report, with the increase and decrease sustained by the operations of last year, is presented:

Sep. 1, '74.	Sep. 1, '77.	Sep. 1, '78.	Increase.	Decrease.	
Bills Receivable	\$75 00	\$75 00	Cash	\$18,188 30	
13,474 91	\$10,661 49	2,813 42	U S Bonds	24,000 00	
15,500 00	8,000 00	7,500 00	Electro Plates	3,814 50	
4,572 10	4,986 60	\$414 50	Steel and Cop Plates	1,775 00	
1,950 00	3,450 00	1,500 00	Furniture & Fixtures	6,137 90	
7,912 51	7,460 01	452 50	Library	584 00	
670 21	676 46	6 25	Grand Lodge Building	3,265 04	
3,265 04	History of the Order	1,504 50	1,504 50	Due from Individuals	120 00
147 12	178 33	31 21	Due from Grand Bodies	7,155 64	
2,064 12	1,484 92	579 20	Due from Subordinates	23 24	
332 24	270 22	62 02	Supplies at cost	7,358 80	
7,167 90	7,867 05	699 15	\$70,661 88	\$58,635 65	
\$48,300 12	\$2,651 11	\$12,986 64	Deduct increase	2,651 11	
Net decrease	\$10,335 53				

United States Bonds appear in the balance-sheet of 1874 as \$26,000, and in 1877 as \$17,500, the Bonds belonging to the Wildey Monument Fund, \$2,000, being included in those years.

The "History of the Order" account, heretofore included in the assets of the Grand Lodge, has been closed by Profit and Loss, which makes the apparent deficit of the last year \$1,504.50 more than the actual loss.

Miscellaneous.

At too late an hour for insertion in their appropriate places the following were received:

SOUTH CAROLINA.—Bro. ROBERT JAMES, Grand Secretary, under date of August 7th, wrote: "I forward to-day my annual return. I regret its delay, but hope it will appear in your *Revised Journal*. You will perceive that we are still going backward. Our loss last year of 51 may be considered our gain, as they were among that class of members who took no interest in the Order.

"Our treasury is still empty, which prevents me from paying our Representative tax of \$75.

"I have not been able to furnish you with a copy of our Proceedings for 1877 and 1878. from the fact that we have no money to print them."

GERMANY.—On the 28th of August, the following from Grand Secretary MEYENDORF, dated Berlin, August 10th, was received:

"Communications have been sent to Schiller Lodge, No. 3, Stuttgart, and Denmark Lodge, No. 1, at Copenhagen, and I have advised the latter to remit to you thirty dollars for Charter fee. I have also forwarded to Denmark Lodge, for immediate use, 25 Traveling and 10 Withdrawal Cards, also one Digest, which I took from my stock on hand, for all of which I received the stated amount, and I have reimbursed the Lodge the sixty marks previously paid to me. Our account is therefore exactly balanced, with the exception of two Charge, two Degree, and two Rebekah Degree Books, which you will be pleased to supply me with at your convenience.

"Referring to my communication of July 16th, as to the three Withdrawal Cards, I remark that they belong to Bros. RATH, TRATZ, and HOFFMEYER, and are yet unsigned.

"In response to a communication from the M. W. Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, Bro. PRAETORIUS, in his official capacity as D. D. G. Sire, a petition has been prepared for presentation to the G. L. of U. S., asking a donation of one hundred dollars to Denmark Lodge, which sum, it is presumed, will about cover its outlay.

"I am convinced that this year's session of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States will conduce greatly to the prosperity of our beloved Order, and I feel assured that its decisions upon such matters as may be brought before it will not only advance the interests of the Order, but contribute to the welfare of humanity.

"I request that you will transmit to the M. W. Grand Sire, as well as to the officers and members of the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, my fraternal greeting and the assurance of my highest esteem and consideration."

The Epidemic in the South.

The unfortunate visitation of the dreaded yellow fever to several cities of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee has been brought to the official notice of the Grand Secretary by the reception of fifty dollars from Union Lodge, No. 1, Denver, Colorado, on the 3d day of September, as "a donation to the brethren in the South who are suffering from yellow fever." Bro. A. J. WOODBURY, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Union Lodge, remarked: "As you have facilities for knowing at what point or points the money can be best appropriated, we place the sum in your hands, knowing that you will willingly attend to its distribution." In the exercise of the discretion vested in me, the amount was promptly transmitted, in currency, by the Adams Express Company, free of charge, to JOHN H. MCKENZIE, Grand Master, Summit, Mississippi.

On the 4th day of September a draft for fifty dollars was received from J. M. NORMAN, P. Sec'y of Denver Lodge, No. 4, Denver, Colorado, the contribution of that Lodge "to the Odd Fellows' Relief Committee of Memphis, Tennessee, for the benefit of the suffering Odd Fellows of that city." This remittance was duly acknowledged, but, in the absence of information as to the organization of a "Relief Committee" in Memphis, the transmission of the amount was delayed until the reception of advice as to whom the money should be paid.

Germania Lodge, No. 14, Denver, Colorado, has also sent to this office twenty-five dollars, "to be distributed to yellow fever suffering districts South."

This splendid offering of one hundred and twenty-five dollars by the three Lodges in Denver, is worthy of all commendation, and it is not to be doubted that the Order generally has now, as heretofore, promptly responded to the appeals for relief which have come from the sadly afflicted cities of the South.

In this connection I have also to state, that on the 1st of September a telegram was received from the Grand Master of Dakota, asking to whom contributions for the sufferers by yellow fever should be sent. He was advised to remit to the Grand Master of Mississippi.

The mail of September 7th brought the following;

HALL OF THE I. O. O. F. ASSOCIATION, Silver Reef, Washington County, Utah Territory,

August 27, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGELY, R. W. Grand Secretary:

DEAR SIR AND BRO.,—Inclosed you will please find bill of exchange for one hundred and fifty dollars (\$150), which amount has been contributed by this Association for the relief of our brethren in the South, who are suffering from yellow fever. It is the wish of the Association that the money be equally distributed between the States of Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and, not knowing the addresses of the Grand Officers of those States, we send the funds to you, with a request that you forward the money to its destination.

This Association consists of members of various Lodges, who have come together here, and there being no Lodge within one hundred miles, have formed an association which numbers thirty-three (33) members.

Hoping that our mite may do a little toward relieving our unfortunate brethren,

I remain, fraternally yours,

C. F. Bowen, Secretary.

The following telegram was also received:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,

September 7, 1878.

JAMES L. RIDGELY, Grand Secretary:

Lodges here contributed one hundred and fifty dollars for the Odd Fellows South. I mailed to you draft for that amount to-day.

Charles Popper, Grand Master.

These contributions, one hundred and twenty-five dollars from Colorado and three hundred dollars from Utah, through this office, evince the true spirit of Odd Fellowship existing in these comparatively young jurisdictions of the Order. The noble donation of one hundred and fifty dollars by brethren temporarily located at Silver Reef, Utah Territory, deserves more than a passing notice.

General Returns,

Compiled from the reports of Grand and Subordinate Bodies under the jurisdiction of the G. L. of U. S.

General Returns

Year 1876. Year 1877. Increase. Decrease. Grand Lodges 48 48 Subordinate Lodge 6,678 6,877 199
Rebekah Degree Lodges 770 690 80 Grand Encampments 30 39 Subordinate Enc'mpments 1,806 1,835 29
Lodge Initiations 40,646 36,087 4,559 Lodge members 456,125 447,186 8,939 Encampment members 87,785
84,787 2,998 Relief by Lodges \$1,507,649 12 \$1,516,241 76 \$8,592 64 Relief by Encampments 177,151 45
183,482 47 6,331 02 Relief by Rebekah Lodges 4,685 05 5,542 48 857 43 Total relief 1,689,485 62 1,705,266
71 15,781 09 Revenue of Lodges 4,008,984 69 3,961,900 72 \$47,083 97 Revenue of Encampments 453,034 72
431,828 05 21,206 67 Revenue of Rebekah L'ges 27,853 05 29,323 08 1,470 03 Total revenue 4,489,872 46
4,423,051 85 66,820 61

The following statement exhibits in brief the entire operations (including Australia and Germany), so far as the same can be ascertained, as owing to imperfect reports in the early years of the Order complete statistics are not to be had,

Conclusion.

The evidence deducible from the facts and figures of this report indicate a material shrinkage in the assets of the Grand Lodge for the past fiscal year, arising chiefly from the extraordinary appropriations, aggregating \$6,000. The deficit revenue, although more marked during the past few years in the general jurisdiction, has been chiefly developed, during the current year, in the middle, southern, and western portions of the country, although it has not wholly been unfelt in the more favored sections of the north, including the Grand Bodies of Ontario where Odd Fellowship is eminently prosperous. The business depression in the Order at large which has prevailed generally for several years, has been growing, and is by common consent referable to its true cause, viz.: the continued paralysis which has pursued commerce and industry. Since the close of our Civil War, much of the antecedent capital and wealth of the country has disappeared as the inevitable effect of that unhappy strife in the enormous waste of war. It is contended, that the loss of this wealth has not only not been restored, but, to the contrary, the industry of the country, which is the basis of wealth, has been inadequately

rewarded, and the products of manufacture and agriculture have been unremunerative. Without venturing to discuss such extraneous subjects in this report we remark as germane to the subject, that our Order is not exempt from the influence which business prosperity entails upon all institutions which require the aid of capital. Besides, the foreign world has but recently ceased its bitter strife of war, leaving behind all the evils which follow in its train, including its fearful waste and general business derangement. Hence we are admonished that the end of financial depression is not yet, and that the blessing of general peace to mankind is still in abeyance, and must await events which ripen as natural fruit, from legitimate and cognate causes. We may reasonably indulge the hope that the future prospect of commerce, agriculture, and general business will soon begin to brighten, and that Odd Fellowship will then revive, and be lifted to its normal vigor as a potential element and moral force. Meanwhile it is our duty and privilege to apply the experience acquired to our proper enlightenment, to deduce wisdom from its pregnant lessons, and to do all that we can to improve and defend the position. To apply ourselves to a judicious and intelligent economy, consistent with our obligations, the just benefactions which arise out of them, and the magnitude of the interests which they involve. There is no cause for alarm. We may confidently rely upon the Supreme Head of the Order; we have in past emergencies done so, and it has always proved itself equal to the crisis, and ever will beyond all peradventure. The circumstances of our position, we have not improvidently superinduced. The administration has been, as heretofore, wise, economical, and prudent, commensurate with the magnitude and important interests of the million which it represents and sustains, and may be therefore confidently relied upon to provide as adequate a finance system in the future as it has done in the long past.

Respectfully submitted,

Jas. L. Ridgely,
Cor. and Rec. Sec'y-

Office of the G. Cor. and Rec. Sec'y, Baltimore,

September, 1878.

STATEMENT OF SUPPLIES *on hand, August 31, 1877, received and disposed of during the year, and on hand, August 31, 1878.*

Grand Encampment Books. Encampment Institution Books. Encampment Ch'ge Books. Lodge Institution Books. Lodge Public Installation Books (Ger.) Lodge Charge Books. Degree Charge Books. Degree Lodge Installation Books. Rebekah Deg. Books. Reb. Deg. Ldg. Installation Books. Odes, with Music. On hand, Aug. 31, 1877, per Journal, p. 7282. Received during the year 87 112 112 730 256 408 124 711 1,030 873 518 107 625 258 657 1,059 Total Disposed of during the year 87 11 112 3 12 16 986 233 408 50 124 6 1,741 724 1,391 531 107 9 883 421 657 25 1,059 274 On hand, August 31, 1878 76 109 96 753 358 118 1,017 860 98 462 632 785 Odes Cards Rebekah Cards Dismissal Certificates Rebekah Certificates Diplomas Book of Forms Funeral Service Anniversary Ceremony Bound Journals Digests Digest, Additions, 1871- 1874 On hand, Aug 31, 1877, per Journal, p 7282 Received during the year 25,913 19,900 14,346 50,000 1,833 1,000 2,274 100 597 1,214 2,000 173 1,758 1,564 1,401 1,908 500 135 559 1,875 Total Disposed of during the year 45,813 19,909 64,346 51,765 2,833 459 2,374 1,360 597 42 3,214 919 1,931 * 902 1,564 357 1,401 113 2,408 † 434 694 € 430 1,875 § 578 On hand, August 31, 1878 25,904 12,581 2,374 1,014 555 2,295 1,029 1,207 1,288 1,974 264 1,297 * 49 to Grand Representatives † 410 to Grand Representatives € 51 to Grand Representatives § 7 to Grand Representatives 542 used in Digests.

ANNUAL REPORT of *Grand Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, organized between September*

ADD. JURISDICTION. No of Lodges. MEMBERS, DEC. 31, 1876 Error in last report. Initiated. Admitted by Card. Reinstated. Total. Alabama 36 1,183 93 27 31 1,334 Arkansas 63 1,487 145 58 50 1,740 British Columbia 5 492 45 7 8 552 California 248 20,201 1,617 615 199 22,632 *Chile 8 399 399 Colorado 28 1,215 190 80 22 1,530 Connecticut 50 5,930 604 39 31 6,604 Dakota 13 315 131 9 490 Delaware 32 2,537 74 7 12 2,630 District Columbia 14 1,952 105 20 11 2,088 Florida 10 318 50 6 12 386 Georgia 48 2,043 182 20 53 2,298 Illinois 583 26,812 2,612 727 611 30,762 Indiana 518 26,404 1,874 575 382 29,235 Iowa 336 17, 476 1,867 544 180 20,067 Kansas 134 4,968 535 237 71 5,811 Kentucky 214 10,028 392 133 99 10,652 Louisiana 25 1,086 161 15 18 1,280 Low Prov BNA 25 1,629 439 41 21 2,130 Maine 62 7,606 1,333 132 45 9,116 Maryland 104 12,118 297 31 65 12,511 Massachusetts 140 21,685 1,847 211 76 23,819 Michigan 285 13,451

1,700 324 321 15,796 Minnesota 55 2,598 9 546 169 49 3,371 Mississippi 45 1,577 64 23 41 1,705 Missouri 323 12,691 1,399 428 321 14,839 Montana 8 256 37 16 4 313 Nebraska 65 2,345 287 116 70 2,818 Nevada 28 2,045 184 00 43 2,327 New Hampshire 53 6,642 638 101 58 7,439 New Jersey 169 14,740 796 66 132 15,734 New York 466 39,626 3,239 378 253 43,496 North Carolina 60 1,784 220 14 26 2,044 Ohio 629 44,981 2,457 684 402 48,524 Ontario 178 11,738 1,948 239 98 14,023 Oregon 72 2,891 268 99 20 3,278 Pennsylvania 899 91,738 3,922 689 533 96,883 Rhode Island 42 5,418 279 38 18 5,754 South Carolina 15 662 31 6 8 708 Switzerland 8 236 82 4 1 323 Tennessee 147 4,138 294 76 126 4,634 Texas 172 4,749 50 734 308 181 6,022 Utah 6 296 55 27 4 382 Vermont 18 1,282 149 21 33 1,485 Virginia 49 3,192 174 25 50 3,441 West Virginia 84 4,426 297 84 78 4,885 Wisconsin 251 13,487 1,320 313 173 15,293 Wyoming 9 418 56 8 3 485 6,832 455,293 82 35,770 7,871 5,052 504,068 * No report received

for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877, and names of Grand Lodges 1, 1877, and September 1, 1878.

DEDUCT. JURISDICTION. Error in last report. Withdrawn by Card. Suspended or dropped. Expelled. Deceased. Total. Members, Dec 31, 1877 No. of brother relieved. Alabama 40 174 1 18 233 1,101 104 Arkansas 97 80 10 20 207 1,533 79 British Columbia 5 40 2 5 52 500 53 California 549 1,074 51 229 1,903 20,729 2,393 *Chile 399 Colorado 58 193 7 9 267 1,263 80 Connecticut 38 246 11 52 347 6257 545 Dakota 16 44 2 2 64 426 104 Delaware 12 279 1 20 312 2, 318 237 District Columbia 10 159 1 26 196 1,892 272 Florida 11 31 1 5 48 388 15 Georgia 81 230 1 23 335 1,963 186 Illinois 979 3, 335 151 255 4, 720 26,042 2, 389 Indiana 699 3,003 131 256 4,089 25,146 2,907 Iowa 556 1,400 93 101 2,150 17 917 981 Kansas 167 535 15 30 747 5,064 315 Kentucky 171 581 18 82 852 9,800 93 Louisiana 39 120 2 29 190 1,090 168 Low Prov BN A 61 176 5 17 259 1,871 78 Maine 169 205 9 75 458 8,658 567 Maryland 53 635 8 178 874 11,637 1,911 Massachusetts 249 816 20 214 1,299 22,520 1,617 Michigan 575 1,939 44 90 2,648 13,148 460 Minnesota 111 217 13 23 364 3,007 163 Mississippi 48 95 4 12 159 1,546 93 Missouri 402 1,191 60 129 1,782 13, 057 1,310 Montana 16 17 2 4 39 274 21 Nebraska 94 268 8 11 381 2,437 118 Nevada 5 81 234 7 25 352 1,975 171 New Hampshire 78 274 4 50 406 7,033 602 New Jersey 125 1,404 14 137 1,680 14,054 1,642 New York 850 3,542 59 413 4,864 38 632 2,750 North Carolina 62 239 91 9 Ohio 844 3,394 153 375 4,766 43,758 3,716 Ontario 353 1,210 26 86 1,675 12,348 1,046 Oregon 99 182 12 24 317 2,961 335 Pennsylvania 864 9,676 96 886 11,522 85, 361 10,879 Rhode Island 64 375 4 35 478 5,276 425 South Carolina 15 73 3 5 96 612 32 Switzerland 16 21 2 2 41 282 8 Tennessee 167 724 21 39 951 3,683 327 Texas 355 870 33 77 1,335 4,687 464 Utah 20 34 2 4 60 322 31 Vermont 46 171 4 18 239 1,246 30 Virginia 43 400 9 44 496 2,945 528 West Virginia 94 474 6 28 Wisconsin 433 1,235 31 102 1,801 13,492 540 Wyoming 4 17 82 5 2 110 375 26 9 9,932 41,697 1,183 4,276 57,097 446,971 41,331

ANNUAL REPORT of Grand Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, organized between September 1, 1877,

No. JURISDICTION. weeks' benefits paid. No. of widowed families rel'ed. No. of brothers buried. Amount paid for the relief of brothers. Amount paid for relief of widowed families. Amount paid for education of orphans. Alabama 301 28 18 \$1,024 00 \$300 75 \$152 78 Arkansas 242 7 20 1,166 90 182 50 British Columbia 273 1 5 3,126 00 25 00 California 12,892 229 229 112,675 23 17,985 99 1,436 75 *Chile Colorado 357 5 9 2,131 00 164 85 Connecticut 4,467 14 52 16,055 60 356 05 163 00 Dakota 81 1 2 783 50 14 95 Delaware 1,761 30 20 7,504 80 346 88 District Columbia 1,549 70 26 6,196 00 2,476 64 876 07 Florida 67 2 5 269 00 60 11 Georgia 592 22 23 2,292 00 2,032 71 65 50 Illinois 6,749 326 255 32,507 69 5,629 88 261 75 Indiana 11,436 370 256 48,891 48 6,492 57 1,333 75 Iowa 4,503 88 101 15,568 74 2,896 07 93 50 Kansas 1,400 35 30 5,560 00 578 85 Kentucky 2,296 132 82 18,279 82 4,320 28 668 65 Louisiana 434 53 29 2,857 44 1,204 10 200 75 Low Prov BNA 388 12 17 1,157 05 220 00 Maine 5,353 36 75 22732 20 1,095 50 156 65 Maryland 13,196 174 178 45,004 00 24 387 40 1,320 88 Massachusetts 10,160 478 214 41,542 44 5 424 26 96 16 Michigan 1,163 76 90 7,772 30 1,804 07 Minnesota 559 18 23 2,705 05 205 57 Mississippi 249 11 12 1,074 90 249 60 Missouri 4,864 343 129 19,648 75 8,833 50 4,093 75 Montana 64 1 4 576 50 67 28 Nebraska 407 7 11 1,979 90 160 50 Nevada 916 11 25 9,684 50 956 93 40 00 New Hampshire 3,669 32 50 13,229 04 698 80 New Jersey 10,853 157 137 52,327 34 3,922 86 426 60 New York 18,749 488 413 101,742 50 15,670 59 812 51 North Carolina 229 4 9 798 44 53 13 31 88 Ohio 18,559 494 375 82,673 88 11,642 93 102 69 Ontario 4,336 143 86 11,692 57 4,696 92 Oregon 1,648 21 24 9,890 20 1,020 50 Pennsylvania 66,065 1,528 886 278,512 31 14,476 54 663 02 Rhode Island 1,142 31 35 13,587 59 186 58 South Carolina 142 32 5 571 00 467 00 49 50 Switzerland 113 1 2 278 00 4 00 Tennessee 1,274 128 39 5,186 18 4,322 15 1,257 23 Texas 1,334 31 77 5,183 47 588 74 506 68 Utah 167 2 4 1,140 00 20 00 Vermont 207 4 18 908 67 91 00 Virginia West Virginia 2,324 1,394 134 52 44 28 8,228 00 3,061 83 3,020 00 901 33 108 00 61 73 Wisconsin 2,049 121 102 9,110 40 8,921 13 6 00 Wyoming 157 1 2 759 05 25 00 221,130 5,984 4,276 \$1,029,647 26 \$159,201 99 \$14,985 78 * No report received

for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877, and names of Grand Lodges and September 1,

—Continued.

JURISDICTION. Amount paid for burying the dead. Amount of special relief. Total relief. Total receipts. Alabama \$649 70 \$196 50 \$2,323 73 \$8 093 14 Arkansas 416 00 1,765 40 9,863 34 British Columbia 187 00 3,338 00 10,774 53 California 18,278 61 9,877 77 160,254 35 458,888 29 *Chile Colorado 467 30 2,763 15 17,001 20 Connecticut 3,003 15 3,285 12 22,862 92 60,725 26 Dakota 614 12 139 70 1,552 27 4,886 28 Delaware 2,495 00 374 70 10,721 38 24,181 77 District Columbia 1,290 79 434 50 11,274 00 21,127 71 Florida 120 00 449 11 3,280 88 Georgia 1,120 00 5,510 21 11,548 65 Illinois 8,150 42 4,972 22 51,521 96 215,506 21 Indiana 13,154 75 4,639 46 74,512 01 218,615 86 Iowa 3,208 05 915 85 22,682 21 90,653 19 Kansas 978 00 951 35 8,068 20 36,062 60 Kentucky 4,283 61 1,540 26 29,092 62 51,054 91 Louisiana 1,277 90 5,540 19 14,410 27 Low Prov BN A 351 05 160 00 1,888 10 10,928 08 Maine 2,732 25 26,716 60 75,138 92 Maryland 9,056 00 4,304 32 84,072 60 98,151 76 Massachusetts 9,483 16 7,965 39 64,511 41 191,915 57 Michigan 2,697 06 1,655 14 13,928 57 71,737 50 Minnesota 837 75 344 75 4,093 12 28,283 26 Mississippi 373 50 1,698 00 10,632 83 Missouri 5,571 75 38,147 75 92,560 00 Montana 145 00 788 78 4,5 5 73 Nebraska 177 25 566 30 2,883 95 20,333 96 Nevada 2,180 39 1,472 12 14,333 94 53,998 58 New Hampshire 2,932 65 481 24 17,341 73 48,318 06 New Jersey 11,403 09 68,079 89 140,461 36 New York 32,181 28 150,406 88 329,744 09 North Carolina 235 00 1,118 45 8,900 39 Ohio 13,852 84 6,097 06 114,369 40 318,414 57 Ontario 2, 482 60 3, 271 87 22, 143 96 110, 675 15 Oregon 1,107 50 1,558 75 13,576 95 54,598 65 Pennsylvania 71,913 88 365,565 75 711,209 05 Rhode Island 2,030 00 4,360 87 20,165 04 63,148 93 South Carolina 30 00 1,117 50 3,209 43 Switzerland 16 00 21 00 319 00 2,836 70 Tennessee 1,334 50 314 97 12,415 03 27,789 63 Texas 2,433 63 8,712 52 54,756 38 Utah 220 55 133 00 1,513 55 6,913 38 Vermont 395 00 52 89 1,447 56 6,912 70 Virginia 3,146 00 200 00 14,702 00 27,975 00 West Virginia 3,146 50 950 00 8,121 39 27,119 22 Wisconsin 4,685 52 1,263 24 23,986 29 84,363 73 Wyoming 176 67 960 72 5,125 55 \$247,022 77 \$62,500 34 \$1,513,358 14 \$3,947,332 25 *No report received

ANNUAL REPORT of Subordinate Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877 names and location of Lodges working under contiguous State Grand Lodges; and Lodges instituted between September 1, 1877 and September 1, 1878

ADD. DEDUCT. Members, Dec 31, 1877 LODGES. LOCATION Members Dec. 31, 1876 Initiated. Admitted by Card. Reinstated. Total. ERROR IN REPORT. Withdrawn by Card. Suspended or dropped. EXPELLED. Deceased. Total. Past Grands. ARIZONA. *Arizona No 1 Prescott 35 35 35 DENMARK, EUROPE †Denmark No 1 Copenhagen GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE *Thomas Wilder No 1 London, England IDAHO €Pioneer No 1 Idaho City €Owyhee No 2 Silver City €Ada No 3 Boise City €Excelsior No 4 Centreville €Rocky Mountain No 5 Salmon City €Covenant No 6 Placerville INDIAN TERRITORY Caddo No 1 Caddo 31 1 1 33 5 4 24 4 Tishomingo No 2 Tishomingo 17 2 1 20 1 1 19 2 McAlister No 3 McAlister 14 6 20 20 §Erin Springs No 4 Erin Springs MANITOBA, CANADA Manitoba No 1 Winnipeg 48 4 2 54 1 2 3 3 51 5 *North Star No 2 Winnipeg 31 31 31 NETHERLANDS, EUROPE Paradise No 1 Amsterdam, Holland 28 6 34 8 8 26 1 Mount Sinai No 2 Amsterdam, Holland NEW MEXICO Paradise No 2 Santa Fe 46 1 2 49 1 1 2 47 10 PERU, S AMERICA. Lima No 1 27 8 1 36 4 4 32 1 Callao No 2 Callao 25 3 2 2 32 6 5 1 12 20 3 Fortschritt No 3 Lima 9 6 3 18 1 1 17 2 Chalaco No 4 Callao 18 25 43 1 1 2 41 2 QUEBEC, CANADA Mount Royal No 1 Montreal 121 28 2 151 8 23 4 35 116 10 St Lawrence No 2 Montreal 37 12 1 50 8 8 42 7 Mizpah No 3 Montreal 187 22 2 211 19 52 71 140 6 Duke of Edinburgh No 4 Montreal 57 10 1 68 9 9 18 50 6 Albert No 5 Montreal 48 13 1 62 1 2 11 1 15 47 3 Beaver No 6 Montreal 28 14 44 3 2 40 1 Pioneer No 7 Richmond 36 8 44 3 41 Unity No 8 Sherbrooke 16 13 29 29 2 Provincial Degree No 1 Montreal SANDWICH ISLANDS Excelsior No 1 Honolulu 78 4 1 83 7 8 1 16 67 20 Harmony No 3 Honolulu 28 28 5 WASHINGTON €Olympia No 1 Olympia €Enterprise No 2 Walla Walla €Vancouver No 3 Vancouver €Olive Branch No 4 Seattle €Touchet No 5 New Castle €Western No 6 Port Tacoma €Seattle Snohomish New Castle No 8 Newcastle 17 15 32 3 3 29 1 Mount Baker No 9 Port Townsend 11 11 22 1 1 21 2 Patit No 10 Dayton 20 16 36 1 35 4 **Ranier No 11 New Tacoma ††Snohomish No 12 Snohomish €€Friendship No 13 Port Gamble §§Colfax No 11 Colfax 832 317 108 6 1263 8 90 107 2 8 215 1,048 97 * No report received, † Instituted, October 29, 1877 €Reports to Gran Lodge of Oregon \$Instituted, June 29, 1878 Instituted January 17, 1878 Instituted, October 29, 1877 ** Instituted, February 9, 1878 Instituted, April 23, 1878 †† Instituted, June 17, 1878 Instituted, €€ June 17, 1878 §§ Instituted, June 13, 1878

ANNUAL REPORT of Subordinate Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877; names of Lodges working under contiguous State Grand Lodges; and Lodges instituted between September 1, 1877, and September 1, 1878—Continued.

LODGES. No. of brothers relieved. No. of week's benefit paid. No. of widowed families relieved. No. of brothers buried. Amount paid for the relief of brothers. Amount paid for the relief of widowed families Amount paid for education of orphans. Amount paid for burying the dead. Amount of special relief. Total relief. Total receipts. ARIZONA. *Arizona No 1 DENMARK, EUROPE †Denmark No 1 GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE

*Thomas Wildey No 1 IDAHO €Pioneer No 1 €Owyhee No 2 €Ada No 3 €Excelsior No 4 €Rocky Mountain No 5 €Covenant No 6 INDIAN TERRITORY Caddo No 1 3 2 \$14 25 \$14 25 \$168 50 Tishomingo No 2 1 \$17 80 17 80 120 25 §McAlister No 3 2 8 40 00 40 00 393 06 †Erin Springs No 4 MANITOBA, CANADA Manitoba No 1 2 10 1 1 40 00 \$40 00 60 67 140 67 626 88 *North Star NETHERLANDS, EUROPE §SParadise No 1 599 05 †Mount Sinai No 2 NEW MEXICO Paradise No 2 1 8 1 58 50 100 00 \$75 50 \$9 50 243 50 540 50

PERU, S. AMERICA. Lima No 1 834 20 Callao No 2 515 30 Fortschritt No 3 1 3 30 00 30 00 696 00 Chalaco No 4 1 6 48 00 1, 776 66 QUEBEC, CANADA Mount Royal No 1 7 16 1 4 541 18 20 25 65 287 30 874 13 1, 063 00 St Lawrence No 2 2 23 114 00 10 75 124 75 374 00 Mizpah No 3 7 28 142 90 142 90 1,135 15 Duke of Edinburgh No 4 3 11 48 00 14 18 62 18 354 71 Albert No 5 2 14 1 69 24 55 25 7 25 131 74 552 36 §Beaver No 6 2 33 165 00 165 00 496 92 §Pioneer No 7 1 2 10 00 34 20 44 20 678 75 §Unity No 8 232 00 SAND WICH ISLANDS Excelsior No 1 5 8 4 94 00 60 50 280 00 31 00 465 50 886 02 Harmony No 3 1 1 7 00 7 00 528 15 WASHINGTON †Olympia No 1 †Enterprise No 2 †Vancouver No 3 †Olive Branch No 4 †Touchet No 5 †Western No 6 †Seattle No 7 §New Castle No 8 1 2 16 00 23 00 39 00 870 50 §Mount Baker No 9 2 5 193 00 193 00 506 26 §Patit No 10 2 9 1 50 00 50 00 100 00 620 25 †Ranier No 11 †Snohomish No 12 †Friendship No 13 †Colfax No 14 45 189 7 8 \$1,681 07 \$220 50 \$355 50 \$209 37 \$417 18 \$2,883 62 \$14,568 47 * No report received, † No report due € Reports to Grand Lodge of Oregon § First report

ANNUAL REPORT of Grand Encampments to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United Encampments organized between September

JURISDICTION. No. of Encampments. Member, Dec. 31, 1876 ADD. Total. Error in report. Intitled Admitted by Crad. Reinstated. Alabama 9 175 10 2 6 193 Arkansas 7 124 124 California 60 3,490 308 25 23 3,846 Colorado 12 289 53 16 2 360 Connecticut 20 1,735 130 9 1,874 Delaware 9 372 34 16 422 District Columbia 4 584 7 2 6 599 Georgia 13 453 15 38 8 514 Illinois 175 5,501 359 58 78 5,996 Indiana 143 5,771 265 44 41 6,121 Iowa 94 3,040 323 63 7 3,433 Kansas 26 838 98 14 19 969 Kentucky 53 2,345 55 28 8 2436 Louisiana 5 161 17 2 184 Maine 25 2,480 307 39 3 2,829 Maryland 29 2,010 29 10 2,049 Massachusetts 44 6,084 410 42 15 6,551 Michigan 79 2,587 45 156 31 26 2,845 Minnesota 15 495 66 17 578 Mississippi 17 278 30 2 17 327 Missouri 73 1,954 152 31 21 2,158 Nebraska 10 282 40 11 5 338 Nevada 10 363 50 6 467 New Hampshire 24 2,186 91 10 2,291 New Jersey 45 2,472 137 11 18 2,638 New York 94 5,438 390 25 17 5,870 North Carolina 13 264 12 1 2 279 Ohio 202 11,350 508 98 104 12,060 Ontario 39 1,794 219 58 10 2,081 Oregon 13 374 61 40 4 479 Pennsylvania 217 14,430 414 59 38 14,941 Rhode Island 17 1,526 53 5 1, 84 *South Carolina 5 258 258 Tennessee 36 689 18 4 7 718 Texas 55 1,015 121 25 19 1,180 Vermont 9 347 20 1 1 369 Virginia 17 703 33 1 737 West Virginia 28 824 34 9 6 873 Wisconsin 61 2,132 173 17 34 2,356 1,807 87,213 60 5,221 829 604 93,927 *No report received

States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877; and names of Grand I, 1877, and September 1, 1878.

DEDUCT. JURISDICTION. Members, Dec. 31, 1877. withdrawn by Card. Suspended or dropped. Expelled. Deceased. Total. Alabama 6 31 1 38 155 Arkansas 124 California 63 136 4 42 245 3,601 Colorado 11 26 3 40 320 Connecticut 10 82 4 15 111 1,763 Delaware 1 33 5 39 383 District Columbia 4 105 1 8 118 481 Georgia 6 33 5 44 470 Illinois 89 576 25 54 744 5,252 Indiana 75 441 10 50 576 5,545 Iowa 84 154 7 23 268 3,165 Kansas 12 178 8 198 771 Kentucky 28 87 13 128 2,308 Louisiana 3 7 2 4 16 168 Maine 45 32 3 25 105 2,724 Maryland 12 61 5 37 115 1,934 Massachusetts 109 290 5 69 473 6,078 Michigan 67 398 8 11 484 2,361 Minnesota 22 41 1 3 67 511 Mississippi 2 18 3 23 304 Missouri 51 231 7 19 308 1,850 Nebraska 3 39 1 2 45 293 Nevada 7 45 3 55 412 New Hampshire 20 104 13 137 2,154 New Jersey 17 263 16 296 2,342 New York 118 671 3 45 837 5,033 North Carolina 13 35 2 50 229 Ohio 132 942 25 112 1,211 10,849 Ontario 62 158 2 14 236 1,845 Oregon 11 16 1 3 31 448 Pennsylvania 73 1,426 7 152 1,658 13,283 Rhode Island 22 106 10 138 1,446 *South Carolina 258 Tennessee 38 159 5 4 200 512 Texas 49 112 1 14 176 1,004 Vermont 7 33 7 47 322 Virginia 5 65 12 82 655 West Virginia 10 75 8 93 780 Wisconsin 44 264 3 14 325 2,031 1,331 7,473 133 826 9763 84,164 * No report received

ANNUAL REPORT of Grand Encampments to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United Encampments organized between September

JURISDICTION. No. of Patriarchs relieved. No. of weeks' benefit paid. No. of widowed families rel'ed No. of Patriarchs buried. Amount paid for the relief of Patriarchs. Amount paid for relief of widowed families. Alabama 12 20 1 \$213 00 Arkansas California 341 2 482 13 42 18,530 50 \$690 00 Colorado Connecticut 97 695 15 1,320 80 Delaware 23 271 5 701 94 District Columbia 45 301 3 8 1,013 00 253 00 Georgia 24 62 5 186 00 13 00 Illinois 352 1 259 10 54 3,592 70 256 43 Indiana 674 2,185 13 50 7,396 34 101 00 Iowa 112 475 4 23 1,266 50 40 00 Kansas 36 76 8 341 00 Kentucky 178 702 8 13 1 658 00 45 00 Louisiana 18 60 1 4 137 00 90 00 Maine 144 1,544 25 7,165 27 Maryland 360 2,593 22 37 5,556 00 2,150 00 Massachusetts 306 2,348 5 69 6 941 65 68 86 Michigan 18 88 2 11 568 04 20 00 Minnesota 13 52 3 260 75 Mississippi 14 34 3 125 50

Missouri 108 389 4 19 1,500 65 90 00 Nebraska 6 15 2 45 00 Nevada 17 211 3 996 56 New Hampshire 155 1,069 3 13 1,725 88 60 00 New Jersey 228 1,615 2 16 4,842 31 60 06 New York 100 1,370 10 45 5,455 70 162 20 North Carolina 2 Ohio 1,073 5,941 26 112 25,416 45 422 50 Ontario 110 569 5 14 698 00 45 00 Oregon 3 Pennsylvania 1,763 12,562 24 152 48,542 22 464 92 Rhode Island 42 412 10 1,297 51 *South Carolina Tennessee 27 72 4 4 320 00 90 00 Texas 27 75 14 290 50 †Vermont 9 7 Virginia 48 200 1 12 580 50 73 50 West Virginia 65 269 8 1,124 00 Wisconsin 24 40 5 14 231 50 94 00 6,569 40,056 165 826 \$150,097 07 \$5,219 47 *No report received †No of weeks' benefits paid not stated

States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877, and names of Grand I, 1877, and September 1, 1878—Continued,

JURISDICTION Amount paid for education of orphans. Amount paid for burying the dead. Amount of special relief. Total relief. Total receipts. Alabama \$20 00 \$233 00 \$880 75 Arkansas California \$25 00 1,388 75 \$381 23 21,015 48 45,481 82 Colorado 2,016 52 Connecticut 330 00 32 00 1,682 80 6,506 14 Delaware 380 00 10 00 1,091 94 1,528 08 District Columbia 160 00 1,426 00 2,720 14 Georgia 45 00 244 00 1,494 01 Illinois 557 50 4,406 63 16,885 59 Indiana 1,575 00 213 50 9,285 84 22,297 85 Iowa 169 00 108 45 1,583 95 8,560 79 Kansas 98 00 439 00 3,485 35 Kentucky 830 50 195 20 2,728 70 5,358 86 Louisiana 35 00 192 00 972 85 Maine 335 00 7,500 27 15,281 54 Maryland 1,179 00 8,885 00 14,374 71 Massachusetts 1,510 21 352 00 8,872 72 27,741 10 Michigan 120 00 708 04 5,573 90 Minnesota 260 75 2,564 55 Mississippi 75 00 200 50 847 71 Missouri 411 20 2,001 85 7,332 60 Nebraska 45 00 1,080 92 Nevada 50 00 62 00 1,108 56 5,442 51 New Hampshire 160 00 1,945 88 5,795 72 New Jersey 610 00 5,512 37 11,116 17 New York 1,712 09 7,329 99 22,161 73 North Carolina 445 23 Ohio 3,049 80 28,888 75 61,184 19 Ontario 140 00 5 00 888 00 7,620 68 Oregon 4,650 18 Pennsylvania 60 00 10,055 90 59,123 04 89,402 69 Rhode Island 315 00 144 50 1,757 01 8,847 37 *South Carolina Tennessee 110 00 520 00 2 563 48 Texas 100 00 390 50 4,981 80 Vermont 70 00 126 30 764 76 Virginia 66 50 720 50 2,240 07 West Virginia 287 10 1,411 10 3,130 96 Wisconsin 242 00 567 50 5,203 05 \$85 00 \$26,087 55 \$1,603 88 \$183,092 97 \$428,536 37 * No report received

ANNUAL REPORT of Subordinate Encampments to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the of Encampments working under contiguous State Grand Encampments;

ADD. ENCAMPMENTS. LOCATION. Members, Dec. 31, 1876 Initiated. Admitted by Card. Reinstated. TOTAL. BRITISH COLUMBIA, CAN. *Vancouver No 1 Victoria *Harmony No 2 New Westminster CHILE, SOUTH AMERICA †Southern WatchNo 1 Valparaiso 33 33 DAKOTA Royal PurpleNo 1 Vermillion 19 1 20 Yankton No 2 Yankton 42 42 Hesperian No 3 Elk Point 17 17 FLORIDA FloridaNo 1 Jacksonville 14 6 20 Aucilla No 2 Tallahassee 24 2 1 27 Excelsior No 4 Pensacola 25 25 Key West No 5 Key West 35 8 43 GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE †Anglo-AmericanNo 1 London, England IDAHO IdahoNo 1 Boise City 15 2 17 LOW PROV, B N A StuartNo 10 Pictou, N S 25 2 27 †MiliceteNo 11 St John, N B 65 65 HalifaxNo 12 Halifax, N S 18 4 22 Port La JoieNo 13 Charlotte town, P E I 31 7 38 MANITOBA, CANADA †HarmonyNo 1 Winnipeg 14 14 MONTANA Rocky MountainNo 1 Helena 28 2 1 1 32 Golden Star No 2 Deer Lodge City 13 3 16 NEW MEXICO CentennialNo 3 Santa Fe 21 21 PERU, SOUTH AMERICA AtahualpaNo 1 Lima 20 3 23 QUEBEC, CANADA MontrealNo 1 Montreal 62 14 2 78 SANDWICH ISLANDS PolynesiaNo 1 Honolulu 31 1 32 UTAH €OquirrhNo 1 Washington Salt Lake City *AlphaNo 1 Olympia Unity No 2 Seattle 5 12 17 WYOMING WyomingNo 1 Laramie 31 2 33 Hope No 2 Cheyenne 20 2 1 23 572 88 24 1 685 * Reports to Grand Encampment of Oregon, t No report

United States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877; names and location and Encampments instituted between Sept'r 1, 1877, and sept'r 1, 1878.

DEDUCT. ENCAMPMENTS. Withdrawn by Card. Suspended or dropped. Expelled. Deceased. Total. MEMBERS, DEC. 31, 1877 BRITISH COLUMBIA, CAN. *VancouverNo 1 *Harmony No 2 CHILE SOUTH AMERICA †Southern WatchNo 1 33 DAKOTA Royal PurpleNo 1 5 5 15 Yankton" 2 1 7 8 34 Hesperian" 3 1 1 16 FLORIDA FloridaNo 1 1 1 2 18 Aucilla" 2 1 1 26 Excelsior" 4 2 2 4 21 Key West" 5 1 1 42 GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE †Anglo-AmericanNo 1 IDAHO IdahoNo 1 17 LOW PROV, B N A StuartNo 10 27 †Milicete No 11 65 Halifax No 12 1 1 21 Port La Joie No 13 5 1 6 32 MANITOBA, CANADA †HarmonyNo 1 14 MONTANA Rocky MountainNo 1 2 1 3 29 Golden Star No 2 1 1 15 NEW MEXICO CentennialNo 3 11 20 PERU, SOUTH AMERICA AtahualpaNo 1 4 4 19 QUEBEC, CANADA MontrealNo 1 3 1 4 74 SANDWICH ISLANDS PolynesiaNo 1 2 4 6 26 UTAH €OquirrhNo 1 WASHINGTON * AlphaNo 1 Unity No 2 17 WYOMING WyomingNo 1 12 12 21 Hope No 2 1 1 2 21 17 39 6 02 623 received, € Reports to Grand Encampment of California

ANNUAL REPORT of Subordinate Encampments to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the ments working under contiguous State Grand Encampments; and Encamp-

ENCAMPMENTS. PAST CHIEF PATRIARCHS. No. of Patriarchs relieved. No of weeks' benefits paid. No. of widowed families relieved. NO. OF PATRIARCHS BURIED. AMOUNT PAID FOR RELIEF OF PATRIARCHS. AMOUNT PAID FOR RELIEF WIDOWED FAMILIES. BRITISH COLUMBIA, CAN.

*Vancouver No 1 *Harmony No 2 CHILE, SOUTH AMERICA †Southern WatchNo 1 DAKOTA Royal PurpleNo 1 5 Yankton No 2 4 Hesperian No 3 4 1 FLORIDA FloridaNo 1 2 Aucilla No 2 10 1 Excelsior No 4 8 Key West No 5 4 2 2 \$2 00 GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE †Anglo-AmericanNo 1 IDAHO IdahoNo 1 3 LOW PRO v, B N A StuartNo 10 7 †Milicete No 11 HalifaxNo 12 1 1 Port La JoieNo 13 1 1 MANITOBA, CANADA †HarmonyNo 1 MONTANA Rocky MountainNo 1 5 3 9 1 63 00 Golden StarNo 2 3 NEW MEXICO CentennialNo 3 1 PERU, SOUTH AMERICA AtahualpaNo 1 QUEBEC, CANADA MontrealNo 1 4 2 2 1 8 50 SANDWICH ISLANDS PolynesiaNo 1 8 1 2 10 00 UTAH €OquirrhNo 1 WASHINGTON *AlphaNo 1 UnityNo 2 WYOMING WyomingNo 1 5 1 4 20 00 HopeNo 2 8 1 52 156 00 83 10 71 6 \$259 50 * Reports to Grand Encampment of Oregon, † No report

United States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877; names of Encamp-ments instituted between Sept'r 1, 1877, and Sept'r 1, 1878—Continued.

ENCAMPMENTS. Amount paid for education of orphans. Amount paid for burying the dead. Amount of special relief. Total relief Total receipts. BRITISH COLUMBIA, CAN. *Vancouver No 1 *Harmony No 2 CHILE, SOUTH AMERICA †Southern WatchNo 1 DAKOTA Royal PurpleNo 1 \$22 25 Yankton No 2 111 26 Hesperian No 3 69 90 FLORIDA FloridaNo 1 55 50 Aucilla No 2 33 75 Excelsior No 4 106 50 Key West No 5 \$2 00 202 47 GREAT BRITAIN, EUROPE †Anglo-American No 1 IDAHO IdahoNo 1 139 25 LOW PROV, B N A Stuart No 10 30 70 †Milicete No 11 Halifax No 12 \$20 00 20 00 86 75 Port La Joie No 13 391 15 MANITOBA, CANADA †HarmonyNo 1 MONTANA Rocky Mountain No 1 50 00 113 00 308 50 Golden Star No 2 183 75 NEW MEXICO CentennialNo 3 121 50 PERU, SOUTH AMERICA AtahualpaNo 1 259 50 QUEBEC, CANADA MontrealNo 1 8 50 289 00 SANDWICH ISLANDS PolvnesiaNo 1 10 00 307 00 UTAH €OquirrhNo 1 WASHINGTON *AlphaNo 1 Unity No 2 \$60 00 60 00 298 75 WYOMING WyomingNo 1 20 00 140 60 Hope No 2 156 00 133 60 \$70 00 \$60 00 \$389 50 \$3,291 68 received, € Reports to Grand Encampment of California

Degree Lodges of the ANNUAL REPORT of *Grand Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the*

Degree Conferred on Members, Dec. 31, 1876. Admitted during year Total. JURISDICTION. No. of Lodges. Brothers. Wives of Brothers. Widows. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Alabama 4 29 26 36 32 29 26 65 58 *Arkansas †Brit Columbia California 37 134 121 849 765 213 207 1,062 972 †Chile Colorado 2 2 4 100 67 100 67 Connecticut 14 35 38 998 791 54 45 1,052 836 †Dakota †Delaware Dist Columbia I 11 54 2 3 13 57 *Florida Georgia 9 59 30 59 30 Illinois 45 91 89 2 1,054 966 220 222 1,274 1,188 Indiana 180 89 82 4 1,202 1,144 89 86 1,291 1,230 Iowa 412 381 723 512 1,135 893 Kansas 19 96 93 154 122 96 93 250 215 Kentucky 23 114 13 2 107 97 115 89 222 186 *Louisiana *L Pro v, BN A Maine 15 207 188 692 598 207 188 899 786 †Maryland Massachusetts 28 234 230 6 1,530 1,520 234 236 1,764 1,756 †Michigan 31 †Minnesota 72 61 72 61 *Mississippi Missouri 18 39 24 2 222 186 105 60 327 246 †Montana Nebraska 5 16 9 176 116 176 116 Nevada 1 22 48 22 48 New Hampshire 11 71 57 2 664 698 71 59 735 757 New Jersey 27 49 63 728 745 54 74 782 819 *New York North Carolina 1 36 15 36 15 Ohio 42 153 136 1,066 1,067 346 389 1,412 1,456 *Ontario Oregon 8 11 109 74 7 12 116 86 §Pennsylvania 91 112 136 869 994 112 137 981 1,131 Rhode Island 14 105 81 3 522 508 46 54 568 562 †South Carolina †Switzerland *Tennessee 137 98 137 98 Texas 5 1 81 52 81 52 †Utah Vermont 5 11 11 213 158 213 158 †Virginia West Virginia 12 82 124 15 268 372 82 124 350 496 Wisconsin 42 87 95 1,067 973 87 96 1,154 1,069 *Wyoming 690 1756 1,632 36 12,805 12,261 3,543 3,183 16,348 15,444 * No report received, †No Degree Lodges of the D of R in this jurisdiction, € Report each sex § Report imperfect, the aggregate membership is

Daughters of Rebekah.

United States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877.

JURISDICTION. DEDUCT. Total. Members, Not att'd to R.D.L'dg's. Withd'wn Dropped Exp ll'd Dec'd. Dec. 31, 1877. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers. Sisters. Alabama 65 58 400 125 *Arkansas †Brit Columbia California 21 33 171 94 7 8 199 135 863 837 †Chile Colorado 1 1 100 66 Connecticut 6 4 3 8 1 7 2 16 15 1,036 821 †Dakota †Delaware Dist Columbia 2 1 3 13 54 *Florida Georgia 1 1 58 30 Illinois 18 10 206 184 1 9 10 234 204 1,040 984 Indiana 5 5 137 112 1 9 6 151 124 1,149 1,106 792 Iowa 7 10 76 37 1 9 8 93 55 1,042 838 Kansas 250 215 911 805 Kentucky 3 5 1 9 213 186 114 15 *Louisiana *L Pro v, BN A Maine 16 7 10 3 7 4 33 14 866 772 †Maryland Massachusetts 23 29 114 90 1 14 10 152 129 1,612 1,627 †Michigan †Minnesota 72 61 72 61 *Mississippi Missouri 2 2 68 43 1 70 46 257 200 †Montana Nebraska 176 116 Nevada 22 48 New Hampshire 28 11 17 8 5 8 50 27 685 730 1,798 807 New Jersey 6 5 137 111 6 8 149 124 633 695 *New York North Carolina 1 1 35 15 Ohio 88 70 141 105 6 8 235 183 1,177 1,273 *Ontario Oregon 8 7 1 9 7 107 79 286 373 §Pennsylvania 13 133 1 4 5 4 152 977 979 90 93 Rhode Island 18 18 55 32 3 1 76 54 492 508 †South Carolina †Switzerland *Tennessee 137 98 Texas 3 1 3 1 78 51 † Utah Vermont 1 10 1 1 1 12 212 146 180 † Virginia West Virginia 350 496 2,046 978 Wisconsin 13 13 297 237 8 1 318 251 836 818 1,784 *Wyoming 254 231 1517 1277 3 4 102 86 1876 1598 14,472 13,846 5,825 5,772 imperfect in stating only the aggregate

membership, without distinguishing the number of given as 1834, without distinguishing the number of each sex

Degree Lodges of the ANNUAL REPORT of *Grand Lodges to the R. W. Grand Lodge of the United*

Total of the Degree. No. relieved. No. dece'd. AMOUNT PAID FOR RELIEF. JURISDICTION. Brothers. Sisters. Wid' w' d families. Orphans. Brothers. Sisters. Brothers Sisters. Widowed families. Orphans. Alabama 648 1 \$18 00 *Arkansas †Brit Columbia California 1,700 5 34 3 7 8 142 50 \$431 00 \$55 00 †Chile Colorado 166 1 Connecticut 1,857 1 5 7 2 10 00 65 00 †Dakota †Delaware Dist 'Columbia 67 4 1 49 00 *Florida Georgia 88 1 1 16 00 Illinois 2,024 8 43 1 9 10 43 00 293 90 25 00 Indiana 3,038 9, 17 6 9 6 4 00 177 61 \$1 90 Iowa 1,880 3 5 6 9 8 18 96 138 00 6 28 Kansas 2,181 Kentucky 528 3 3 1 16 00 16 00 *Louisiana *L Prov, BNA Maine 1,638 1 3 1 7 4 2 00 18 00 9 00 †Maryland Massachusetts 3,239 29 3 14 10 332 75 17 75 †Michigan 1,229 †Minnesota *Mississippi Missouri 457 10 36 50 18 00 †Montana Nebraska 292 Nevada 70 4 215 00 New Hampshire 4,020 7 5 3 5 8 41 42 30 00 10 00 New Jersey 1,328 310 6 8 509 00 *New York North Carolina 50 1 Ohio 2,450 25 3 6 8 251 71 11 75 *Ontario Oregon 845 1 81 50 Pennsylvania 2,139 6 57 3 4 5 120 00 783 00 30 00 Rhode Island 1,000 1 3 4 1 00 †South Carolina †Switzerland *Tennessee 235 Texas 129 1 1 3 1 25 00 10 00 †Utah Vermont 538 1 1 †Virginia West Virginia 3,870 180 00 97 00 40 00 Wisconsin 3,438 4 20 4 8 1 25 10 180 00 25 00 *Wyoming 41,144 43 575 28 6 102 86 \$481 98 \$3,797 97 \$281 50 \$66 18

Daughters of Rebekah.

States, for the year from January 1 to December 31, 1877—Continued.

AMOUNT PAID FOR RELIEF. JURISDICTION. Burying the dead. Special relief. Total relief. Paid for expenses. Total receipts. Total assets. Alabama \$18 00 \$24 00 \$42 00 \$250 00 *Arkansas †Brit Columbia California \$141 90 770 40 2,496 57 5,142 14 †Chile Colorado Connecticut 69 00 \$32 00 176 00 672 85 2,262 62 4,248 67 †Dakota †Delaware Dist Columbia 49 00 68 00 81 33 571 23 *Florida Georgia 16 00 27 50 Illinois 90 00 451 90 893 52 1,757 16 2,987 64 Indiana 35 50 219 01 615 33 1,099 86 1,530 88 Iowa 163 24 732 00 1,160 00 2,083 00 Kansas 61 45 117 15 195 50 Kentucky 32 00 113 30 1,065 30 66 95 *Louisiana *L Prov, BNA Maine 5 00 34 00 696 95 1,076 33 1,060 84 †Maryland Massachusetts 95 45 62 14 508 09 2,740 4,018 40 10,958 31 †Michigan 84 46 336 33 484 86 1,489 08 †Minnesota *Mississippi Missouri 54 50 220 70 466 50 439 00 †Montana Nebraska 36 10 175 00 Nevada 25 00 45 00 285 00 386 65 665 00 1,267 34 New Hampshir 81 42 404 32 533 75 1,894 54 New Jersey 509 00 1,635 04 *New York North Carolina 29 80 30 8 19 14 Ohio 38 50 301 96 653 50 1,076 38 2,970 20 *Ontario Oregon 81 50 348 35 Pennsylvania 61 50 994 50 1,876 49 2,708 82 4,728 98 Rhode Island 16 30 20 00 37 30 1,190 32 1,492 14 3,226 81 †South Carolina †Switzerland *Tennessee Texas 20 00 55 00 10 18 32 35 85 50 †Utah Vermont 4 00 31 21 3 86 Virginia West Virginia 30 00 347 00 450 00 475 00 1,670 00 Wisconsin 4310 273 20 57 25 1,456 9 4 3,857 77 *Wyoming \$641 25 \$189 14 \$5,542 48 \$14,733 56 \$29,323 08 \$45,780 24 *No report received †No Degree Lodges of the D of R in the jurisdiction €Report imperfect in stating only the aggregate amount paid for relief

Balance Sheet, *R. W. Grand Lodge of the United States, I. O. O. F.*

BALTIMORE, Sept. 1, 1878. Page. Supplies Profit and Loss. Stock Balances. DR. CR. DR. CR. DR. CR. DR. CR. DR. CR. Stock 1 \$58,635 65 \$58,635 65 Profit and Loss 3 \$200 00 \$200 00 Cash 4 30,280 54 39,280 54 Bill Receivable 8 150 00 150 00 Interest 9 888 34 \$888 34 Joshua Vansant, Grand Treas'r 13 52633 80 41,972 31 \$10661 49 United States Bonds 14 17,500 00 9,500 00 8,000 00 US Bonds, Wildey Mon Fund 15 2,000 00 2,000 00 Supplies, pp 16-140 12,783 72 20,622 91 \$12,783 72 \$20,622 91 Electrotpe Plates 142 4,986 60 4,986 60 Steel and Copper Plates 146 3,450 00 3,450 00 furniture and Fixtures 148 7,960 01 500 00 7,460 01 Library 154 676 46 676 46 J Vansant, Trustee W M Fund 160 840 1 3 50 00 790 13 Wildey Monument Fund 161 50 00 2,840 13 \$2,790 13 Annual Expenses 164 7,959 51 148 32 7,811 19 Fifty-third Annual Session 171 27,128 50 185 50 26,943 00 Representative Tax and Dues 177 12,384 58 12,384 58 Charters 180 144 00 144 00 Grand Lodge Building 186 3,265 04 3,265 04 History of the Order 188 4,504 50 4,504 50 Individuals 3,417 75 3,239 42 178 33 Grand Bodies 30,067 80 28,582 88 1,484 92 Subordinates 2,628 29 2,358 07 270 22 \$221,482 65 \$221,482 65 Supplies per Inventory 7,867 05 7,867 05 Profit 15,706 24 15,706 24 \$28,489 96 \$28,489 96 Loss 10,335 53 \$10,335 53 \$39,458 69 \$39,458 69 Capital 48,300 12 48,300 12 \$58,635 65 \$58,635 65 \$51,090 25 \$51 090 25

BALANCES, *September 1, 1878.*

PAGE DR. CR. 1 Stock \$48,300 12 13 Joshua Vansant, Grand Treasurer \$10,661 49 14 United States Bonds 8,000 00 15 United States Bonds, W M Fund 2,000 00 16 Grand Lodge Charge Books 39 52 18 Grand Encampment Books 33 79 21 Encampment Instit'n and Install'n Books 22 08 26 Encampment Charge Books 203 31 33 Subordinate Lodge Institution and Installation Books 93 08 38 Subordinate Lodge Public Install'n Books 31 86 46 Initiatory Charge Books 254 25 56 Degree Charge Books 223 60 62 Degree Lodge Installation Books 30 38 68 Degree of Rebekah Charge Books 97 02 75 Rebekah Degree Lodge Institution and Installation Books 158 00 80 Lodge and Encampment Odes 388 56 86 Book of Odes, with Music 235 50 90 Visiting and Withdrawal Cards 220 17 99 Rebekah Visiting and Withdrawal Cards 47 48 103 Dismissal Certificates 30 42

106 Rebekah Certificates 44 40 110 Diplomas 229 50 115 Book of Forms 308 70 119 Funeral Service 120 70
 120 Anniversary Ceremony 154 56 123 Bound Journals 3,948 00 132 Digests 514 80 140 Supplemental Digests
 437 37 142 Electrotypes Plates 4,986 60 146 Steel and Copper Plates 3,450 00 148 Furniture and Fixtures 7,460
 01 154 Library 676 46 160 Joshua Vansant, Trustee of Wildey Monument Fund 790 13 161 Wildey Monument
 Fund 2,790 13 186 Grand Lodge Building 3,265 04 200-7 District Deputy Grand Sires 80 96 204 James H
 Emslie 10 00 206 William H Barnes 19 62 208 John W Stokes 24 50 211 Charles Betz 43 25 220 Grand Lodge
 of Alabama 149 60 222 Grand Encampment of Alabama 75 00 226 Grand Lodge of Australia 109 40 230
 Grand Encampment of Arkansas 75 00 232 Grand Lodge of British Columbia 75 00 239 Grand Lodge of Chile
 44 50 257 Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia 150 00 258 Grand Encampment of the District of Columbia
 75 00 268 Grand Lodge of the German Empire 55 51 296 Grand Lodge of Louisiana 2 24

BALANCES, *September 1, 1878.*

PAGE DR. CR. 298 Grand Encampment of Louisiana \$4 65 354 Grand Encampment of New York \$150 00
 358 Grand Encampment of Nevada 75 00 394 Grand Lodge of New Zealand 97 80 400 Grand Lodge of South
 Carolina 75 00 402 Grand Encampment of South Carolina 75 00 409 Grand Lodge of Tennessee 150 00 410
 Grand Encampment of Tennessee 75 00 422 Grand Encampment of Vermont 75 00 423 Grand Encampment of
 Victoria (Australia) 15 00 428 Grand Lodge of Washington 30 00 430 Grand Lodge of Wyoming 75 00 440
 Denmark Lodge, No 1, Denmark 30 00 441 Thomas Wildey Lodge, No 1, Great Britain 108 25 455 Manitoba
 Lodge, No 1, Manitoba 43 457 Paradise Lodge, No 1 Netherlands 46 65 473 Mizpah Lodge, No 3, Province of
 Quebec 25 25 475 Albert Lodge, No 5, Province of Quebec 9 26 475 Pioneer Lodge, No 7, Province of Quebec
 4 44 484 Colfax Lodge, No 14 Washington 3 06 512 Anglo-American Encampment, No 1, Great Britain 44 50
 525 Milicete Encampment, No 11, Low Prov 15 00 546 Atahualpa Encampment, No 1, Peru 10 50 \$51,215 70
 \$51,215 70

Report of the M. W. Grand Sire.

To the R. W. Grand Lodge, I. O. O. F., of the United States:

Representatives,—I have the honor to submit for your consideration a report of my official acts for the past year, during which time we have been highly favored as a people with abundant harvests, hopeful signs of a revival in the trades and industries of the country; and as a society, with entire harmony and good order pervading all its branches. At no time probably within the history of this nation has the husbandman been so richly rewarded in his efforts as in the past year. And representing, as we do, a constituency engaged actively and largely in industrial pursuits, the happiness, welfare, and comforts of whose families engage so much of our sympathy, our interest will be greatly promoted in the abundance and cheapness of the food supplies with which we have been and are now so highly favored, that we should not fail to make with grateful hearts the proper acknowledgments to a kind Providence for these manifold blessings. Whilst the annual returns exhibit an increase in the Lodges and Encampments, and in the amount paid for relief over last year, they indicate, for the first time since 1863, a falling off in the membership and revenue.

The annual loss to the Order in prosperous as well as in adverse times of members for non-payment of dues is a subject eminently worthy the best consideration that we can give it, and whilst large accessions of new and untried material is being constantly added to our numbers, we find it occasionally counterbalanced (especially so at the present time) by the loss of members, who through neglect or inability are dropped or suspended for the above cause; and if the Lodges and Encampments will take a glance at their list of suspended members, they will doubtless find in this great, inactive, and, I might add, neglected if not forgotten constituency, a very large number of worthy men that could be restored, if proper efforts were put forth to effect it.

Some of these thoughts have been suggested in a letter before me from my distinguished brother, SCHUYLER COLFAX, to Bro. JAMES L. RIDGELY, Grand Secretary, in which he says that if "a concerted and systematic effort all over the country was made, with liberal inducements as to the payment of their arrearages, it would win back to active membership a large number of this class," and I most cordially indorse the suggestion and recommend it to your favorable consideration.

The general returns give the following condition of the Order at the present time:

Grand Lodges. Subordinate Lodges. Grand Encampments. Subordinate Encampments. Lodge Initiations.
 Lodge Members. Encampment Members. Total Relief. Total Revenue. Year 1876 48 6,678 39 1,806 40,646
 456,125 87,785 \$1, 89,485 62 \$4,489,872 46 Year 1877 48 6,877 39 1,835 36,087 447,186 84,787 1,705,266 71
 4,423,051 85 Increase 199 29 15,781 09 Decrease 4,559 8,939 2,998 66,820 61

A review of these official reports for the last half century discloses the sad but sure effects that periodical

revulsions in trade and business have invariably had upon the growth and increase of the Order. And a revival of these industries has as unmistakably exhibited an appreciation of its reliability and usefulness during such depressions by witnessing large accessions to our ranks, thus presenting the most hopeful and encouraging outlook for the future. There has rarely, if ever, been within the experience of the oldest of us now living, a depression so general and protracted as the one from which we appear to be gradually and I trust surely emerging.

There are doubtless some that are willing, and probably with some reason, to ascribe this temporary falling off to other causes, to some of which I will for a moment briefly allude.

The unparalleled success and popularity of Odd Fellowship in America, it would seem, has given rise to a general desire to emulate its example, by creating, under various names, organizations ostensibly similar in design, until secret beneficial Orders have been multiplied in some localities far beyond the wants or ability of the people to sustain them, temporarily retarding the progress and success of Odd Fellowship, and rendering the existence of each other precarious and uncertain, thus entailing loss and disappointment upon the people that have been drawn into them by promises of large weekly and funeral benefits, endowment policies, and life insurance, upon the payment of small dues; which a moment's reflection would show could not, under the most favorable circumstances, and that whilst their members are young and healthy, be paid but for a few years at most. A glance at the tables of mortality and the laws of our being, will reveal to us the unalterable decrees of Providence, that death will sooner or later come to us all. And the money promised to be paid to the members and their families on these sad occasions cannot be realized.

The funds of all beneficial associations must be steadily contributed in properly adjusted proportion to their promises, so as to make it certain that those with the longest expectations of life can safely and surely rely upon it. Some may and do, of course, die early, and their families may get a much greater amount than they have paid in. This must be expected, it is in fact the capital upon which they expect to do business, and is used as an inducement, indeed I might add as an allurements, to obtain members; but the heirs of those that die late will not only get much less than the amount paid, but run the risk of getting nothing at all.

The abundant caution heretofore practised by the G. L. of U. S. in this particular, and the rigid enforcement of wholesome and judicious laws in our Order against vice and immorality of all kinds, is the real secret of our great success, and enables us to point with pride and satisfaction to our past record as exhibiting to the criticism of a scrutinizing and intelligent people that our best efforts are put forth in upholding a reliable, exemplary, and useful organization. I therefore feel it to be my duty, with the experience that nearly half a century has afforded, to encourage the members of our Order to an increased interest and zeal in its maintenance, and if possible to inspire them with a higher and better appreciation of the advantages they enjoy in holding membership with such a large, reliable, and harmonious body of men banded together for mutual relief, the preservation of their manhood, and the elevation of the race; whose boasted pride is in seeing the promises of their brethren everywhere and at all times fulfilled, and their misfortunes alleviated; and to warn them to beware of all organizations and associations that make large promises upon small consideration. If but little is contributed to the funds and large sums are to be drawn out, some one in the end is sure to be disappointed; rely upon it, it cannot be done, and I beg the members of this great brotherhood will be admonished in time. Again I would call your especial attention to the great objects of our organization; bear in mind that its earnest and persistent purpose is to assist each other with stipulated and reliable weekly payments (which we have proclaimed to the world to be the peculiar characteristics of our Order), at such times as they may be unable to help themselves, blended with the further, broader, and grander purpose of *Benevolence* and *Charity*, whenever and wherever misfortune shall lay its heavy hand upon any part or portion of the brotherhood. Any attempt to divert it from the fulfilment of these sacred engagements or to embrace other features altogether foreign to the original design, must result in weakness if not in disaster and ruin. Never let it be hampered with seductive schemes of life insurance, which may have nothing but the good name and reputation of the Order they seek to use to recommend them, and that has cost us half a century in the pursuit of a single purpose to establish.

I know that we have abundance of the material in our ranks that would seem to warrant success in whatever they undertook,—indeed it is this element that has made Odd Fellowship such a prominent and assured success,—but all this will not warrant us in indulging in doubtful experiments, and above all we should not allow ourselves to neglect or forsake it for new and untried schemes, which the simple tests of reason and experience will explode at the first touch.

No one organization can expect or should undertake to provide properly for all the ills and misfortunes of life. Let us therefore keep a single eye to the purposes of the organization, and leave all outside of that to other associations, each one of which may have a special mission or service to render to their fellow-men. And in all such good work they will have our best wishes and cordial co-operation and sympathy.

We have Mutual Aid, Relief, and other similar associations, composed entirely of members of the Order, but not otherwise connected in any way with the organization, to which specific contributions are made, that

have been in successful operation in many localities long enough to test their nature and to establish a reliability for their engagements, which have already received the indorsement of your R. W. Body, and I submit with these recognized and reliable adjuncts the members of the Order will find all that the ability of the ordinary business and working man is able to sustain. And never attempt, I pray you, to counteract the influence, opposition, or competition of what appears to be rival associations or orders, by promising more than you honestly intend to perform; or in attempting to graft upon our system, measures that will jeopardize the health, growth, and beauty of the parent stalk; but so adjust your dues and benefits, and manage your financial affairs, as to inspire a confidence that it can be perpetuated to all time.

Warrants Issued.

Australasia.—For Grand Lodge of Australasia, issued in blank to D. G. Sire J. B. HARMON, Special Commissioner to that country, who will report in detail the result of his mission.

Denmark.—A Warrant was issued, April 30, 1878, for Denmark Lodge, No. 1, Copenhagen, with special commission to J. C. PRAETORIOUS, M.W. Grand Sire of the Grand Lodge of the German Empire, to institute the Lodge; reports have been received from that distinguished brother that the Lodge was duly instituted, June 29, 1878, with very flattering assurances of its success. The correspondence relating to the introduction of the Order into this new jurisdiction is very fully presented in the G. Cor. and Rec. Secretary's report, and your special attention is called to the suggestion of the M. W. Grand Sire of the G. L. of G. E., to reimburse the new Lodge for some of the expenses incurred.

Netherlands.—For Mount Sinai Lodge, No. 2, at Amsterdam, Holland. Warrant issued October 2, 1877; instituted January 17, 1878, by F. S. OSTHEIM, Special D. Grand Sire.

Province of Quebec, Canada.—For Unity Lodge, No. 8, at Sherbrooke. Warrant issued October 11, 1877; instituted by G. VAREY, Special D. G. Sire, October 29, 1877.

Indian Territory.—For Erin Springs Lodge, No. 4, at Erin Springs. Warrant issued December 31, 1877; instituted June 29, 1878, by ISRAEL W. STONE, Special D. Grand Sire.

Washington Territory.—For Ranier Lodge, No. 11, at New Tacoma. Warrant issued December 19, 1877; instituted by H. G. STRUVE, Special D. Grand Sire, February 9, 1878.

For Snohomish Lodge, No. 12, at Snohomish. Warrant issued March 6, 1878; instituted by H. G. STRUVE, Special D. Grand Sire, April 23, 1878.

For Friendship Lodge, No. 13, at Port Gamble. Warrant issued April 27, 1878; instituted by H. G. STRUVE, Special D. G. Sire, June 17, 1878.

For Colfax Lodge, No. 14, Colfax. Warrant issued May 9, 1878; instituted June 13, 1878, by E. L. POWELL, Special D. Grand Sire.

Washington Territory.

Application was received from a portion of the Lodges located in Washington Territory for the institution of a Grand Lodge, but not being in conformity with the regulations required for the formation of Grand Bodies, it was refused, and is herewith submitted for your consideration.

Quebec, Canada.

Seven of the eight Lodges in the Province of Quebec have united in an application for a Charter for a Grand Lodge in that jurisdiction, to be located in Montreal, accompanied with the usual Charter fee, and I most respectfully recommend their application to your favorable consideration.

Decisions.

The comparatively few questions that have been propounded during the year, give the highest assurance that the Order in the different jurisdictions is being administered by intelligent executive and ministerial officers, who seek to perform their respective duties by a proper study and understanding of the laws. Nothing will add more to the harmony and prosperity of the Order than uniform and consistent laws intelligently administered, and I take the liberty of suggesting that a thorough revision and condensation of the present Digest, as valuable as it is, is to be greatly desired at the present time.

Decision.—The signs, grips, and passwords of the Order are designed to speak one universal language to the initiated of every nationality the world over. Therefore the *Annual* and *P. P. W.* of the Degrees are not to be translated into any other language, or spoken other than as they are written, spelled, and pronounced in the English language. The different nations must learn to give them the one universal sound as nearly as possible,

so that the sound of the word will be as familiar to the ear as the signs are to the eye, or the grip to the touch of the hand; to the end that an Odd Fellow of any country may be known and recognized in any part of the habitable globe as a brother. The language used in describing and explaining the use, meaning, and manner of performing the signs, grip, &c., may be in the tongue of the peoples in which the Lodges are working.

Finances.

The reports of the R. W. Grand Treasurer and G. Secretary will present to you in detail the fullest information upon the subject of your financial affairs, to which I take the liberty of inviting your special attention. It will be observed that with the close of this session the balance in the treasury, which has been gradually diminishing for several years, will almost if not entirely disappear, the expenses exceeding the revenue this year several thousand dollars, and whilst it may not be of much avail to advert to the former policy of the Grand Lodge, it will be wise to profit by the experience of the past, and to settle down upon some reliable financial basis that will bring the expenditures within the revenue. A fruitful source of this depletion has resulted, I fear, from a propensity to hold the annual sessions of the body at places remote from the seat of government. I know that it has generally been a concession to pressing invitations from the jurisdictions visited, and now that the constituency in many different localities of the country have been gratified with the presence in their midst of its assembled Representatives, I would suggest that some constitutional restraint be imposed, fixing permanently the place for holding the annual, and other sessions, or certainty to limit the meeting in other localities oftener than once in five or ten years, unless by unanimous consent of the Representatives, or from circumstances which might render it impossible, of which the officers of the G. L. of U. S. might be left to judge.

The practice that has heretofore obtained of placing Subordinate Lodges and Encampments, located in districts where no Grand Bodies have been instituted, under the jurisdiction of adjoining Grand Lodges and Encampments, I submit has resulted in a loss of revenue without any corresponding benefit, as the most of them rarely see a Grand Lodge officer, and the information, which is generally if not entirely communicated through the mails, could be as well if not more conveniently done through the office of the Grand C. and R. Secretary and D. D. Grand Sire.

Mission to Australasia.

I regretted very much my inability to accept the high honor you conferred upon me to undertake an official and special mission to New Zealand and Australia. Molding the subject under advisement quite as long as the importance of the mission would allow, and finding it impossible to be absent from my home and country so long, I early in February of this year notified the R. W. Grand C. and R. Secretary of my declination, and requested him to advise the Deputy Grand Sire, Bro. J. B. HARMON, that under the law creating the commission the duty would devolve upon him; and I am happy in being able to state that Bro. HARMON very promptly advised me of his acceptance, and it became my pleasure to co-operate with the Grand C. and R. Secretary in facilitating his preparation for an early departure to his field of labor.

The whole subject will be so fully presented to you in the elaborate reports of the Grand C. and R. Secretary and the Special Commissioner, that I abstain from further reference to it here, beyond congratulating you upon the exhibition of good feeling and friendship evinced toward us by the brethren of that distant continent in the cordial reception extended to your Representative, and the entire success of the mission.

Rebekah Degree Lodges.

The reports from the Degree of Rebekah Lodges do not present the most encouraging prospect for the future, and I most respectfully submit for your consideration whether the experiment of chartering and instituting Lodges for the express purpose of conferring this degree has not been fairly and patiently tried. They may have been a success in a few instances in many of the jurisdictions, but assuredly not to an extent anywhere that will warrant the continuation of a system which is certainly detracting from the character and standing of the Order.

I do not wish to be understood as making an objection to the degree itself, nor to the orderly manner of these bodies when assembled, but I am abundantly satisfied that its value and usefulness would be greatly enhanced if it were left entirely under the control of the Subordinate Lodges, who would at special and convenient times take occasion to confer it upon all willing and entitled to receive it. The law of 1876 forfeiting the Charters of all neglecting to make proper returns should be rigidly enforced, and it will be well to consider whether the time has not arrived to stop the granting of other Charters for this special purpose.

Revision of the Subordinate Degrees.

I have been advised by the committee authorized to be appointed at the last session to revise the subordinate degrees, that they have concluded their labors, and will be ready to submit for your consideration the result of their deliberations. Without expressing an opinion upon the merits of the work, I may be permitted to say that there is a decided sentiment pervading the Order in favor of reducing or consolidating the five degrees to three, and while such a result will doubtless meet this great want in the Subordinate branch, it would greatly promote the interest and increase the membership in the Patriarchal branch, of the Order, which needs your fostering care and protection. I therefore invite your special attention to the subject as one of great importance and interest to both branches.

Anniversary of the Order.

In issuing the usual proclamation for the due observance of the Anniversary of the Order, I took the liberty of departing from the form which had been specially prepared and eminently proper at the time for the observance of a day of thanksgiving and praise after the close of the war, for the harmonious reunion and preservation of the Order "from the desolation that had sundered and scattered into fragments every other organization of a national character, whether moral, religious, or secular," and endeavored to make it more in keeping with the anniversary ceremonies and regulations required to be observed on such occasions, and most respectfully submit it for your approval.

Anniversary Proclamation.

I. O. O. F.

Office of the M. W. Grand Sire, R. W. G. L. of U. S.

To whom these presents may come greeting:

WHEREAS, The twenty-sixth day of April is the Anniversary of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows in the United States of America, and it has been the custom and usage of the several jurisdictions under the Grand Lodge of the United States to celebrate the day in such appropriate manner as they may respectively designate;

Now, therefore, I, JOHN W. STOKES, M. W. Grand Sire, by virtue of such usage, do hereby recommend all Grand and Subordinate Bodies of the Order to set apart that day for its due observance as the *Anniversary of Odd Fellowship in America*. And to that end to dedicate the occasion to appropriate exercises, and thanksgiving to Almighty God for His manifold blessings to our Order, individually and collectively.

Done at the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, this ninth day of February, A. D. 1878, and of our Order the Fifty-ninth.

J. W. STOKES, *Grand Sire*.

JAS. L. RIDGELY, *G. C. and R. Secretary*.

History of the Order.

It is a source of infinite pleasure to be able to report that the distinguished brother charged with the preparation and publication of the History of the Order for the first decade, has accomplished his labors, under the terms prescribed last year, and he will be able to present it to you and the Order at the present session. It is not necessary that I should refer to the merit of the work; it will speak for itself; the high character of the author and his long familiarity with the subject committed to his charge, is a guaranty that it will be full of interest, and highly appreciated by the members of the Order.

Sandwich Islands.

There has existed in Honolulu, since the institution of Harmony Lodge, No. 3, at that place, an unfortunate misunderstanding or difference in reference to the use or joint occupancy of the Odd Fellows' Hall. I interposed my good offices over one year ago to conciliate the parties, and, as I understood at the time, with some degree of success; but different views still prevail. Its history is too long to give you an intelligent understanding of it here. The question at issue between them will be found fully stated in the correspondence upon the subject,

which is herewith submitted. I have deemed it of sufficient importance to claim your consideration, under the belief that if not satisfactorily adjusted it will greatly interfere with the harmony of the brethren and the usefulness of the Order there, which we should all very much lament.

England.

Thomas Wildey Lodge, No. 1, and Anglo-American Encampment, No. 1, instituted in London, England, have virtually ceased to exist. No reports have been received, and no regular meetings held, so far as I have been able to learn, for more than a year; and there does not appear now, nor has been manifested during my term of office (with one honorable exception, A. FAIRLIE), the least disposition on the part of the original Charter members to maintain the organization.

Brother FAIRLIE was not one of these, but initiated soon after the institution of the Lodge. The correspondence with this brother, submitted with my report last year, will fully exonerate him from any delinquency in the matter. The result of the effort discloses the cause of the failure; it did not fall into hands that appreciated its value and importance to themselves and their fellow-men; and the sooner it is withdrawn the better it will be for our noble cause. The lesson that this failure supplies should teach us to exercise a thoughtful care in the future; not to attempt the introduction of the Order into other countries before the people themselves shall have a proper appreciation of its value.

Bro. R. C. T. SCHROEDER, a P. G. of Missouri Lodge, No. 11, a gentleman highly recommended by his brothers in St. Louis, is now on a visit to London, and has assured me that he will cheerfully fulfil whatever commissions he may be intrusted with, and I respectfully recommend that he be authorized by the Grand Sire to collect the Charter, books, and effects of both the Lodge and Encampment, and return them to the R. W. Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary. And in order that all unpleasant feelings may be avoided, I would recommend that the R. W. Grand Secretary be authorized, upon the receipt of the Charter, books, and effects of the said Lodge and Encampment, to cancel all of their financial obligations to this Grand Lodge.

Foreign Countries.

Our official relations and intercourse with the Order in other foreign countries continue to be entirely harmonious and friendly. Their growth appears to be steady, natural, and healthy. It is gratifying to announce that Denmark has been added to the list of foreign jurisdictions since my last report. The prospects and conditions of the Order in foreign lands are so fully set forth in the report of the Grand Cor. and Rec. Secretary, that I take great pleasure in referring to it as containing the fullest information upon the subject.

Regarding the complete success of the Order in foreign countries to be worthy the highest consideration of this Grand Lodge, I feel constrained to again call your attention to the recommendation in my last report, of consolidating the two branches in foreign countries, and to reiterate in substance the conclusions then formed. The Order in Switzerland is already desirous of being instructed in the higher degrees, which will afford an opportunity of conferring special powers upon the Subordinate Lodges of that country to confer the Encampment degrees upon their members, instead of instituting Subordinate Encampments, which I greatly fear would have but a feeble existence.

Relief for the Sufferers from the Fever in the South.

I received from the M. W. Grand Master and the Grand Patriarch of Mississippi a request, that I should appeal to the brotherhood at large in behalf of their suffering and afflicted brethren and people, their widows and orphans, for aid in the hour of their need, which should more properly have been sent to the Grand Masters of the different jurisdictions.

Being familiar with the liberality and promptness with which our Lodges and Encampments have responded upon all such occasions, (for they have never yet been found wanting when the cry of distress has gone forth,) and remembering the experience of Memphis and Shreveport in 1873 when their voluntary contributions amounted to nearly thirty thousand dollars more than was needed, a circumstance which called for the passage of a law by the G. L. of U. S. in 1875 upon the subjects of "Charity and Relief," to be found in vol. 8, Jour. G. L. of U. S., pp. 6577-8, and as this was the first instance since the passage of that law in which the necessity has arisen for an appeal to the Order at large, now numbering over eight thousand Lodges and Encampments, I deemed it proper to call the attention of the Grand Authorities of that jurisdiction to its provisions, and to refer to the subject here that the special attention of the Order may be called to the existence of a law that I submit was greatly needed and eminently proper if we desire to keep the hearts of our members under the influence of that "Charity which giveth liberally and up-braideth not;" for under this law they have the assurance where more than is necessary is contributed, the surplus is to be securely invested and held by the

Grand Treasurer of the G. L. of U. S. in trust for such purposes of special relief in the future as may be needed to alleviate the suffering of other calamities, and thus avoid so many special appeals.

Record of Deaths.

It gives me unfeigned sorrow to announce officially that which you have already been saddened to learn, and which to our Order has been an irreparable affliction. Death has been doing his relentless work in our fraternity as elsewhere during the past year, and among the many who have fallen by his insatiate hand were two illustrious members of this Grand Lodge.

On the sixth day of January last the startling message flashed over the telegraphic wires, carrying sorrow and gloom to many, many hearts, in every portion of the jurisdiction, "NATHAN PORTER is dead." NATHAN PORTER, the man of whom it could with pre-eminent truth be written, as descriptive of his life and character, "He was pure, true, loving, strong, grand!" It is not too much to say, that in the death of Grand Representative PORTER this Grand Lodge, his own jurisdiction, and the Order at large has sustained a loss that will be rarely filled as he filled it. Strong as he seemed in his noble manhood, we did not anticipate so early a severance of the fraternal ties that bound him to the hearts of his compeers upon this floor, and his taking away seems to us untimely and inscrutable; but he has left us a heritage of precious unsullied memories, that make us even in our bereavement rich indeed.

Scarce had our first grief for Bro. PORTER time to subside into the sad calmness of a life-long regret, when we were summoned to stand by the bier of one who for many years had been intimately identified with the most vital interests of the Order and this Grand Lodge. FREDERICK D. STUART, Past Grand Sire, whom so many knew, so many loved, died on the 25th day of January last, venerable in years and covered with the honors his brethren delighted to confer upon him, and of which he was so eminently worthy. We shall miss his genial smile, his hearty greeting, his ready counsel, and his skilful, willing hand.

Representatives! Brothers! Language fails me to portray my own, your sadness, at the thought that these bright lights in our firmament have gone out; that these comrades may never more unite with us in the work of our fraternity, that "the places which knew them shall know them no more forever."

Those voices of counsel are silent in death. The feet that went so willingly on messages of mercy are powerless. The hands so skilful to teach the craft-lore of Odd Fellowship are nerveless. They sleep the sleep that on human dawn knows no waking. They are at rest, while we are in tears.

*"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime;
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time,"*

Representatives, it is for you to take such action as may be a fitting tribute to their memories.

Turning from the members of the Grand Lodge to the Past Grand Officers and Representatives, there are other names of departed, eminent brothers who have mingled with us in years past in the Annual Communications of this Grand Lodge, whom I would fain mention, but I leave the announcement of their deaths to the Representatives of the jurisdictions that they formerly represented, believing that justice will be done to their worth and distinguished services in the Order.

In conclusion I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to the R. W. Grand Secretary, Bro. RIDGELY, and his efficient assistant, Bro. Ross, for their prompt and ready assistance so cheerfully rendered at all times in the discharge of the duties of my office. And to you, Representatives and Officers, for the uniform kindness and forbearance that I have ever received at your hands, I extend the thanks of a grateful heart. With the close of this Annual Session I shall surrender the high position intrusted to me two years ago to my successor in office, and take my place by your side in the great work of human benefaction that is before us. The great good to my fellow-men that I have seen accomplished in the past, increasing from year to year for nearly half a century, from a few hundred dollars a year to millions, will be an ever-present incentive to an increased devotion and attachment to the great cause that has for its purpose the elevation and good of the race by the promulgation and practice of brotherly kindness and friendship to each other, and whilst I shall never cease to appreciate the high honors I have heretofore enjoyed, I anticipate in the years that may yet be spared to me the greatest pleasure in witnessing the future prosperity and usefulness of this great brotherhood.

J. W. Stokes,
Grand Sire.

Report of Grand Treasurer.

To the R W. Grand Lodge of the United States, I. O O F.:

Section I, Article VII. of the Constitution of the Grand Lodge, constitutes the Grand Treasurer the custodian of all the moneys, and all the evidences of debt, choses in action, deeds, etc., of the Grand Lodge, and requires him to lay before the Grand Lodge at its stated communication in September, annually, a full and correct statement of his accounts.

In obedience to the injunctions of the Constitution, the undersigned has the honor of communicating to your honorable Grand Body the subjoined statement of the operations of the monetary affairs of the department of the treasury, during the fiscal year terminating with the 31st day of August, 1878, and the condition of the treasury at the date of this report.

Dr. Grand Treasurer

Aug. 31. Cash balance in the treasury, as per the report of the Grand Treasurer, page 7310 of Journal of 1877. and as per report of Committee on Finance, page 7398 of Journal of 1877 \$13,474 91 Sept 4 Sale of fire-proof safe 300 00 Oct 9 Per diem returned by Isaac A Sheppard, G Rep of Pennsylvania 6 00 Sept 21 Proceeds of sale of \$3,000 of U S bonds of 1865, "called in" August 21, 1877 \$3,112 12 "" Proceeds of sale of \$500 of bonds of 1865 to meet current expenses, at 5½ premium 527 50 Nov 30 Proceeds of sale of \$2,000 of U S bonds of 1865, to meet current expenses, at 6½ premium 2,122 50 1878 Aug 28 Proceeds of sale of \$2,000 of U S bonds of 1865, "called in" July 30, 1878 2,016 25 7,778 37 Jan 3 Interest on \$10,000 of U S bonds 300 00 Premium on \$300 in gold, at 2½ per cent 7 50 July 11 Interest on \$10,000 of U S bonds 300 00 Premium on \$300 in gold, at 1½ per cent 75 608 25 Aug Received from G Secretary on account of interest 31 Received from Grand Secretary on account of sales of supplies, dues of Subordinates, and from Grand Representative tax during the fiscal year ending with this date 1 72 30,464 55 Total \$52,633 80 1877 CR GRAND TREASURER Sept, 20 By this sum paid to Grand Officers and Grand Representatives that attended the session of the Grand Lodge in 1877 for mileage and per diem, as per report of committee on that subject, page 7440, Journal of 1877, and per special resolution, page 7480 \$18,895 00

Dr. Grand Treasurer

Sept. 20. By Warrant No. 960, G. Rep. J. M. Jones, for per diem services on Committee on Supplies \$18 00 "" No 961, G Rep J D Cleaver, mileage and per diem, same committee 47 40 "" "962, G Rep Wm J Miller, mileage and per diem, same committee 95 20 "" "963, P G Sire J B Nicholson, mileage and per diem, same committee 47 40 "" "964, G Rep W R McLean, mileage and per diem, same committee 30 00 "" "965, G Sec James L Ridgely, per diem, same committee 12 00 "" "966, G Treas Joshua Vansant, per diem, same committee 18 00 "" "967, Ass't G Sec T A Ross per diem, same committee 18 00 "" "968, G Sire J W Stokes, official expenses for twelve months 45 50 "" "969, G Rep John H White, making index to Vol 8, Journal 100 00 "" "970, H Simons, return of Representative tax which had been paid by jurisdiction of Utah 75 00 "" "971, Peter Hama, return of Representative tax which had been paid by jurisdiction of Wyoming 75 00 "22 "972, J F Schweitzer, service at session of G L 25 00 "" "973 Jas Young, on account of printing Daily Journal 250 00 "" "974, J E Chamberlain, postage on Daily Journal 254 20 Oct 1 1975, B Mayer, Spanish translation of Charge and Degree Books 100 00 Sept 26 1976, John McGeoch, services preparing room and at session of Grand Lodge 44 00 Oct 8, "977, Insurance on paper for printing Revised Journal 18 00 "12 "978, Harrington & Mills, repairing furniture of Grand Lodge 31 10 "15 "979, Sherwood & Co, printing funeral hymns 22 00 "19 Gr Secretary Jas L Ridgely, Historiographer, on account 500 00 "22 No 980, James Young, printing Daily Journal 153 51 "" "981, Safe Deposit Co, for keeping U S bonds 14 00 Nov 2 "982, J L Murphy, printing reports of Grand Officers 242 94 "10 "983, John Medole & Son, printing Digest 340 20 "9 "984, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, paper for reports and Daily Journal 244 80 "" "985, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, for flat cap paper 6 44 "12 986, P Wetzell, ice for office of G Secretary 7 90 "10 "987, Geo F Lewis, printing cards 110 40 "21 "988, Chas Heinrich, translation of German documents 25 00 "15 "989, W F Hesse, repairing stoves, office of Grand Secretary 7 25 "30 "990, G Sec J L Ridgely, 3 months' salary 750 00 "" "991, Asst G Sec T A Ross, 3 months' salary 500 00 "" "992, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, 3 months' salary 250 00 "" "993, J E Chamberlain, for incidental expenses, office of G Secretary 65 00

Dr. Grand Treasurer

Nov. 30. No. 994, J. E Chamberlain, postage on Revised Journal to G. Representatives, &c \$81 86 Dec 12 "995, J L Murphy, express freight on Revised Journal to G Representatives 47 00 "15 "996, A Hoen & Co, book of warrants 12 00 "10 "997, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, on account of paper for Revised Journal 540 00 "12 "998, John Medole & Son, on account of printing supplies 315 87 "13 "999, C E Eccleston, carpenter work in office of Grand Secretary 3 00 "31 "1000, Otto Schaettle, for translations of German letters 20 00 "21 "1001, Gibson Brothers, printing for office of G Secretary 14 50 "26 "1002, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, on account of paper for Revised Journal 540 00 1878 Jan 4 "1003, Geo F Lewis, for printing cards 27 60 "3 "1004, F Bergner, for picture frame 2 25 1877 Dec 29 "1005, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, on account of paper for Revised Journal 540 00 1878 Jan 7 "1006, Diggs & Bro coal for office of G Sec 13 00 "11 "1007, J L Murphy, printing Revised Journal 1,371 18 "14 "1008, John Medole & Son printing odes 79 50 "" "1009, John Medole & Son for freight on boxes to Chile and Peru 13 38 "" "1010, M C Lilley & Co for German Digests 18 00 "12 "1011, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, on account of paper for Revised Journal 540 00 "15 "1012, Grand Lodge of Maryland, six months' ground rent 30 00 "12 "1013, Geo L Roche, painting in G Sec office 56 65 "15 "1014, Howell & Bro papering office of G Sec 40 72 "" "1015, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, on account of paper for Revised Journal 216 54 "16 "1016, F S Ostheim, special appropriation of 1877 for expenses as D D G Sire for the Netherlands, &c 102 50 "31 "1017, R J Strickland, subscription to Odd Fellows' Chronicle 3 25 Feb 11 "1018, A L Spear, clock for office of G Sec 12 00 "14 "1019, Geo F Lewis, printing cards 217 00 "28 "1020, G Sec Jas L Ridgely, 3 months' salary 750 00 "" "1021, Asst G Sec T A Ross, 3 months' salary 500 00 "" "1022, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, 3 months' salary 250 00 "" "1023, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, expenses of Grand Secretary's office 84 61 March 5 "1024, W F Hesse, repairing roof of G Sec'y's office 6 50 "6 "1025, D G Sire John B Harmon, to pay expenses to Australia, as per resolution of Grand Lodge 1,000 00 "12 "1026, A H De Lorte, translating odes into French 15 00 "15 "1027, Rawlings & Brunner, for binding Supplemental Digests 18 00 "25 "1028, John Medole & Son, for paper boxes 33 25

Dr. Grand Treasurer

April 3. No. 1029, Insurance on library, furniture, and portraits \$57 60 "10 "1030, John Medole & Son on account of printing supplies 207 30 "18 Gr, Secretary James L Ridgely, Historiographer, as per resolution of Grand Lodge session of 1877 2 500 00 "22 No 1031, W H Dougal, on account of new diploma plate 600 00 "30 "103 2, John L Murphy, printing and binding Vols 5 and 6 of Journal 488 11 "27 "1033, Dobler, Mudge & Chapman, for paper 14 14 "29 "1034, M C Lilley & Co, for German Digests 12 00 May 9 "1035, Geo F Lewis, printing diplomas 225 31 "15 "1036, Insurance on electro-plates 30 00 "11 "1037, Insurance on Grand Lodge building 3 75 "22 "1038, Joseph Vansant, for German translations 17 00 "15 "1039, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, for postage, freight, &c 136 52 "31 "1040, G Sec J L Ridgely, for 3 months' salary 750 00 "" "1041 Asst't G Sec'y T A Ross, for 3 months' salary 500 00 "" "1042, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, for 3 months' salary 250 00 June 15 "1043, Geo F Lewis, insurance on steel plates in printing office, Philadelphia 14 00 "18 "1044, John Medole & Son, on account of printing supplies 518 35 "15 "1045, Geo F Lewis, printing diplomas 35 00 "22 "1046, Joseph H Daniel, for services in preparing Book of Odes 30 00 "" "1047, Wm H Dougal, balance for diploma plate 1,000 00 July 10 "1048, Gr Lodge of Maryland, rent of premises, &c, for one year, and six months' ground rent 355 00 "19 "1049, John Medole & Son, on account of printing supplies 648 54 "22 "1050, Geo F Lewis, for printing cards and diplomas 136 55 Aug 24 "1051, M C Lilley & Co, for German Digests 7 00 "30 "1052, James Young, for printing for office of Gr Secretary 19 75 "" "1053, Geo F Lewis, for printing cards 151 80 "" "1054, John Medole & Son, on account of printing supplies 63 70 "" "1055, J W Bond & Co, for stationery for 12 months 143 84 "31 "1056, G Sec Jas L Ridgely, 3 months' salary 750 00 "" "1057, Asst't G Sec T A Ross, "500 00 "" "1058, J E Chamberlain, Messenger, 3 months' salary 250 00 "" "1059, J E Chamberlain, expenses in office of Grand Secretary 102 03 "" "1060, G Treas J Vansant, for 81 check stamps 1 62 "" "1061, "for 12 months' salary 500 00 Total disbursements \$41,972 31 Cash balance, 31st of August, 1878 10,661 49 \$52,633 80

According to the foregoing statement, the aggregate receiving or debit account of the Grand Treasurer is \$52,633 80 And the aggregate credit or disbursing account is 41,972 31 Showing a cash balance in the Treasury of the Grand Lodge of \$10,661 49

To the end that the Grand Lodge may understand this money account, it is proper to state that while the debit side of the Treasurer's account exhibits the total amount chargeable to that officer, it does not in the

aggregate indicate the *revenue proper* for the fiscal year, for the reason that it includes a cash balance of \$13,474.91, brought forward from August 31, 1877, the date of the closing of the preceding fiscal year, and also includes the proceeds of the sale of \$7,500 of United States 5-20 bonds of 1865, amounting to \$7,778.37. Deducting those two items from the aggregate amount of cash which the Grand Treasurer charges himself with, to wit, \$52,633.80; and it will show that the revenue proper for the fiscal year ending with the 31st of August, 1878, was \$31,380.52; which was derived from the following sources, to wit:

Supplies and Representative Tax \$30,464 55 Interest on United States Bonds 608 25 Sale of Fire-Proof Iron Safe 300 00 Amount of per diem returned by G. Rep. Sheppard 6 00 Interest account 1 72 Total \$31,380 52

From the foregoing state of facts the revenue and expenses proper for the fiscal year may be stated as follows:

Expenses \$41,972 31 Revenue 31,380 52 Balance against revenue \$10,591 79

The expenditures of the year were materially increased by, what is generally termed, extraordinary expenses, to wit;

Preparation of the History of the Order \$3,000 00 Mission to Australia 1,000 00 New Diploma Plate 1,600 00 Aggregating \$5,600 00

On the other hand, the general depression of trade and productive industry, the depreciation in the values of property and productions, and the scarcity of employment for those who depend upon physical labor for support, that have marked the times for the last two or three years in all the domain of the United States, in addition to other causes known to those familiar with the distribution of supplies to subordinate Grand Jurisdictions, have contributed to affect the sources of revenue of the Grand Lodge during the period indicated. The Subordinate Lodges of the Order, in the matter of their membership, and in their revenues, have not been exempt from the prejudicial effects of the state of the country. A favorable change in the condition of the people will bring with it a more vigorous vitality in all the departments of the Order.

The available assets of the Grand Lodge—which means cash money, and that which can at pleasure be converted into cash—on the day of making up this report, to wit: August 31, 1878, were—

Cash in the treasury \$10,661 49 United States 5-20 Bonds, par value 8,000 00 Total \$18,661 49

On the 31st of August, 1877, the cash balance was \$13,474 91 And the U. S. Bonds owned by the Grand Lodge, at par, were 15,500 00 Total \$28,974 91 Showing that the diminution in those two items during the fiscal year terminating Aug. 31, 1878, was \$10,313 42

It may be observed by an examination of the tabular statement that the Grand Treasurer disposed of \$7,500 of U. S. bonds. The sale of \$5,500 of these was rendered necessary to contribute to the payment of the mileage and per diem of the last session of the Grand Lodge, and the printing of the Daily and Revised Journals, and other expenses incurred in the first few months of the year. The other \$2,000 of bonds were called in by the government on the 30th of July, 1878, and the proceeds of the same contributed to increase the cash balance.

It is to the Grand Treasurer a matter of regret that he cannot present a more favorable report of the financial condition of the Grand Lodge in the department which is especially, by the Constitution, placed under his charge. It is, however, as he conceives, his duty to present the money affairs as they exist, accompanied with such remarks or explanations in that connection as may render the Grand Lodge intelligent upon the subject, to the end that it may, if deemed by it necessary, adopt such legislation in that connection as its wisdom may suggest. In his judgment, he would be faithless to the responsible trust reposed in him by the favor of the Grand Lodge if he did less than this.

It is respectfully suggested that the Grand Treasurer be authorized to dispose of such amount of the bonds of the Grand Lodge as may be necessary to meet any deficiency of cash moneys in the treasury to meet its obligations.

He has also the honor of reporting the condition of the Wildey Monument Fund.

Dr., Grand Treasurer.

1877. Aug. 31. To cash balance \$718 48 1878. Jan. 3. To 6 months' interest on \$2,000 of U.S. bonds 60 00 Premium on \$60 in gold at 2i per cent 1 50 July 11. To 6 months' interest on \$2,000 of U.S. bonds 60 00 1878 July 11 Premium of \$60 in gold at ¼ per 15 Total \$840 13 Cr., Grand Treasurer. 1878. July 1. By cash paid J. F. Schweitzer, for 12 months' salary as keeper of monument 50 00 Cash balance 790 13 The assets of the fund consist of, United States 5-20 bonds at par value \$2,000 00 Cash balance, as above 790 13 Total \$2,790 13

Fraternally submitted,

Joshua Vansant, *Grand Treasurer.*

Baltimore,

Ceremony of Turning the First Soil of the Thames Valley Railway.

Sir Geo. Grey, K.C.B. Premier of New Zealand, Before his Constituents. *Saturday, the 21st December, 1878.*

Grahamstown: Printed at the Office of "the Thames Advertiser. 1879

Introduction.

THE Thames people are desirous of showing their appreciation of the policy, as well as the disinterested exertions, of the present Premier, their representative in & Assembly, which have resulted in the turning of the first sod of a railway of such importance to their welfare, and to the wealth of the colony. After years of patient waiting, and much agitation, the Government of Sir George Grey introduced the line in the general schedule of works, and the future welfare of the Thames was from that moment assured. Those who have visited the fertile lands of the Upper Thames, and the vast area from the Hauraki Gulf to the Waikato and the Bay of Plenty, will be convinced of this. In recognition of this important work, and with the view of giving the widest possible publicity to it, and to the Speech delivered by the Hon, the Premier when before his constituents in the evening, the full report of the proceedings, compiled from the THAMES ADVERTISER'S account of the same, is herewith published in a pamphlet form, as well as in the ordinary newspapers. It is a souvenir of the important work thus commenced under the auspices of the Grey-Macandrew administration, and will be read with interest by all sincere well-wishers of the colony's progress. The speech is worth careful perusal, study, and preservation. The noble principles which it enunciates, and the liberal and far-sighted policy which it embodies, must commend themselves to the good sense of all.

Turning the First Sod of the Thames Valley Railway.

SATURDAY was a red letter day in the history of the Thames. It ushered in a new order of things, which will enable us to take a fresh lease of life. The district has for some time past been under a cloud, but let us venture to hope that the turning point has at length arrived, the silver lining dawned, and that ere long we may have no cause for complaining on the score of progress and prosperity. The work just inaugurated promises to be the harbinger of that prosperity to which we have long looked forward as the result of the opening up of our lands by an industrious class, and aided by railway communication. Should our sanguine hopes be realised, we shall have cause to thank the Grey-Macandrew administration for the inauguration of this work, and it was, therefore, to be expected that the citizens of the Thames would vie with each other in their efforts to do honour to the gentleman representing the head of that administration, when it was ascertained that he intended to comply with our wishes in the turning of the first sod of the projected line of railway, uniting the Thames with the fertile valley which links it with the interior. In accordance with arrangements made, the Colonial Government steamer 'Hinemoa' left Auckland at 7 a.m. on Saturday for the Thames, having on board Sir George Grey and a number of invited guests. At 11 o'clock the little p.s. 'Ruby' proceeded to the Government steamer to land the guests, His Worship the Mayor, Mr Davies (Chairman of the Harbour Board), Mr A. Brodie (County Chairman), and Mr W. Carpenter (Chairman of the Parawai Highway Board) accompanying. Arrived at the Goods Wharf Sir George Grey and the visitors were received by members of the local bodies, and at the shore end by members of the Railway Committee, the band of the Thames Scottish playing suitable airs, and the guns of the Naval Brigade firing a salute at the time. The wharf and entrance were gaily decorated, and carriages were in readiness to convey the visitors, the committee, and local bodies, &c., to the site fixed upon for the ceremony of turning the first sod of the railway, on the beach midway between Shortland and Grahamstown, a little below high-water mark. The places of business were closed, a half-holiday having been arranged for, and various decorations met the eye as the long line of carriages bore the guests and members of local bodies to the place prepared for the ceremony. Here an enclosure had been constructed with accommodation for some 500 children who were to sing on the occasion. Under a shed at the end of the avenue the spade and wheelbarrow to be used by Sir George Grey in the turning of the sod were in waiting. The attendance of spectators was very large, not less than 2000 adults being present, in addition to the 500 school children, who introduced the proceedings with the singing of two verses of the National Anthem.

The Chairman of the Thames Valley Railway Committee then read and presented to Sir George Grey the following

Address.

To SIR GEORGE GREY, K.C.B.,—

SIR,—This Committee, in asking you to turn the first sod of the Thames Valley Railway, desire to express to you the great satisfaction which they, in common with every inhabitant of the District, feel on the present occasion, which is the happy termination of a long and arduous agitation commenced more than six years ago, and carried on without much encouragement. Notwithstanding the want of success which attended their efforts to obtain a favorable consideration of this question for many years, the Committee never lost sight of the object they had in view, but took every opportunity of pressing it upon the attention of the Government of the day, but still without any result until you, sir, appeared upon the scene, and announced to the people of the Thames that you considered the scheme to be not only practicable, but reasonable, and a project deserving the attention of the Legislature of the Colony and of capitalists seeking profitable investments. From that time until the last session of Parliament the prospects of the Thames Valley Railway continued steadily to improve, when your Government took the decided step of placing it on the schedule of railway works to be undertaken by the Colony of New Zealand. This recognition of a scheme no less useful than necessary redounds much to the credit of your Government for justice, impartiality, and foresight, and we now have the pleasure to invite you thus to crown an undertaking which already owes so much to your advocacy, by making a formal commencement of the work.

*For the Thames Valley Railway Committee,
JAMES KILGOUR,
Chairman.*

Sir GEORGE GREY said : Dr. Kilgour, ladies, and gentlemen,—I will only say it is with great delight I find that the wishes of the inhabitants of the Thames are at length crowned with success in respect to the commencement of this railway. It is with infinite satisfaction and pleasure that I to-day render you my assistance in commencing this important undertaking. (Loud cheers).

Sir George Grey then proceeded to turn the first sod. A gangway had been run out from the small platform erected, alongside which were some turf sods. A very handsome wheelbarrow of rim[unclear: u] (manufactured by Mr F. Dann), and varnished, was standing near, and a light spade of ordinary make, the silver implement ordered for the occasion not being finished, Sir George proceeded to handle his tools in a workman like manner. He dug a good sod, put it into the barrow and wheeled it back to the shed, instead of putting it over the "tip," amid a salute fired by the Naval Volunteers, and the cheers and complimentary remarks of the spectators, by whom the greatest enthusiasm was manifested.

Addressing Dr Kilgour, Sir GEORGE GREY said : Ladies and gentlemen,—I trust that the railway, which has not been inaugurated, may prove a blessing and convenience to the inhabitants of the Thames, and be the means of bringing large amount of commerce from the interior of the country to what I believe will be one of the greatest ports in New Zealand. I thank you all for having allowed me the opportunity of assisting at the commencement of so great and noble at undertaking. (Loud and repeated cheers.:

Mr PEACOCK, Mayor of Auckland, said he had very great pleasure on behalf of the people of Auckland in congratulating the Thames on the proceedings of that day. There would have been a much greater attendance of Auckland visitors, but for some uncertainty regarding the steamer and the day. He need not dilate on the importance of railway works. That was recognised everywhere, and the benefits felt. Auckland people were aware of the importance of opening up the country. The energy which had been displayed in bringing the work commenced that day to a practical issue was deserving of success, and he could assure them they had the good wishes of the people of Auckland.

Mr J. W. MELTON expressed the pleasure he felt at being present to represent the Borough of Parnell. After the speech of Mr Peacock it would be unnecessary for him to say much, but he would reiterate that they had the good wishes of the burgesses of Parnell in this undertaking. He regretted that the Mayor (his successor), Mr Coleman, was prevented by illness from attending to day and occupying the position he (Mr. Melton) did. He would again say he congratulated the Thames people on the result which had attended their exertions.

Mr MCMINN, M.H.R. for Waipa, hoped to be able some day to congratulate them at the other end of the line on the completion of the work begun that day. He was sorry there was no other representative from Waikato present, but the fact was they were nearly all farmers in Waikato, and it was very inconvenient to leave their homes at this season. The Thames had a warm friend in the Premier, who had always done what he could for the district, and particularly in regard to the railway and other matters during the late session of Parliament.

Mr. A. J. CADMAN, Chairman of Coromandel County Council, congratulated the Thames people that day. He hoped it would not be many years before the Coromandel people would be able to invite the Thames to assist in a similar work at their end of the peninsula.

Dr Kilgour read an apology from H. Brett, Esq., ex-Mayor of Auckland, congratulating the Thames people on the work of that day, and regretting that he and Mrs Brett were unable to avail themselves of the invitation to be present.

Three cheers were then given for the visitors in a hearty manner, and the band played a selection of music.

The school children then sang the following piece, entitled "My own New Zealand Home," the words and music being by Mr John Grigg, of Pollen-street:—

I love my home, my happy home,
In fair New Zealand's isle—
The glory of the South, where all
The face of nature smiles;
Where noble forests crown the hills,
And streamlets thread the vales,
and mighty ocean circles round
And breathes refreshing gales.
CHORUS—My happy home, my happy home,
My own New Zealand home.

I love to stroll on summer's morn,
Before the sun is high,
And gather flowers and ferns and moss,
And chase the butterfly;
At noon to shelter 'neath the trees,
And hear the tui's song,
And then, 'ere ev'ning spreads her veil,
Homeward to speed along.
CHORUS—My happy home, my happy home,
My own New Zealand home.

I love to wander by the shore,
Beside the flowing tide,
And watch the seabird's graceful flight,
And ships with sails spread wide.
The pleasant school and busy town
Are full of charms for me,
While on this British Southern soil
I dwell content and free.
CHORUS—My happy home, my happy home,
My own New Zealand home.

(The hymn was much admired by those present, the tune being specially commended by musical connoisseurs for its sweetness and softness of cadence. The Thames Scottish Band rendered the chorus accompaniment.) At the conclusion of the local anthem, for which great credit is due to Mr Grigg, the composer.

Sir George Grey proceeded to the raised ground where the children were assembled, Sir GEORGE GREY, addressing the children, said : It affords me very much pleasure to see so many children assembled here to-day, and to hear them sing so well. I tell you this—that myself and a great many other friends of the children of New Zealand have been working for many years to try and secure them a happy future in this colony. It is with great delight that we have seen that wherever the children of New Zealand have been brought in competition with the children of other countries, they have taken a very distinguished place. (Cheers.) God has given you a

country in which there is a climate which develops well not only your frames but the human intellect. Well, now, my earnest prayer to you is that you reward all those who have worked to make this country for you by growing up to be a noble race of men and women, and doing your very best to make the country in which you were born one of the greatest nations in the world. (Cheers.) I do not mean a nation merely distinguished for wealth, but I mean a nation distinguished by the goodness of its inhabitants, and by the care which is bestowed upon its children. When you grow up remember that we have all tried to be kind to you when you were helpless and could not care for yourselves. Recollect that kind words make happy homes. (Cheers.) That kind looks make happy children. You must all have felt that you liked to be met by smiling faces and by kind words and that they brighten up your homes. Now, do you try to brighten your homes by your kind looks, by your cheerful faces, by your good actions towards your fathers and mothers. Be obedient and loving children to them. Endeavour to repay them for the care they have taken of you, and when you come to be fathers and mothers, you will reap your reward. I will not keep you longer. I will only wish you a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and hope that God will bless you throughout all your lives. Goodbye to you all. (Loud and continued cheers.)

The children again cheered, and the visitors moved towards the beach, where the carriages were in waiting to convey them to the luncheon, but the proceedings being over earlier than was anticipated, and before luncheon was ready, it was arranged that the party should be driven out in the direction of Parawai and the new County road. The decorations at various places along the line of route were admired, and the appearance of the country generally, especially the progress made since Sir George, and others who accompanied him, last visited the road. The party proceeded along the newly-formed county road as far as the native reserves at Totara Point. A great battle was once fought at this place. On one of the invasions of the Ngapuhi, the Thames tribes assembled at Totara, and constructed there an enormous pa. This was besieged and taken by the Ngaputu, who, armed with muskets, made a tremendous slaughter amongst the Thames people. Ever since, the place has been strictly *tapu*, no person having till lately been allowed to pass over it. Many of those who knew the natives, and the awe which surrounded the place, predicted that they would never consent to a road being made there, as it might disturb the bones of their ancestors. From the configuration of the country, it was absolutely necessary that the road should pass by Totara. The perseverance of the County Council at length had its reward, the road was made and it is anticipated that the railway will be laid down alongside. The verdure and foliage along the road was green and refreshing to the eye, although the sun-light and heat, and the dusty road, made the journey otherwise unpleasant. Here the party halted, and the horses were directed towards Shortland again. Arrived at the Volunteer Hall, everything was in readiness for the guests, and the neatness of the hall was a theme of general admiration. The building had been elegantly decorated for the occasion with tree ferns, flowers, and shrubs. Great credit is due to the Luncheon Committee for their excellent arrangements for the comfort of the guests. The luncheon was prepared by Mr J. Forgie, of Pollen street, and included the delicacies of the season.

The Luncheon.

The Luncheon Committee, consisting of Messrs Allom, W. Davies, F. C. Dean, J. McGowan, H. McIlhone, B. N. Smith, and John Osborne, successfully supervised preparations for a cold collation, in the drill-hall, Richmond-street. About 200 attended. During luncheon the Scottish Volunteer Band enlivened the proceedings by the performance of a selection of music. The chair was taken by the Chairman of the Thames Valley Railway Committee, Dr Kilgour, supported on his right by Sir George Grey, the Mayor, Colonel Fraser, and Major Murray; on his left by the Count; Chairman, Wm. Rowe, M.H.R., and E. W. Puckey. The vice chair was occupied by Cr. J. Brown. The elite of the town were there, together with the many distinguished visitors from a distance who came to mark their interest in the proceedings.

After lunch the usual loyal toasts were given from the chair, each being received with hearty cheers.

The MAYOR (who was received with cheers), said the next toast had been placed in his hands. It was that of "His Excellency the Governor of the Colony." He believed there were no portions of the British Empire more loyal than its colonies. His Excellency was the representative here of Her Majesty the Queen, and it was only their duty to drink his health. The toast was received with cheers.

A. BRODIE, Esq., said that in proposing the next toast he was placed in rather unfavourable circumstances for doing justice to it, inasmuch as a change in the programme had been made, and he was not aware that it would fall to his lot to propose the Army, the Navy, and the Volunteers, until he entered the room. What the British army had done in former years, and more recently what it had done in India, needed no recapitulation from him. What the Volunteers had done in this colony was well known. He remembered that several now present were engaged in defence of the colony, either as soldiers and sailors in the British navy, or as soldiers in the ranks of the volunteer force. He saw a very old volunteer before him in the Mayor of Auckland. As to the force here, the Premier would have an opportunity of inspecting it himself that evening, and as an old military

man he may perhaps tell us, later on. what he thinks of them.

Major WITHERS responded for the army, regretting that he lacked the necessary eloquence to reply to the toast. The deeds of the British army were blazoned in history. As to the Volunteers, in this colony we knew what they had done. He was only sorry that his powers of speech were not greater, to enable him to do proper justice to the toast.

The MAYOR OF AUCKLAND, in responding for the Volunteers, said he was somewhat surprised to be called on, after so many years, to respond to the toast, which, however, was in itself a proof that the service rendered in a time of difficulty to the country was long remembered. He had served in the Volunteer force, and in the rank of "full private" he had endeavoured to do his duty. He thought that the toast would be more appropriately responded to by some volunteer whose connection with that branch of the service was more recent. He had every confidence that, if the Volunteers should ever be called on again in presence of active hostilities, they would do their duty as they had done before.

Major MURRAY, in obedience to loud calls, also responded, and in doing so took the opportunity of again acknowledging the support given them by the present Government and especially by the immediate head of that department—Col. Whitmore.

Col. FRASER could not refrain from saying a few words on this toast. He came to this colony emphatically as a volunteer. The late Captain Goldsmith and himself, with their men came, when help was needed. Our men felt happy they had done so, he felt happy in his happy home, and if they carried out the work commenced they would have a happy people.

The CHAIRMAN said the toast he had next to propose was that of their illustrious guest, Sir George Grey (prolonged cheers). He was sure he had but to ask them to drain their glasses without another word and they would respond at once, but the present was not an occasion to be passed lightly over. This had been a great day for the Thames. A great day in so far that they were favoured with the presence of the Premier to initiate an important work for the district. Long before he came to New Zealand Sir George Grey was a man of mark. He had been Governor of the Cape of Good Hope and South Australia, and the peoples of both rejoiced at his rule. He had not therefore, when he re-entered public life, yet to win his laurels, but as the world would say "he was comfortably laid up in lavender at Kawau." But when the colony needed his help, he once more in answer to the call of duty merged from his privacy and reentered political life. He did this not for the sake of sordid gain, but for the good of the country. We may differ in opinion from Sir George Grey on some points, but in this we should be united, that in the attempt to open up the lands of the colony to bona fide settlers Sir George Grey's policy was one that must be endorsed by all the world. As one instance he noted the case of the Broomhall settlement, in which Sir George and his colleagues took a much broader view of the question of settlement than that implied in the sale of lands to English capitalists, who could send out labouring people to work them, or immigrants with more or less capital. He looked to a more permanent advantage from settlement than was implied by the money paid into the Treasury. Sir George felt that the lands should be as open to settlers actually in the country, or the children of settlers born in the country, as to gentlemen in England and those whom they employed. They took high ground, and said we have men ready and willing round about us, and it is our duty to give these men, who have come so far and suffered so much, an opportunity to obtain and cultivate this land. No political man with whom he was acquainted had achieved such deserved success as had Sir George Grey. He trusted the toast would be drunk with enthusiasm. He wished Sir George a "Merry Christmas and a Happy New year, and many of them." (Musical Honours.)

Sir GEORGE GREY, after the prolonged cheering had somewhat subsided, said Mr Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, your Chairman just now in proposing my health, said I ought to be a proud man. Well, I am both proud and thankful to be allowed to live to realise what had almost seemed a vision. The scene of that day reminded him of a vision he had tried to realize years back. It was 35 years since he first visited the Thames. He came down in a little schooner belonging to the late Bishop of Lichfield, who brought him down and left him here a few days. He proceeded up the river Thames, in a small boat, as far as practicable, and then still further in a canoe. At that time he was perfectly satisfied that this district was one of great importance. He relied on the belief of Captain Cook, formed years before, that a great city ultimately must stand here. (Cheers.) He stated that if a great city was to arise in New Zealand, he felt perfectly certain that no more convenient locality could he found for it than the Thames River. That was the opinion of a great navigator. (Cheers) He spent several days in going up the river, and in fancy saw such a city rise and a great settlement established. Early one morning he walked up to the top of the Aroha Mountain, and as he looked down upon the valley he spent some time musing upon what the future of this valley and this country was to be, and in that fancy saw some such scene as witnessed to-day. (Cheers) He did not imagine that he was to take a part in the scene himself, but he thoroughly believed that a day of greatness was to come for this place. He now enjoyed the blessing—a blessing not often realised in the world—that after the lapse of so many years he had been permitted to see the visions of comparative youth thus brought vividly as a fact before him. (Loud Cheers) Now, from this he could

point to one thing worthy of their consideration, and that was that steadiness in the pursuit of some particular object almost invariably met its reward. (Cheers.) We are told that "the rolling stone gathers no moss," and there is more in that proverb than at first strikes the ear. If he had not persistently, through many years, felt a great affection for New Zealand,—felt determined to see this country reach the goal to which he felt sure it must come, — If he had not remained here and felt that determination to witness the great end which years before he had seen in prospect,—if he had been a mere rover, a wanderer, caring little for the country, except during the time of official life, he could not have had the infinite pleasure and satisfaction which that day had afforded him (cheers.) Now, to form the opinion he had then required a belief in many things. It did not simply require a belief in oneself and one's own powers to do anything; but it required a belief in his fellow-man. It required a belief that an industrious, thrifty, and enterprising population must prepare to face great difficulties and great dangers. They came to this country and persisted in the noble career upon which they had entered of founding a great nation and a great people in the very remotest corner of the earth. He believed in that—he believed in his race; he believed in the Anglo-Saxon people; he believed in the British as a race and people who were destined to occupy the earth, who would dare all difficulties and dangers, and who would not be easily turned back from any proper and legitimate pursuit upon which they had entered — he asked them all to look around today, and answer him, had they well and faithfully fulfilled this expectation of his? (Cheers.) Had they shown that they had sprung from a race who would dare all things, and do all things legitimately and properly to found homes for the families who were to follow them? He said the enterprise developed here had been wonderful, and was but little known. Look at the machinery brought into the place look at what the miners have achieved; look at the difficulties and dangers which they all had to encounter. See them all overcome, and see now the great career which is opening before them! (Cheers.) Well, now, in reference to that career, just let him say one thing more. It was not his business on an occasion like this to make a political speech or allude to politics. He might tell them that he had heard it said Sir George Grey will make a fine speech to you; he will tell you all about the Public Works Policy." Now, he would tell them that he was the first man who introduced the Public Works Policy into the British Colonies. (Cheers.) He was the first man who even proposed that a change should be established—the first man who recommended the British Government to establish a system which should be carried out in all Her Majesty's dominions—and he, upon his own recommendation and his own advice, pointed out a Public Works Policy which was afterwards introduced into this colony. They have done this, and it was as much their duty to make use of it to extend their public works as it was their duty to grind their corn. Well, that subject, introduced by him, raised great discussion. He had returned to Great Britain, and recollected being present at a dinner party where a discussion arose on the subject as to whether he was right in wishing to spend money on works part of the burden of which would rest on posterity. There were present among others Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, Lord John Russell, Mr Gladstone, and Lord Macaulay. The first three opposed his view, but Macaulay—who was a man of infinite wit in a peculiar way—supported him by saying in opposition to the statement that you have no right to burden posterity with anything—it is a bad system, "We all know of the massacre of the 100,000 Chinese under Lin. When I (Macaulay) heard of it I was painfully affected, but I really believe that the effect of distance is such that an attack of gout in my little finger would have caused very much more trouble and pain to me," and applying the story to the burdens on posterity said "he did not think they would ever bring the people to think much of those burdens if they were satisfied that the money raised was to be expended for right and legitimate objects. It was like professing an intense regard for those who surround you, but neglecting their demands out of consideration for those who might come 300 years hence." But here the time has come. You have created that invisible thing, credit; and it is your duty with it to open up the country—to spend it, not extravagantly but wisely, so that the country may become populous and fertilized. Insist on your right to have that done for you which has been done for other parts of the colony. Do not be led astray by the glittering temptation of imported wealth held up before you As your chairman said just now, with reference to your lands, whether, temperance settlements or intemperance settlements, or any other kind of settlement that may be proposed, by which large numbers of people are to be brought from England, allow nothing of the kind to be done until the wants of yourselves and your children have been provided for. He made no answer to the arguments on that side of the subject used in the House. They amounted to this, it would be "providing a great blessing for Thames people if capitalists came from England to provide work and employ labour. He sat still, he said nothing. In his own mind he thought the Thames people knew their own interest too well. They want to employ themselves. Knowing that nothing could be done, he made no answer, but resolved in his own mind that the lands (which properly belonged to them) now that the power rested with himself, should be secured to them. When what is necessary for their own wants has been taken, let the whole world have a chance and not the water drinkers only. (Laughter and cheers). He was himself a water drinker and had a very great respect for them : let them have the same rights as other men. But he believed the way to make men temperate was not by restrictive laws, which produce little effect; not by depriving them of lands and money and making them simply labourers to other men. The true way, he believed

to make sober, thoughtful, temperate, and, he believed, religious men was to give them the opportunity of obtaining homes for themselves; to give them a chance of providing for the wants of this life, and time in their old age to prepare in peace and comfort for the life to come. One word more, on the work in which we have this day been engaged. May the work in which we have been engaged produce all the prosperity and blessing for this place which he believed it was capable of achieving. He hoped those who had aided him that day might live to see this good and prosperous town the starting point of a railway connecting every part of New Zealand. (Applause)

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (John Brown, Esq.) rose to propose the next toast—"Our Visitors"—which he said he was sure would meet with a ready response from the people of this goldfield. They were much indebted to those gentlemen who had come from the Waikato, Auckland and Coromandel to assist them on that occasion. He trusted that they would have the pleasure of carrying out Mr McMinn's wish, by going to Waikato to assist them, in return, to make a success of their end of the line. He also hoped they would have the pleasure of going to Coromandel on the same business, to assist them when they had completed their own line. The wisest policy they could carry out was that of assisting one another to get through New Zealand with their lines of railway, opening up the country, and carrying prosperity with them. This event was one of great importance. It was the beginning of the end, and he hoped it would be pushed on with all possible expedition until completed. It was the good intention of the Government to give us the railway. They did not like to be under any obligation to the Auckland people, and hoped soon to be able to help them on a similar occasion. (Drunk with loud cheers)

THOMAS PEACOCK, Esq. (Mayor of Auckland) rose amidst applause to respond to the toast. He said he could assure them he appreciated the hospitality they had extended to him and others that day. The undertaking they had commenced that day was pregnant with the most beneficial results to this community. He had a high opinion of the efficiency with which they conducted matters. He need only print to their Volunteers and Volunteer Fire Brigades as evidence of this, as well as to their County and Borough officials, who carried out all their undertakings with energy and enterprise. (Cheers.) He felt sure the Government would concur in his opinion when he said that they looked after the interests of the Thames people. (Cheers.) He had heard words of a jealous tendency between the two places, but he did not think it was their wish such should arise. (Cheers.) The interests of both were identical—the success of one meant the success of the other. He hoped that cordiality would not diminish, but grow on and on. (Cheers.) He concluded by thanking them for the kindness and hospitality shown him.

J. W. MELTON, Esq. (ex-Mayor of Parnell), also thanked the proposer for the toast, and regretting that the Mayor-elect, Mr Coleman, was not able to attend. He was assured it would have afforded him great pleasure.

Mr A. J. CABMAN (Chairman of the Coromandel County Council) was called upon to respond, and in doing so said the committee deserved credit for the successful issue of the arrangements. The Coromandel people had an interest in the Thames railway, and hoped when the time arrived they would not forget that others wanted railways also. They hoped to see the line extended to Coromandel from the Thames. (Cheers.)

Dr KILGOUR (Chairman) rose to propose the toast of "The health of W. Rowe, Esq, our representative, Mr. McMinn, and other members of the House present." He could add his testimony to that of others as to the work done during the last session. He happened to be present during the session, and it was his duty to be brought into contact with their representatives present, and he could testify to their diligence, and to the kindness he had received during his stay there. They worked hard to promote the welfare of the country. He could say that there was complete accord between the gentlemen before them when anything affecting the good of the country was concerned, just as there was with himself. He hoped they would be in accord in time to come as they had been in the past. (Cheers.)

W. ROWE, Esq, M.H.R., rose to respond. He said he believed short speeches ought to be the order of the day on these occasions, For himself he had not felt a happier day for a long time past. He felt that the outcome of the day was but the result of what they had been looking after for years past, and he saw before him those who had assisted to push it forward years ago. There was Mr Berry and Mr Robertson, both to be classed among the pioneers of the movement, and to-day they saw the outcome of their exertions. He was a firm believer in consistency. He believed that if men formed their convictions they should not let men or circumstances put them aside. He did not seek popularity—he cared nothing for that. His convictions were his guide as to his public duty, and by those he stood. They might have heard something of differences between Sir George Grey and himself—(Question?) They were met to day on an occasion when old sores could be healed,—when they might take advantage of the occasion to become united. (Hear, hear.) He had differed from Sir George on some occasions, but he might say that on all he had found him intensely desirous to promote the welfare of this community. (Cheers) He always endeavoured to say to Sir Geo. Grey that he was about to do so and so for the Thames, as representative, and his invariable reply was, "Very well, it is good, it is right, and I will support it." No man had a greater respect or affection for Sir George Grey than he had; but he might say that he would not sacrifice any political opinion of his own in that respect. He was glad to see the Auckland

people present, because he did not believe in the reports that they would oppose the Thames getting their railway. Now is the time for cementing a unity of opinion not only among the people of the Thames, but of the people of the whole Provincial District. (Cheers.) He could say of Mr Macandrew, the Minister of Public Works, a more sincere friend Auckland never had. He believed that the Parliament of New Zealand desired to promote the best interests of the colony at large; that they did their duty, and deserved every praise. The Hon. Hoani Nahe and Mr McMinn were sterling representatives of the interests of their constituents. He was sorry that the name of the former had been omitted from the toasts. (Cheers.)

The Hon. HOANI NAHE rose to respond to the toast (interpreted by E. W. Puckey, Esq.) He said he was glad to meet them that day. He was pleased at the way they had drunk the toast of the New Zealand Parliament, although he hesitated about making a speech, for it occurred to him that Sir George Grey had already spoken long enough. (Laughter and cheers.) He was pleased at the opening of the railway, and hoped it would be carried to a successful completion. He was also very glad to hear that the permission of the chiefs of this district had been given to take the land necessary for the railway line. The railway would be the greatest possible blessing to the native race as well as to the European. The first railway he saw was the one from Grahams town to Tararu. He would only say that he was pleased at the proceedings with a view of opening the Thames Valley Railway. (Cheers.)

E. MCMINN, Esq., M.H.R. for Waipa, rose to respond, and was greeted with loud cheers. He said he was proud to see so many people of the Thames and Auckland, and had to apologise for the Waikato people, as he was the only representative present from that district. Mr Whyte, the Mayor, and a number of others, intended to be present, but as he had already explained, the harvest season prevented their leaving home just now. He was pleased to see them in one respect because they reminded him of the large body of consumers in this district which the railway would open a market for from the Waikato, although he did not say so in any selfish way. (Cheers.) He felt sure the settlers of the Waikato would take the same view, and say the same. (Cheers.) He was glad to see that those entrusted with the arrangements for the day had shown their good sense by inviting the presence of the ladies. There was one hon. member of the House who, if he were present, would be rejoiced to see them—he referred to the ladies' champion, Dr. Wallis. (Laughter). Mr McMinn said he had a toast to propose before he sat down—the "Health of Mr Brodie," and he paid a high compliment to the County Chairman of Thames (Mr A. Brodie), whom he had met in Wellington. He said that there was not a person present at the County Conference held there so well versed in the County system as Mr Brodie. He thought he was somewhat proficient in that respect himself, but he himself was a mere child in these matters in the presence of Mr Brodie, and there were others who also felt they had their match on that occasion, when Mr Brodie was present. (Loud cheers). He asked them to drink his health. (Cheers.)

A. BRODIE, Esq. (County Chairman), thanked Mr McMinn and those present for the honour thus conferred upon him, and the hearty expressions accompanying the toast. (Cheers.)

"The Ladies," by Cr. ROBT. GRAHAM, and "The Mining, Commercial, and Agricultural Interests," by Capt. SOUTER, brought the programme to a close, and the proceedings terminated with three cheers for Sir George Grey.

At six o'clock Sir George Grey, accompanied by Major Withers, inspected the Volunteers, comprising six companies, and numbering about 500 men, commanded by Major Murray. After the review Sir George Grey said:—"Major Withers, officers and men of the Thames Volunteers,—Your appearance to-day is in every way satisfactory. I was much pleased to hear from Colonel Whitmore of your efficiency and enthusiasm in all that pertains to volunteering, and I take this opportunity of informing you that he has in no way overlauded your commendable spirit and satisfactory condition, which I can now fully endorse as being equal to anything I have seen in the colony."

Sir George Grey's Address to his Constituents.

In the evening Sir George Grey, Premier and representative of the Thames, addressed his constituents in the Theatre Royal, Grahamstown, before a crowded and overflowing audience, which could not have numbered less than 1000 persons. Sir George Grey was half-an-hour late in arriving, but when he arrived, accompanied by Br Kilgour and friends, he was received with deafening rounds of cheers.

Mr W. MCCULLOUGH took the chair, on the motion of Mr Greenwood, seconded by Mr Hansen, and after a pause to await the arrival of Sir George Grey he said that he was looking forward like them to the pleasure to be derived from Sir George Grey's address. To Sir George the Thames community were indebted, and should forever be grateful. He had proved himself the best friend the Thames had ever had. (Cheers). If anything were wanting to prove that such was the case they could point to the successful turning of the first sod of the Thames Valley Railway, which that day had been inaugurated. (Cheers). Sir George's interest in the Thames Harbour

Bill would also be for ever remembered with gratitude by the people of the Thames. He would not detain them any longer, but introduce Sir George Grey. (Cheers).

After demonstrative applause, Sir GEORGE GREY said: Your Chairman has been good enough to say that you, as a constituency, have reason to be grateful to me; all that I can answer is I have reason to be grateful to you, for you gave me opportunity of serving New Zealand. Before I speak to you upon what are purely political subjects, I will just say a few words upon practical local matters. Firstly : Since I was returned a great deal has been done in the way of constructing roads through the country, and very great improvements have been made. I should be very ungrateful if I did not say that these improvements have been carried out by aid of your local authorities. They entered into arrangements with Government that they would endeavour to carry them out for the benefit of both races. They tried to convince the native race that their interests were identical with their own, and that it was desirable that roads should be opened up. Now the Chairman of your County Council and the heads of your local bodies have faithfully, energetically, and loyally carried out that agreement, not only here, but in Coromandel also. I should be sorry in the heat of discussion to-night to have forgotten to have rendered my thanks to them for what has taken place during the last twelve months. I need hardly say that this will be great encouragement to myself and Government in endeavouring to do our utmost for a community which so willingly aids in carrying out what is for the good of all. I will endeavour to give you an account of my stewardship during last session, stating what is the proper course for us to pursue during the coming session; what are the objects which we should endeavour to obtain, and what is the system which we should strive to build up? Before entering upon this, however, I will say we have heard such language as "Grey will make a fine speech, but that is all." I don't consider you so wanting in intellect that you should be led astray by fine speeches. (Hear, hear) God has endowed every one of us with different faculties, and if a man makes winning speeches, the power is not his own, but the gift of God. Some men have one gift, and some another. Such gifts as these; have they cannot avoid using, and for those gifts and their use they are responsible. (Applause) Now persons who use such language do so most unjustly. If the arguments used are unjust, let them answer the arguments, but that they never do. Let them answer reasoning. They simply indulge in vapid declamation. As an example of what I mean by that, I will just mention one or two facts that occurred last session. You are all aware that, in the case of Canterbury, a clause was introduced into the Bill by which 7,000,000 acres of land were given to the run holders in Canterbury that ought not to have been given,—that is, three years before their leases had expired, and those leases had been for a long term of years. On that subject an appeal ought to have been allowed to the country, but a majority in the House would not allow such an appeal. If the runs had been divided, instead of a few persons holding them, a large rental could have been derived from them. Were the children to be patient whose parents had been robbed of a chance of that kind, or were they not? (Cheers.) A large additional rental would have been obtained by fair competition in the market. If they had been reduced in their proportions, they would have been placed in a larger number of hands. A far greater number of cattle and sheep would have been carried on them; the country would have been relieved from a considerable burden of taxation through the additional revenue obtained, and by the increased commerce and trade, so that the whole community would have been benefited. Was I justified in pitying the children who were called upon to make some sacrifice to give more money to those favoured individuals, or was I not? (Cheers. I felt pity for them, placed in such circumstances. I say that I was thoroughly justified in feeling that pity, and I believe that the heart of any man who cared for his country would have felt the sympathy and pity that I felt on looking at looking at a large number of children who, I believe, are compelled to make some sacrifice which they ought not to be required to make, and whose parents, I believe, in many cases have been impoverished. I was angry at that—indignant at it; and, upon remarking that I pitied the children of the South who had been deprived of such chances, I was ridiculed. The arguments were not answers as to the wrong done, but there were roars of laughter at the speech the hon. gentleman made who "pitied the little children." I appeal to you whether I ought to pity the children or not, (Applause.) I believe the mind of any man who cared for his country would have felt such pity. Then, again, this further thing took place. I had been ridiculed for speaking of the wives of the poorer colonists as ladies. What I did say was this—and bear in mind the statement was not made in the House, but at a religious meeting at which I was asked to preside—that I had entered many cottages where the influence of Christianity was such that it had softened the manners and the tones of the occupants, and I am not ashamed to make such a confession. I have been ridiculed for such statements. Laughter is no answer to argument. Ridicule undeserved is no answer to just and weighty argument. Another kind of argument used lately has been this: "Don't you be led astray by Sir George Grey; what you require is material advantage, and one great material advantage given to a place is worth all constitutional truths, or all constitutional principles. Look out for your pockets; they say that is the thing for people to do. Let them not think of their rights in these days, or what their constitution is to be, but let people see that they get a large amount of public revenue spent among them. That is what you want for your constituents," they say. To that I answer I do not believe that this constituency is capable of so acting; It is a thing to look for that you have a fair amount of the

public revenue spent amongst you. I tell you, as your representative, I will take care that you have your fair share of the public revenue spent amongst you. I will make myself responsible for that whether I am in office or not. I don't believe you will be so foolish as to neglect to look after yourselves. It is for you to see that the public revenues are properly spent. Now I think you will agree with me upon that point, and those who attempt to delude you that your object should be simply to get money are not your real friends. You may depend upon it there is something beyond it if they recommend you to do that. Well, I will pass now to some other subjects. Lately the cry has been raised in several parts of New Zealand—in the North island especially, about the land being unfairly dealt with. The argument used is, that some people have rights coming to them which are not coming to the public at large. Well, now, do not be led astray by arguments of that kind. In this case a law is made, under which lands become the property of private individuals, although that law gives to every man equal rights. But if we come to some of these individuals' peculiar rights where they have the power to make a law that what has been done shall be made lawful, they say they have power to do that. Now I say any people who argue in that way are enemies to their country. (Cheers.) What does it mean? It means this, if you behave in that way you will break the law, because you assume that you have power to render the infraction of the law lawful. There is no law in this world that can give power to any Government to do exactly as they like. I say it is impossible for any Government to break the law. I say it is impossible for them to do that, and in doing so they are doing wrong to the whole community. (Cheers.) They do wrong to themselves in breaking the law. They are doing wrong to think that they can get the law broken when they like, and they are doing wrong to the community by dealing with that which they only hold as trustees. When they say they are developing a country because some gentlemen are spending large sums of money in improving it, I say it is not their money; it is your money. If I give a man one hundred thousand acres of land, you know he can go into the market and raise a large sum of money upon that. That money so raised is your money, it is raised upon your property. If labourers are employed in improving property so acquired it is not the money of the employers which is invested, but your own money given back again. (Loud cheers.) Then further consider this, to give men large tracts of country in that way you give them the power of raising enormous loans. Every one of you must know this that the value of the produce of a farm depends upon the facility of getting it to market and the means of communication. If therefore I give a man the power of determining whether roads are to be made through that land or not I give him the power of taxing every one of his neighbours about him. I give him the power of determining whether they shall get their produce to market or not. I limit the value of every man's farm who is in his vicinity—it is literally to give one individual the power of taxing all his fellows in his neighbourhood. Well, now, that leads to another point—to a subject upon which I shall have to speak to you to-night. The people who acquire these great tracts of land—I hope I make myself clear to you—(cheers)—by a law peculiar to this colony have votes in proportion to the land they hold. They may have five votes to one—that is a man owning the smallest area of property can have but one vote, while a man with a large amount in a riding may have five votes. It is possible for a man to have forty-five votes and most of his neighbours to have only one vote. Now you will therefore see that votes are not, under such circumstances, given to human beings but to acres. According to my view the vote should be proportionate to the owners of property in a district. I would not care how many acres it was; and persons thus qualified should have the power of saying we desire our property should be taxed at so much per acre. (Cheers.) I contend the majority of the people in such a district should have the power of determining what amount should be imposed per acre. (Applause.) I contend that it should not be allowed to one man to have forty-five votes, with which he may elect a County Council and all the officers. I say to give a man power to do this, is to create a governing class you will never get rid of. I should wish to make myself clear to you. Where one man has a right to exercise forty-five votes you give him the power to spend the money, and you create a distinct class in the community—one of whom will have the power to govern all the rest of another class, who will go hat in hand to him and ask to be employed, to get work and be paid with their own money. I say no worse attempt has been made to set up an aristocracy in New Zealand, and that of the worst possible kind. If you will search the writers on this subject of plurality of votes, you will find that they say this: "We believe in plurality of votes,—that is to say, the time may come when plurality of votes will be given; but we believe the greatest curse that can afflict a country would be to attach to that plurality of votes property and money." We believe that to do that is to secure degradation to a class for all time, and raise up a class in the country of the worst possible kind. Then they go on to say money may be acquired fraudulently, and by mean habits in various ways, and even by prudent people—often by people who have saved and accumulated money, and often by people who have no right to acquire money by the means they have used, and to reward wealth by giving it plurality of votes is one of the worst ways by which power can be acquired. These are the disreputable means by which power is acquired in the present day. They say, further, the time may come when the community will recognise some men of greater wisdom—some men of greater faculties. Perhaps, then it will be a wise thing to do. That is different from what has been done here. I am anxious you should understand that question, for it is a point upon which I shall have to speak at large with

reference to my conduct last session. In round numbers I may say three quarters of a million will be taken from the general revenue and given to local bodies. You will see that this three quarters of a million belongs to you, belongs to myself, belongs to each one of you in equal proportions, and that no person has any right to a larger share than his fellow. He does not contribute more than I do—he contributes exactly the same. Why, because they have a greater extent of land or property do they expend money which has no relation to their property at all, but which belongs to all of us? (Cheers.) The whole rates of New Zealand at the present moment—I have not brought papers with me, and cannot therefore give the exact amount—are under £100,000 a year raised in rates in New Zealand, therefore the proportion which this bears to the whole expenditure may be set down at one eighth; and I say that nothing can be more unjust to my mind than that they should have the power of spending our money and contributing so little themselves. I think that you will understand that the people really contribute the revenue themselves. I now come to the Electoral Bill. You may either agree with me or not as to my action with regard to that Bill. In the old country the Government have always power to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people. I have made the greatest search through the writings of all governing statesmen, their histories, and all that can throw light on the subject, and I find that the opinion of those authorities is this if certain circumstances take place we shall dissolve. They do not say we shall advise the Crown to do it, but they say the Crown must take their advice. They say we intend to appeal to the constituencies. They speak always with the most perfect confidence that that shall take place. I think you will agree with me, there is no possible harm in appealing to the people. I say they have always their right to dissolve Parliament, and appeal to the people. That is certainly the proper course. (Cheers). In New Zealand that has been denied to us. It is said the Governor here is to decide the question of right, and that his rights descend from Governor to Governor. That some Governors may please to allow a dissolution, and some Governors may not allow it—that is to say that New Zealand statesmen are not to be trusted with the same powers which are exercised by statesmen at Home, and we have heard here in New Zealand some members of the New Zealand Parliament say, "thank God that is the case." (Loud laughter.) I think in that they might hold their sides for laughter. They knew they had their seats for a long time. What they mean is this: that a Ministry, having a minority, shall be tried as to whether they can get a majority; and unless they can show that, they shall not be allowed a dissolution. The effect of this is not only to weaken a Ministry in the House of Representatives, but that the party opposed to the Ministry know that they will not be sent back to their constituents. No Ministry in New Zealand can be strong enough to carry measures with certainty. That has been the position of myself and my friends. Now, certainly, in the next session of Parliament- I say when a dissolution is asked for that dissolution will probably be allowed. That must be the position of any Ministry when a new Parliament is elected with power to appeal to the people. Now let us consider the constitution of the Upper House of this colony. They are a nominated Upper House. In some other colonies there are Upper Houses, but none with the peculiarities of the Legislative Council of New Zealand. Perhaps some people will say we have an Upper House as the House of Lords is in England; but there is this extraordinary difference between England and New Zealand. In England the Upper House can impose no new burdens upon the community. The House of Peers are not paid out of the public funds. If I were in England and endeavoured to impose any new burdens upon the community the Upper House could not interfere. There is no Upper House in the colonies which is paid as the Legislative Council is here. A man here is appointed in one day to the Council and immediately acquires two hundred a-year. It is not for a day but for his life. It is a pension for life. (Laughter.) I do not know if I make myself clear to you on that point. Take the civil service here: You put a man, who will shortly be entitled to his pension, into the Upper House—you give £200 a year, in addition to what he gets as a pension. That gives him a position. There is no difficulty about that. In England, when they give a civil servant a pension, that pension comes from the Crown, and if he gets a further appointment he loses a proportionate part of his pension. Take my own case-I get a pension of £1,000 a-year. I wanted to get my ministerial salary reduced. I introduced a Bill for that purpose, and the House threw it out. I wanted £1,200 instead of £1,750. Well, from my pension they took £890 a-year. In New Zealand if a civil servant is put in the Upper House he nets 200 gs. added to what he will receive by his pension. Then this extraordinary thing takes place in New Zealand: in the Parliament at home, if you make a man a Peer, he not only cannot sit in the House of Commons, but he cannot interfere in any election of a member of that House, rendering himself liable to punishment if he does. Here, a person is taken and put into the Upper House because he loses his seat in the Lower House. At home, if you make a man a Peer, he must always be a Peer; but here, if a member has a chance of getting in for another constituency, he can resign his peerage, and go back to the Lower House. And he does that, I may say, shamelessly. I should be ashamed to occupy that position myself, but there is nothing to prevent a man from doing it, and then if he loses his election he goes back to the Upper House again. Now you will see really the dominant power in the country consists of some fifty members in the Upper House, each of whom is paid 200 guineas a year. There are upwards of fifty now,—I forget the exact number,—property, money, and power have got them in, neither myself nor my friends got them there, and if my friends wanted to get a majority in, we should have to get fifty-fire, each with 200 guineas a year for life.

No man who wants to work the constitution properly would try to do it. The Governor himself has no power to do anything at all, although you may depend upon it that the Governors at the present time are intended for party purposes. (Hear.) Look at what Beaconsfield said—he admitted that some years ago attempts had been made by a certain section of the Colonial Department to break Up the Colonial Empire. I say no party who would attempt to do that would have any right to be put into the third branch of the Assembly. You will see that the Constitution is most difficult to work. If you expect me as a minister to carry measures as they do at home you will be greatly disappointed. I say it is in the power of any Governor to ruin any Ministry, because he may ally himself with the party opposed to the Ministry; and then it is an alliance between the Governor and a particular party. If a Ministry is weak in the House, and has not power to carry its measures, it must fall into disgrace. Well, now then I come to the question of the Electoral Bill. You yourselves must judge whether I was right or not. I am on my trial, as it were, before you. We did not want to introduce a bill which we could not carry. We had to consult our friends. We could not carry a measure against our friends. We were obliged to bring a bill in without attempting to interfere with the plural voting. We were obliged to bring in the bill in that shape which would conserve our vote. We believed, as a Ministry, that if we divided that vote the Ministry would be lost altogether. I was fully certain in my own mind that an appeal to the country would not be granted upon the question: but I asked for it. Another of my friends brought in a proposal to do away with the plural vote—that each man should have one vote, and votes be the representatives of human beings, and not of acres of land. We endeavoured to get that carried, but it was lost. I am in favour of triennial Parliaments. I will tell you why, because if any great political crisis arises during a five years' Parliament, it cannot be dealt with during that period without a dissolution, which one Governor may give who is on good terms with the Ministry, and another in anger may refuse. I think this is a matter which ought not to be left to a decision of that kind, and that the constituencies ought not to be debarred from having a voice in every three years. I thought it was a pity to stop the constituency from exercising its voice for a period of five years. Surely it was reasonable enough to ask that the time should be reduced to three years. I was quite willing to submit to that test. I did my best to get that measure passed, but it was rejected. As you are all aware, the Constitution of the country gave the natives exactly the same right of voting as the Europeans. That has prevailed for some time. Many years ago the Legislature said the great bulk of the natives resided in districts where there were no polling-places, and it was said they had no franchise at all. Therefore, they said, we will allow four native members to be elected in and for those districts; and they elected four members accordingly. I have no hesitation in saying that when my opponents were threatened with an adverse vote of the House they saved themselves by keeping those four votes in hand, and they managed the whole thing upon an admirable plan. But after four years or so they would take that out of our hands. (Laughter.) This Electoral Bill, the object of which was to give fresh privileges to every one of her Majesty's subjects in New Zealand—in effect, universal suffrage—when it got to the Upper House they struck out the dual vote altogether except in respect of these four native members. That they left in. The Act went on to say that all natives whose names were enrolled as ratepayers should have power to vote if they paid their rates, and all Europeans whose names were on the ratepayers' roll should have the power of voting whether paying rates or not. Myself and my friends determined that they should not submit to it. They put in these words, "Every male subject of her Majesty in New Zealand, being twenty-one years of age, and not being a Maori, shall have a vote," and that left the House to the four native members. That was accompanied by a statement made in this House, that the natives in the Upper House had arranged to pass the Land Tax, and that they ought not to be allowed to do so again. Well, I was in favour of the Land Tax myself. I believed that the Customs' Duties were already sufficiently heavy, and that the people should not be taxed or punished twice over. I contended that the Upper House exceeded their privilege in rejecting that measure—that they were a nominated body—that they had no right, and that a sense of delicacy should have restrained them from interfering in a matter of that kind. (Cheers.) Therefore I said to myself, I now believe in doing away with the plural vote. I believe in Triennial Parliaments, and I believe it is quite possible that parties in the Upper House may want to meddle, and have set us this example of meddling. They do not hesitate to interfere with the privileges of the Lower House, therefore what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and I have followed the example which they gave to me. They threw the gage down. I determined in my own mind not to accept the amendments on the measure made by the Legislative Council, and I found a majority of the House coincided with me, therefore I would not accept their amendment. I believe the result will be that next year we shall get a fundamentally better Reform Bill, and that we will get it in time for the new elections. We shall see that the country is divided into fair representative districts,—that there shall be no more pocket Boroughs. (Cheers.) Then I shall say you are no more a divided constituency. I recollect you had for years only one member here, and other places with less population had as many as three or even four members. We are determined that population shall carry representation with it. I believe I shall get a Reform Bill which shall do away with plurality of voting, and probably we shall have triennial Parliaments. If we cannot carry that we shall have to appeal to the people next year, and then you must decide yourselves whether you like it or not. Mind, I

only tell you what my own views are, and I try to assert them with humility—I tell you that I do not like the plural vote, and I am persuaded that you will agree with me that I am right. As to triennial Parliaments, representation in proportion to population, you will have an opportunity of saying whether you like these things or not. I shall say if you do not like them you will be unwise, and I shall lie by until I get some other constituency that will like them. I now come to the Land Bill. We say that every man in New Zealand—every father of a family shall have a right of homestead, and have no tax upon it, that they shall be enabled to bring up a family and found a home to live in—that every man shall begin to pay a land tax in proportion as his property grows. Whatever structure may be erected for the decent living and comfort of a man's family, to enable them to be brought up and to have a proper home to live in, to that extent there shall not be a tax upon a man's homestead. That a man shall be enabled to leave it to his children without a public burden upon it, no tax shall be put upon it. But the moment that a man passes beyond that boundary, he shall begin to pay a tax exactly in proportion to his property. We say to the poor man that, in regard to property which is merely sufficient to support himself in comfort and decency, he shall pay no tax. We will say on the other hand, to the man who holds large quantities of land for the purpose of speculation, that he shall pay not less for his land than his neighbours, and that in proportion to its extent the poor man shall pay taxes for making roads that give additional value to the land in the neighbourhood, while the owner of the land did not make any improvement whatever upon it. We say the selling value of the land without improvements upon it is that which shall be taxed. The whole theory of the Public Works Policy is that land shall be taxed. They say "we want a property tax." But that does not suit our views at present at all. I have no objection to a property tax by and bye. Let those people who have large tracts of land with speculative principles set an example, Let those people who live in England, and derive large revenues from the colony, pay their share towards the general taxation of the colony. (Cheers.) Never fear, I will get it out of them by and bye, if it is possible to do it. (Loud cheers.) And if I am out of power I will aid you at getting at those people. Let us make sure that those people who hold immense properties in this country contribute in proportion to their property—those people who hold great runs. There are large numbers of people in this colony who hold millions of acres of land, and they shall and will be got at, as will those who hold investments in public companies. (Cheers.) They want a tax on improvements. They believe if a tax were put on improvements a large number of farms in the country would fall into their hands. We say no, let every man who has land improve it to the best of his ability, but do not let him pay for the improvements which he has made upon it by his own labour. (Loud cheers.) The landowners tried to create discontent. They said you have only made a tax of one halfpenny in the pound to deceive the people I would reply, "Let us see what this tax of one halfpenny in the pound will bring in, and if we want more we have an easy means of getting it. You have a great machinery in your hands. It will be for you to use it as you like. If you want to raise greater revenue you can do it, and I believe it is a perfectly fair way for you to do it. Then this other objection was made; it was said, "Oh, you have not taken enough burthens off the people. Why do you not take more off at once?" The answer was, "We want to see what the Land tax Bill will bring in to be quite sure of what we are doing" They said, "You have imposed one halfpenny in the pound per acre, why have you not imposed twopence or fourpence?" The answer to that is, "We want to see what the Land Tax would bring in. We have taken off half the duty on sugar, and it will be very easy to take the other half off. We will gladly do so when the proper time comes. We have taken twopence in the pound off tea, and we will be delighted to take off the other fourpence when we see what will be the result of the new tax, I believe this tax at the present moment is fairer than any other tax in the neighbouring colonies. The moment we know what the land tax really does yield, we will unhesitatingly do our very best to remove the whole of these burthens from the public, under which they ought not to suffer. You will see from what I have stated that you are entitled to a reduction upon articles of consumption. We were obliged to deal gingerly with every one of these subjects, not being certain of a dissolution. But you will see next session, if a dissolution takes place, the power rests in your own hands. You become the legislators for the time. We shall lay down a programme, and you shall vote upon that; you will become the General Assembly for the time being. You now understand what I mean upon that point? (Cheers) There are some other points on which I will speak to you, and which will agitate the Assembly next session. You will have next session to determine—and this is the first time it will have become public—this matter, which will be submitted for appeal to you: Is a titled aristocracy—an aristocracy peculiar to New Zealand to be set up in this colony, or is it not? ("No.") Well that is what I want to know. I intend to resist it to the utmost. I will tell you what has taken place. In England the law is this: The Crown is the fountain of honour. The crown can make peers, baronets, knights, and every degree, and invest them with decorations, and every order that people are liable to have stuck upon them. (Laughter.) It has all these powers, but the Crown can create no new rank in England, and can create no new title. It tried to do it; it tried to make a life Peer without an Act of Parliament. Both Houses resisted, and it was admitted that in England, according to the Constitution, the Crown can create no new title whatever. Now the Crown determines to set up in New Zealand a new order of aristocracy. It was to be a life aristocracy. They were to be called honourable for life, but they

were only to carry their title of honourable within two miles of New Zealand. Directly they went outside that line they threw it off, and directly they come back they are again honourable for life. If the Crown can create an order of nobility, it can create anything it pleases. I think you are aware they sent out to me to promulgate an order in a *New Zealand Gazette* that Judges in New Zealand, on retirement, and certain civil servants were to be made honourable for life. I said I cannot put that in the *Gazette*, I do not think the Queen has power to do it; and, in the next place, I said, when an honour is conferred on one of her Majesty's subjects it is put in the *London Gazette*, and the whole world knows his name and the honour that has been bestowed upon him. I said, "I will not put anything of the kind in the *New Zealand Gazette*; I will not put anything in the *New Zealand Gazette* that will not be in the *London Gazette*, and you have no power to order me." (Cheers.) I tell you now that it has been conceded that these notices shall be put in the *London Gazette* for the future. The authorities to whom this matter has been referred have said it is right, and we intend to carry it out. To that I answer distinctly that "The Queen has no right; and I tell you the reason that she cannot do it in England, and there is an additional reason why she cannot do it in New Zealand. The only power left to the Queen upon such a subject is this: the Queen is one part of the General Assembly, and it is said the General Assembly may make laws for the happiness and good government of New Zealand. Clearly, the creation of an aristocracy is a question relating to the good government of the colony, said further, suppose you have the power to do that it would be an act of generosity to consult the people on the subject, and if you create a separate aristocracy in New Zealand you also at the same time create a class here that will tend to separate from the mother country. I said the people of New Zealand have a dislike to such things, why not behave generously to them, and say, although we claim the power in New Zealand, we will not force it unless the representatives in the General Assembly address the Crown, asking the Crown to do so. We all know the Queen takes no interest in those matters. It would be a generous and fair thing to her subjects in New Zealand that this thing should be done by their consent and by their choice." They do not notice that. They simply say they intend to do it. They do not say that they have taken any legal opinion, but they say they are quite satisfied the Queen has the power. Now I say this, that you must not think because the Colonial Department says this, that there is any reason to believe they are right. I will give you an instance of what I mean. The Colonial Department claimed the power of creating Bishops in all these colonies, and they issued letters patent to the Bishops at home, and they made them Peers within the colonies. They said the same rights and dignities belonged to them in these colonies as was enjoyed by the Bishops in Auckland. They authorised Bishops to set up Ecclesiastical Courts, to sue people, to have people within their jurisdiction brought up and tried upon ecclesiastical questions. This was a power the Bishops had not at home. All these letters patent were drawn up by law officers, Crown solicitors, and law officers of the Crown, and they got £5 5s for reading those documents, or some clerk got it, I do not know which. However, these letters were said to be perfectly legal. I remonstrated with them. At one time the clergy of Cape Colony were in a similar position, and reference was made to the House of Commons, and they said the Queen had no right to do anything of the kind. I next referred the question to the legal authorities. They argued that the Queen was right, and that the issue of these letters patent was perfectly legal, but I managed to get the question brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Fortunately, just at the time, the Bishop had suspended a clergyman from his living, giving him a right to appeal, and subscriptions were raised—that enabled us to take the whole matter before the Privy Council. The decision given was that the Queen, having granted a constitution to that colony very much much as we have here, and having created a Legislature for the conservation of the peace, order, and government of the country, she could not now by letters patent issued in Great Britain over-ride what had been done, and, therefore, we got rid of the Bishops. (Laughter.) I do not mean that we got them abolished, but we got rid of their power derived from the Crown—that is we elect them, and they exercise just such powers as their congregations choose to give them. This will convince you that the Colonial Department is very often wrong. I have no hesitation in saying that the Colonial office has no power whatever to force a colonial aristocracy on this colony. And I, as your representative, possessing the powers which you have delegated to me, shall not be fairly behaving to you unless I use every means to insure that nothing of the kind shall be done in this country And I am perfectly satisfied that as soon as the Home Government find that a decided stand is taken they will give way. If I see that the country does not go with me still I shall protest, and I think you will protest. I believe this will be one of the burning questions in the next session. I now come to another question—that of the nomination of the Governor. I have told the people of this colony that they had a perfect right to pass a law to decide upon the manner in which their Governors should be nominated. I have always held that they had a perfect right to pass a law providing that the Governor should be recommended to the Queen, leaving the Crown to make the appointment Now the Colonial Department at home have come to their senses upon that point, and they admit that the colonists have a right to pass such a law. But I say if the Colonial Legislature exorcises that power the Queen has no right to reject that law if she chooses—we know that the Queen has power to reject it. You know now that you have to pass such a law as to how your Governor shall be nominated—I think it is a great thing for you to know that the power rests in your

hands to use it as you may please. (A cheer.) I had intended to speak to you on other matters, but I fear the time is late (go on)—but there are subjects upon which there is great misapprehension. The one point which I shall refer to is the question of the power of the Judges. Before last session the Judges claimed that they had the right at any time to commit any man to gaol for life for contempt of Court, and that they were not obliged to make a record of such committal. They also said that the Governor, and even the Queen, had not the power to release him. (Laughter) Some little time ago they committed Mr Barton to gaol for a month for making an application on behalf of one of his clients. The matter came before Parliament, and we found that they also claimed the right to commit editors as well as lawyers. Well, I thought this power was dangerous, and should be restrained. I thought power with regard to the Press should be limited. The Judges said, "We are witnesses of the contempt: we saw the gestures and heard the tone of voice, and we must take these things into consideration in deciding on the punishment." Therefore, it was contended that power ought to be absolutely left in the hands of the Judges, and that there should be no trial by jury in such cases. With regard to the Press, I said that they did not write the article in the Court? they did not say anything in the Court, The Judges are not qualified in deciding about this as a jury. I said that the Judges should direct a prosecution if they wish, and punish the offender, and let the State bear the cost, and the jury decide upon the matter. The result of the debate was that the majority in the House were of opinion the Judges should not be interfered with, and I think they were wrong (hear, hear), and I wish you to know it. I firmly believe this, that in the course of a few years no man will say that anyone should be sent to gaol for life, for I believe that any such power to Judges is a bad power. One Judge will imprison a man for life, and another for a month. It depends on the caprice, or, it may be in some cases, the personal animosity of the Judge. Not long ago in England the Judges had the power to torture prisoners for the purpose of wringing a confession from them. For example, there was once a lady named Margaret Clitheroe, who was a devout Roman Catholic, and she was arrested on a charge of having secreted priests at a time when they had a price on their heads. Well, as she refused to plead she was tortured, but to no purpose, and pressed to death. An investigation into the legality of torturing people was then made, and it was found that they had no power. I believe this to be the case with the New Zealand Judges. They claim from custom; and I am convinced that they have no power; and I think we should strive to remedy what I believe to be a great wrong. (Hear, hear.) With your help I will endeavour to do so. I think I have gone through the main points of what took place last session, and given you a look at the programme for the future, and will now turn to matters nearer home. I believe that this portion of New Zealand is destined to have a great future. With the railway you will have an opportunity of developing the capacities of the district. You have a splendid water carriage, and immense water power for turning machinery. Then, again, you have auriferous deposits, which you must see are properly worked. Passing, as I hope the railway will, along the whole peninsula, so that the whole of the auriferous land can be got at, it will unite the varied capacities of the whole district, and these are many. You have at the back of the Thames a fertile country, and you must take care to have a proper harbour constructed to connect with the railway. Without a harbour your communication will be incomplete. When you have these you will possess all the necessary artificial advantages, in addition to many natural ones, and a bright future is in prospect. As I have before stated to-day, it had been said we should do our utmost to induce capitalists to come here and provide labour for the inhabitants. Of course, it would be a great pity not to allow them to come; but what they should most desire was to provide fertile homesteads for themselves, employing their own labour. There was the attempt to obtain what was termed the Broomhall settlement. We refused to have that land surrendered while the inhabitants already here wished to obtain it. At the small charge of £3,500 the claim made was surrendered and the land secured for yourselves. (Cheers.) Now, just let me make a personal application of these matters to myself, as your representative, and to you as my constituents. Supposing that my plan had been this—that, for example, I had secured on this goldfield, and between this and the Waikato, the best blocks of land I could get for myself and my friends, and then that I had got a railway made, how would you have looked upon me? Would you have felt the same sentiments in the getting of the railway for you as you would when you know that I have not an acre of land in the district, and that I have no personal interest whatever in it? Would you have felt that I had been really working for your advantage? [Cries of "No."] I say that your bounden duty is to aid me in watching all the lands in this district, that I as your representative and you as my constituents, should see that as far as possible, these lands are secured to the public. I say again, shut your ears to the voice of the charmers who tell you, "Give us large blocks of land, and we will find employment for you." I say that in this country the thing that we desire is, that the people should have the opportunity of making homes for themselves. These are objects which you should all desire to attain; and I feel certain that those persons who aid in such a work will earn the gratitude of future times,—that many humble men, perhaps some of those who are now listening to me, by working for that object, would leave imperishable names behind them. [The hon. gentleman here referred to a statement recently published by a leading Bishop in England, depicting the terrible state of the poor in the towns.] Now, I say this, that it is your duty to take care and watch things in their beginning, and not allow yourselves to grow up in a state which will assuredly entail a future of that kind in a

few generations upon our posterity. I say, that. that man who, for the sake of getting labour easily, and allows land to be improperly acquired, that he may get labour, who deprives his fellow men of their rights of obtaining land for themselves and their families, is a disgrace to the community. I say, then, let us all lay these subjects to heart; let us work to lay down a broad platform for the future benefit of the nation which we are building up here, and I am certain that we shall obtain the blessing of those who will follow us. Let me close by using the last words which I uttered in the House of Representatives: That in New Zealand there is the noblest clay existing, ready to the hand of the potter. I pointed out that the original immigrants were chosen with the greatest care, that they all came out in the prime of life, that they were of good character, men selected of good health, free from vice, who had families; and that the young men of the higher ranks who came out were some of the most distinguished families in England; that the flower of some of the other colonies flocked here, believing there was a great opening in New Zealand for such a class of immigrants. I said that here is the noblest clay ready to the hand of the potter; that there may be fashioned one of the greatest and best nations that the world has ever seen. I said this that that noble clay will be moulded by no unskilful potter; it will not be moulded in a shape which will create misery and destitution to millions hereafter to come. It will see that justice is done to itself, and any Government that attempts to pass laws of an unfair kind, creating these class distinctions that I spoke of—creating these vast inequalities of property—giving favours to certain individuals over others,—I say such a Government and such a system is rotten, and if attempted to be enforced cannot exist for a day. I say that the clay is truly noble—the clay will be moulded into a noble shape,—those potters who try to act otherwise will find that the whole population of New Zealand will cry out: Away with you; we will be moulded by no such potters as you are! (Loud applause.)

The CHAIRMAN proposed that this meeting cordially thank the Hon Sir George Grey for his admirable address, and reiterates the feelings of confidence so frequently expressed by the people of this district in him as their representative in the New Zealand Parliament.

This was seconded by Mr R. GRAHAM, and carried most enthusiastically, when the proceedings closed with three cheers for Sir George.

Printed at the Thames Advertiser Office, Grahamstown.

Light Country Railways and Street Tramways.

Information Respecting an Economical and Efficient Mode of Transit. Compiled from Papers Furnished by the Inventor and the Manufacturers of the Motors Employed. Together with Official Reports of a Royal Commission Appointed by the Danish Government to Inquire into the Matter, and of Exhaustive Trials Carried Out by the Prussian Government in 1877.

New Zealand: Lyon & Blair, Steam Lithographers and Printers, Wellington. 1878

The Employment of Mechanical Motors on Tramways.

THE introduction of a cheap and efficient means of communication is a question of much importance, and one of which the solution has occupied extensively the consideration of our leading experts. While the beneficial influence that railways have exercised on the districts with which they are connected, by leading to the expansion of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture, has largely contributed to the material progress of the country in general, outlying towns and neighbourhoods, too far distant from the main routes of thoroughfare to partake of any direct advantage from their development, are naturally anxious to reap an increased share of the benefits accruing from a closer connection with the exterior world. Many and various efforts have already been made to comply with these requirements, but the greater number of the projects have been failures, or where they have been carried out, the result from a financial point of view has been anything but satisfactory. These failures have for the most part arisen from the comparatively heavy cost of construction of even the lightest class of railways, combined with the expenses attendant on their working, and the parties interested have therefore given their attention to the question of producing a means of communication, which while capable of being more cheaply executed and worked, will not essentially alter the mode of transport.

The solution of a problem of such importance has, as may well be supposed, given rise to many different schemes; and the tendency of more recent investigations has been in the direction of substituting for horses an efficient mechanical motor as soon as such can be shown to be obtainable.

When this has been done, the question of "secondary railways" for the country may be looked upon as settled, because the construction of light tramways upon the principal country roads as they now exist really supplies an inexpensive railway, inasmuch as the entire cost of land, earthworks, culverts, and fences, and the greater part of the outlay usually required for bridges, ballast, stations, and gate-houses, will be avoided; and in

regard to working expenses, the greater part of the official staff can very well be spared, while the important reduction in the proportion of dead to paying weight will materially reduce the cost of haulage.

The mechanical motor may either be in the form of a distinct engine coupled to a tram-car, thus resembling a locomotive and railway train, or it may be placed inside the car itself, and act directly upon the car wheels. Each of these modes of construction has its advocates, but it may be looked upon as established (as I propose hereafter to demonstrate) that the placing of the engine inside the car is to be preferred, as conducing to economy of working.

If we suppose the mechanical motor under both conditions to be in the form of a small locomotive, weighing two tons, and having a power equal to 15 horses, attached to an ordinary tram-car weighing about $2\frac{1}{2}$ tons, and carrying 60 passengers, weighing say $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons, or a load altogether of 7 tons, then such an engine would not, at any rate upon a perceptible gradient, be able to start its load, because the adhesion of the driving wheels, with only 10 cwt. upon each wheel, would not be sufficient to overcome the "*vis inertiae*." The engine wheels in such a case would revolve upon the rails without producing forward motion. On the other hand, if the engine were placed inside the car, so that the car wheels themselves would be used as driving wheels, then the weight, or at all events a portion of the weight of the car and passengers, in addition to that of the engine itself, or in all $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons per wheel, instead of half a ton, would rest upon these, and be available for the establishment of sufficient adhesion to enable the resistance to be overcome. It is quite true that there would be no great difficulty in loading the engine, say with 4 tons of lead, so as to obtain in that way a sufficient amount of wheel pressure to meet the requirements of the case, but there would then be an addition to the dead load of 4 tons, which would require so much additional haulage, and entail an increased expenditure for fuel and wear and tear of the roadway.

The ready stopping of the car is also effected more advantageously when the engine is placed within the car, than when it is separate, because when the brake action takes place in the lighter engine, the heavier car behind will strike it with a certain force, and the concussion will drive the engine forward for some distance before a complete stoppage is obtained, whereas, when the engine is in the car, the brakes act directly upon the car wheels with instantaneous effect.

These considerations will, I think, show satisfactorily that whatever may be the special form of mechanical motor selected, it should in all cases be placed in, and form an integral part of the car itself.

I now propose to describe the kind of car which I would use for the purpose, calling attention to the fact that thoroughly exhaustive trials, made in the presence of experienced judges, have confirmed the correctness of my views.

The principle on which the car is constructed is the same as that employed in America for ordinary railway carriages, the body resting upon two "bogies" or under carriages.

Between the bogie and the carriage body, springs and bearing plates are so placed as to secure the light and equable motion of the car. This kind of vehicle is common in America, and is remarkable for the ease with which, unaffected by its length of body, it moves round exceedingly sharp curves, the bogies turning freely under the car, and it is only the distance of the wheel centres in each individual bogie, and not the length of the carriage, which limits the radius of practicable curves. Such a long car, supported at each end on flexible springs, is easy for the passengers, and in consequence of the weight being distributed on eight wheels, instead of as is usually the case, on four, the wear and tear of the rails is proportionately slight, an advantage which is further increased by the diminished amount of friction due to the short distance of centres of the bogie wheels. With a view of affording a suitable place in which the engine may stand, the pin of one of the bogies is made hollow, and enlarged to several feet in diameter, and in this hollow pin is fixed the engine, which acts directly upon the bogie wheels underneath, and thus sets the whole carriage in motion. It is evident that the enlargement of the bogie pin will not affect the revolving movement of the carriage body upon it, nor will the engine in this position interfere with the arrangements for ascending and descending to or from the upper seats of the car at either end.

To allow the engine to be attached or detached with facility, the end of the car is made to open on hinges, and a crutch is arranged under the body to be let down when required, so as to rest upon the solid ground, and by means of screws take the weight off the bogie, while the latter, with the engine resting upon it, is removed and replaced or exchanged for another when so required.

Springs are placed between the bogie plate and the carriage body, so as wholly to prevent any vibration caused by the engine from being communicated to the body of the car itself, the passengers thus being quite unconscious of the working of the machinery, the whole of which is separated from them by a double partition. While every annoyance of this description is thus provided against, the engineman can at all times have access to any portion of the engine and give it requisite attention.

It will be seen, that in accordance with this arrangement, the half of the weight of the carriage body and of the passenger load will rest upon the driving wheels, and by this means furnish sufficient adhesion to enable the

engine to work with its full power, whatever that may be.

The force of adhesion being thus to a great extent independent of the weight of the engine, this weight can be reduced to a minimum, and the dead load decreased while the wear and tear of the roadway is diminished accordingly.

The car can of course move equally well with either end foremost, but as it is desirable that the engineman should, like the driver of a horse-car, be able to see the track before him, the end in which the engine is placed must always in practice be ahead. This necessarily involves frequent turning round of the car, to which there can be but little objection, as there are many different ways in which this turning can be conveniently effected, without the use of a turntable.

The most simple arrangement for the purpose, where there exists an open space at the terminus of the tramway, is to lay a circular road, and let the car run round it. When circumstances do not permit of this method being adopted, one bogie may be blocked fast upon the rails, and the other being turned across, can be made to revolve round the first as a centre. But, probably, the easiest of all will be to lay a triangular siding into a lateral road or street in the neighbourhood of the terminus. For instance, let *A* be the end of the track, and *B* the nearest side street before arriving at *A*. *C* and *C*# are sidings laid in symmetrical curves from the main line to a point where they connect, *d*, and are prolonged for the length of a car to *B*. The car turns from the main line along *C* towards *B*, and is then backed on to it again over *C*#, when it arrives at *A* in a reverse position ready for its return journey. This operation will not occupy more than half a minute of time.

Mathematical diagram

The bogie system is peculiarly adapted to the employment of a steering apparatus, and is therefore especially suited for use upon single lines of tramway, where it is constantly necessary to shunt into sidings. The same apparatus enables it also, in case of its getting off the track, to be easily brought again on the rails, as it is unlikely that both bogies should go off at the same time, and one bogie can be steered on again with so little trouble that the passengers would scarcely be aware of the mishap.

Many other cars of different patterns have been designed and built, but none of them comply with all the conditions specified above, and it is quite impossible that any four-wheeled car, with the unavoidably long distance between wheel-centres which this system entails, can have the same advantages as those afforded by the double bogies.

Although the foregoing paragraphs by no means state all the merits of the car which I have described, or enumerate all the inconveniences arising from the use of a separate engine, enough has I think been said to show, that of the two systems, the combined car and engine is decidedly to be preferred.

I would further remark, that a car on the double-bogie principle can be made of a size to hold 100 passengers as easily as it can be made to hold 20, and that it can be used on tramways or railways of any description.

Having now shown the manner in which a car with mechanical motor can be most advantageously constructed, it remains to be considered what is the best description of motor for the fulfilment of the objects in view. As is well known, engines have been made to be worked by means of gas, springs, compressed air, &c., but I think it will be admitted by the great majority of qualified judges that—

No power has yet been discovered which in point of cheapness, handiness, and security, can compete with *steam*.

The question to be determined is therefore this: Can steam be used in such a way as to fulfil all the necessary requirements? and I shall now endeavour to show that this question may be answered in the affirmative.

The difficulties which have to be dealt with in the outset are these:—

- 1st. The size and weight of the engine.
- 2nd. The noise caused by the working of the machinery.
- 3rd. The annoyance occasioned by the smoke from the furnace.
- 4th. The noise made by the escaping steam.

5th. The difficulty which the engineman necessarily experiences in keeping a good look-out ahead, and at the same time giving due attention to the regulation of the fire and other arrangements, which the control of the steam in the necessarily small boiler demands.

1st. *The Size and Weight of Engine*. Experience shows that an engine of from 15 to 25 horse power is required for the efficient working of an ordinary tramcar where there are any considerable gradients, and it is found that such an engine of 15 horse power can be made to weigh not more than 2½ tons, and to occupy a space of about 150 cubic feet, without steam of higher pressure than 150 lbs. being required. Such size and weight place on difficulties in the way of its being used in the manner above described.

Since this was written, engines of a much greater power still, on the same principle, have been found practicable.

2nd. *Noise of Machinery*. This can easily be got rid of by a proper mode of construction and careful workmanship in the details.

3rd. *The inconveniences arising from the smoke* can be avoided by the use of one of the many recognized smoke consumers, or by burning only first-class coke in a form of boiler which secures perfect combustion.

4th. *The noise of the escaping steam* has hitherto caused serious objections to its use for tram-cars. In common locomotives the steam is made to escape through the chimney, because the draft so produced is necessary for the maintenance of an effective heat in the furnace, and this escape is attended by a mass of visible condensing steam, and a sharp puffing sound. If this means of supplying draft is dispensed with, a substitute must be found, and this substitute must be of such a nature as to be completely under the control of the engineman, so as to enable him to regulate with accuracy the state of the fire in the furnace, and consequently the supply of steam. But this is by no means easy, as the boiler in such an engine as is here referred to must of necessity be of very limited dimensions, with but little space for reserve steam, while it is not permissible to allow any escape through the safety valve. At the same time the demand made by the engine itself is exceedingly irregular, having to vary each time the working changes from a level road to a steep gradient, or from a full load to a light one, or during its frequent stoppages to take up passengers, stoppages which may be of longer or shorter duration according to circumstances. All these considerations render it necessary that the engineman should have the most complete control over the artificial draft by which the state of the fire and the supply of steam is to be regulated.

It must be assumed that the total absence of escape steam in any form is an unavoidable condition for a steam engine on a tram-car, as it will otherwise be looked upon as a highly objectionable nuisance by the inhabitants of the houses situated on the roads or streets through which it may have to pass, and will have to contend against great opposition from such persons, especially if they should happen to be owners of horses.

The principle which I have adopted is exceedingly simple, consisting of the use of a small noiseless fan which supplies the blast to the furnace, and at the same time effectually condenses the surplus and exhaust steam.

There is no difficulty in finding room in an ordinary tram-car for a condenser with from 1000 to 2000 square feet of condensing surface, though so much will scarcely be required.

An arrangement by which the cold air from the fan can be made at will to pass round under the seats on its way to the condenser, or to enter the latter direct from the fan, enables the apparatus to be used for warming the cars in winter.

In the cars of two stories which are now beginning to be very generally used, the warming of the upper story can easily be managed by connecting one or two pipes with some of the tubes of the condenser.

The air from the condenser, except in so far as it is used for warming the interior of the car, passes from the tubes directly into the ashpit of the engine, acting as a blast of hot air under the furnace, and the inconsiderable amount of power expended in driving the fan is more than compensated for by the more perfect consumption of the fuel.

The power of regulating exactly the amount of blast thus enables the engineman to ensure perfect combustion, or to reduce the heat at pleasure, and even, by stopping it entirely, to extinguish the fire if necessary. In this way the production of steam in the boiler can be controlled with the greatest nicety.

As the manner of producing draft above described can be used on almost any kind of engine, it is unnecessary to enter into further particular concerning that which I propose to adopt; the supply of air to the furnace, and the condensation of the steam being provided for, the remainder becomes a simple mechanical problem, which has been already satisfactorily solved in practice.

5th. By this system of working the engineman is enabled to keep a sharp look-out upon the roadway ahead, at the same time that he gives the requisite attention to the action of his engine, all the cocks and levers to be used in stopping or starting the engine, regulating the blast, &c., being so placed as to be within his reach without his having to move. The furnace is made of such a size that it will not require to be replenished with fuel during a journey, and the condition of the fire can be effectively regulated, as above described, from one spot, while the water is pumped from the cistern into the boiler by a self-adjusting pump, and the cistern is supplied by the condensed water from the condenser.

It therefore appears that the engine above described entirely gets rid of the difficulties attending the regulation of the steam supply, and the suppression of visible or audible steam, while at the same time it possesses other important advantages. Thus it is only necessary to replenish the cistern with water once or twice in the course of the day, as the steam is constantly condensed and used again, and the water from condensation being perfectly pure, boiler incrustations, an important consideration in such small boilers, are greatly diminished. The blast of heated air to the furnace reduces the consumption of fuel, and the facilities for warming without extra cost the interior of the vehicles, will certainly contribute to the increase of their use in winter.

The engine will, as a rule, have power sufficient to draw more cars when required—an important qualification in the case of the contingencies of holiday or other abnormal traffic.

In working out the idea of "Rowan's steam-car," it is impossible to avoid being struck with the possibility of doing away with the heavy locomotives now so destructive to lightly-constructed lines. If it prove possible to get rid of the present weight of engines, it follows that iron roads may be laid down of a cheaper and lighter construction than has hitherto been considered necessary for railroads.

Again, if lines can be constructed cheaply and furnished with a cheap rolling stock, many places at present isolated could afford to connect themselves with existing trunk lines. If the Legislature will but sanction the construction of such lines on existing high roads, all the large expenses of railway making, such as earthworks, land purchase, fencing and bridges will fall away, and we shall soon see all country towns connected by an organised system of steam-omnibusses and goods-trucks.

There can be no doubt that steam-haulage on iron tracks is cheaper than horsing on an ordinary macadamized road. One steam goods-truck will transport 60 tons of goods 12 miles daily for twenty-five shillings. This includes driver, fuel, cleaning, oil, waste, and repairs and renewals.

With horses on the macadamized road, five tons at the most could be transported the same distance for the same money. It is the same with passenger traffic—one steam-omnibus would carry 300 passengers 12 miles for twenty-five shillings, while an ordinary omnibus might carry 30 the same distance for the same money; and the passengers in the horse-bus would not have half the comfort they would have in the steam-bus.

A steam-omnibus might thus earn daily by carrying passengers at 1d. per mile 3,600 pence (£15), all haulage expenses being £1 5s. This sum leaves a large margin with which to pay interest on capital and other working expenses.

In comparing such steam-trams with railroads, when it is an object to economise in construction, and to use rails only adapted for a very light traffic, it must be admitted that the rate of speed would be much slower, probably not more than half the speed of a railroad, but the public must be prepared to give up some personal comfort, if they can obtain regular and frequent communication at a low outlay in comparison with a railroad. The capital required would probably not be more than one-fifth, and the working expenses would be about one-half if as much.

The rolling stock and equipment of the line would cost about one-half, though it would give exactly the same accommodation to passengers. Another advantage on a steam-tram would be, that the train can be stopped in a few yards. This fact and the comparatively slow speed would render accidents impossible. Besides this passengers can be picked up at any point on the line, and the wear-and-tear of the road is reduced to a minimum.

There is no doubt, also, that such road-rails will be a great saving to parish authorities, as all the heavy traffic which now destroys their macadamized roads would be diverted on to the iron tracks, and thus the macadamized portion of the road would be spared. Mr. Ewing Matheson, M.I.C.E., in his book lately published, "Aid to Engineering Enterprise," has given great attention to the subject, and he says:—

"Although tramways for the conveyance of minerals and merchandise were in operation long antecedent to railroads, a new stimulus has been given to this branch of enterprise by the rapid extension of town lines for passengers. Bail tracks upon highways, for vehicles with flanged wheels will probably become more common; while, if steam-cars become fully established in towns, their adoption for longer distances on country roads will follow in many districts where the roadways are suitable. Traction by horse-power or by fixed engines, or by something other than locomotives, has been generally accepted as that which distinguishes tramways from railroads, but if the use of steam on highways becomes general, the classification, if it be retained, may also depend on the speed, and may so include in the category of tramways those lines on which the loads are carried by steam-cars. A rail track affords—after canals and navigable rivers—the cheapest means of transport, and the use of steam overcomes the greatest obstacle which has hitherto prevented an extended use of tramways. For while on level roads even horse-traction allows on a rail track an enormous saving in the cost of haulage over that incurred on an ordinary highway, occasional hills almost entirely neutralise the apparent benefits. But though a ruling gradient of even two percent, may thus effectually hinder the success of a horse-tramway, the latent or reserve force in a steam-engine overcomes the difficulty."

The grooved rails used on town tramways are generally unsuitable for service on country roads, and raised rails which cannot conveniently be crossed by ordinary vehicles are advisable; but as in many countries the highways are or can at small cost be made wide enough to allow a rail track on one side without diminishing too much the space for ordinary vehicles, it might prove advantageous in a Colony needing development, and where new roads are being made to lay out such roads, so that a tramway for steam-cars might be added at a future time. If a line can be laid in this way many of the expenses incurred in a railway project for land and works can be avoided; and as the maximum speed need not exceed ten miles per hour, and as the cars can at such a speed be stopped within half their own length, no fencing of the track nor signal apparatus is necessary.

A tramway of this sort might be of great convenience in wide, sparsely-peopled districts—as, instead of stations few and far between—passengers and light goods could be taken up on the route, or at any rate at all cross roads; platforms or cranes for heavier merchandise being only provided at special places. In districts with only a small traffic a more frequent, and therefore a more convenient service could be maintained than the same expenditure on a railway, even of narrow gauge, would allow. For instance, on a road ten or thirty miles long from a seaport or railway station, where a traffic of only one hundred passengers and 20 tons of goods each way per day had to be carried, one mixed train, for goods and passengers, would suffice, and if the load were divided over two or more trains, the mileage would be proportionately and unprofitably increased, as the train even for the diminished load must still have a certain number of vehicles. But if instead of one railway train, four steam-cars, two for passengers, and two for goods were running each way at suitable intervals daily, the service would be more convenient and probably cheaper.

With the view of assisting to carry out a system of tramways for steam-cars, we append four sketches as types of cars which may be found useful.

Fig. 1 is an open goods-truck capable of taking—say, 10 tons of goods. A few passengers may be accommodated in the compartment behind, or this may be altogether omitted. We should suggest keeping goods-trucks as much as possible of the same type as the waggons of the line to which the steam-tramway or light railway acts as feeder. This will avoid the expense and trouble of shifting cargoes at the junction.

Fig. 2 shows a composite car for two classes of passengers and luggage. The steam-car is shown dragging a goods-truck after it.

If the gradients permit, there is no reason why any steam-car should not drag several waggons after it. The steam-car may be constructed to have the same power as a 15-ton locomotive.

Fig. 3 shows a steam-car built on the same plan as a railway carriage. This car could be attached to an ordinary train, if necessary, and proceed on a journey without shifting passengers—but this will not be advisable in passenger traffic. For light railways this car would be well suited.

The engine is 40 H.P., and when the car is loaded, there would be 14 tons on the driving wheels, while the total weight of the car with 60 passengers would not exceed 21 tons.

On a railway 60 passengers would require one 15-ton locomotive and two coaches, with a total train-weight of 36 tons.

In this car we have, therefore, the same tractive and adhesive force as in the railway locomotive, and the same accommodation for passengers as in the railway carriages, with a saving in haulage of 15 tons dead weight.

The total daily working expenses of such a car may be reckoned at about £2 10s.

Fig. 4 shows a car with several divisions for different classes of passengers. The height has been reduced as much as possible to meet the occurrence of bridges with low headway.

Fig. 5 shows a covered goods-truck, with the engine run out, while a jack supports the end of the car.

The question now is, what is to be the cost for mechanical power? There are many minds at work on this problem. It has already been settled by experience, that the ordinary running expenses for steam-power on tramways—and no other motor need meantime be taken into the comparison—can be for 3d. per mile run. The charge for maintenance and renewal of the steam-motor is yet to be settled by experience; but it may be estimated approximately as in proportion to the quantity of fuel consumed per mile run, relatively to locomotives on railways. It appears that in the year 1876, the average cost for repair and renewal of locomotives on railways in England was at the rate of 3¼d. per train-mile run; and, taking the maximum quantity of fuel consumed per mile run by a tram-locomotive, with a car, as 8 lbs. per mile run, against, say, 32 lbs. per mile run by railway trains—in the ratio of 1 to 4—it is safe to take, for estimation, the cost for repair and renewal of tramway locomotives at a fourth of 3¼d., or 81d. per mile. Allowing 1d. per mile, the total cost for steam motivepower on tramways may be taken at 4d. per mile run, as against 7½d., the cost for horse-power. The difference, 3¼d. per mile, amounts to 22 per cent, of the receipts, and to 7¼ per cent, per year on the capital cost. It thus appears that the saving by the substitution of steam-power for horsepower on tramways would afford a dividend of 7¼ per cent, on the actual capital expenditure. The prospect is even better than this, for the tramways to be constructed in the future will be made at a much more moderate outlay than the pioneer tramways, which, like many of the earlier railways, were constructed mainly for the promotion of private interests.

Memoranda by Compiler.

The Inventor of these cars is W. R. Rowan, C.E., Managing Director of the "Scandia" Company of Copenhagen, whose Railway Carriage Works are at Randers, in Jutland. Messrs. Kitson & Co., of Leeds, the

well-known engine manufacturers, have undertaken the manufacture both of cars combined with engines as used in the Berlin trials, and of separated, noiseless, steamless, and smokeless engines which can be used in drawing ordinary tram-cars.

Messrs. Kitson and Co. (whose reputation is a guarantee for the work turned out) have decided on adopting the system known as "Rowan's Steam-Car" as the most advantageous method of substituting mechanical power for horse-power on tramways. They manufacture both steam-cars and separate engines, both of which are considered to have produced the best results hitherto obtained in point of economy and efficiency; they show neither smoke nor steam in *any weather*, and fully conform to the Board of Trade regulations in every respect. In the "Engineer" of Jan. 18th, 1878, may be seen a short account of some of the results obtained from one of these "dummy" engines working on the Leeds tramway line. This engine was afterwards run on the Dewsbury, Batley, and Birstall Tramways, from March 26 to April 13, 1878, with the following results:—

The above mileage includes *100 miles* run, *with two cars attached*, which were *invariably full*.

The engine has since been purchased for the Rouen tramways in France.

It should be borne in mind that, while first-class results are attained by the separate engines, these results are greatly enhanced in having the engine and car combined. In both the machinery is thoroughly protected from mud and dust, lessening thereby enormously the cost of repairs, but, in the combined car, owing to a considerable portion of the weight being borne upon the driving wheels, the adhesive power of the engine is increased by the load which it has to draw. The combined car, with two tons less dead than the separated engine and car, has the same adhesive power, and can ascend a gradient of 1 in 15 with a load which the separated engine would fail to draw up 1 in 20. Again, the steam-car on 1 in 30 has an excess of power over the detached engine to 1 in 40.

In the combined car, also, the combination increases the steadiness of both engine and car. The steam-car is shorter than the separate engine and car, or than a pair of horses and car—an important point in town traffic.

A new system is applied to the condensation of the steam, and to the combustion of the fuel and surplus steam in the furnace; for obvious reasons, details cannot be entered into here. The draught of the furnace is so completely under the control of the driver, that the generating of steam can be proportional to the amount required whereby the greatest results are obtained with least waste. These are not random assertions, but have been verified in England and on the Continent before some of the first practical engineers of the day.

Either separate engine or combined car can work round curves of as little as 45ft. radius. or up grades as steep as 1 in 15 with a full load. The combined cars are so constructed that ordinary cars can be attached to them if required, the power of the engine being ample on ordinary grades. They are also so constructed that the engine and bogie can be run out if required, either to be employed in another car, or to be replaced in case of accident, either by another engine or by a simple bogie, so as to allow the car to be drawn away by horses. The engine is so separated from the passenger portion of the car that *absolutely no heat* is felt from the engine, while a portion of the exhaust steam can be utilised in warming the car in winter. There is no puffing or other noise; and nothing to frighten either horse or man—simply an ornamental-looking car moving along quietly without visible motive power.

The saving effected by using steam instead of horse-power as a motor is now generally computed at from 15s. to £1 per car per diem.

Recapitulation of Some of the Special Advantages of Messrs. Kitson's Separate Tramway Engines and Steam Cars.

Some of the principal advantages of these engines are:—

- The complete manner in which the machinery is all enclosed and protected from dust, dirt, &c., together with—
- The accessibility of all parts of the machinery to the engine-driver at any moment for oiling, &c.
- The complete manner in which the steam is condensed and disposed of without objectionable noise,
- The powerful blast of hot air to the furnace, controllable at will by the driver.
- The power of generating steam just as required for long or short efforts of speed and traction.

Besides these advantages, common to all the engines, the steam-car (*i.e.*, engine and car combined, so that the weight of the cars and passengers rests partly upon the driving wheels) has special advantages of its own:—

- A great saving in the amount of dead weight to be moved in proportion to paying weight.
- Passenger capacity for equal length of street occupied,

- Steepness of grades to be overcome.
- Brake power.

N.B.—Unless specially ordered all the engines, both separate and for the steam-cars, are constructed with Rowan's Patent Condenser, and provided with all Board of Trade requirements, such as automatic brake, &c.

Attention is Requested to the Following:

[TRANSLATION.]

Prussian Government Trials of Rowan's Steam Car (on the royal Prussian Military Railway), in the Summer of 1877.

The trials took place, for the most part, on the Military Railway, but there was also constructed at Clausdorf, by the Royal Railway Regiment, a temporary line of, with steep gradients and sharp curves for the special purpose of these trials.

Results of the Trials.

Total distance run.—In the course of these trials a total length of about 1,000 miles was run, and during the whole time the engine worked most satisfactorily, without exhibiting any defect worth mentioning.

Longest run.—The greatest length passed over in a single trial was 28½ miles.

Speed.—In respect of speed it was found that the car was quite able to keep pace with the mixed train from Loosen, on the Dresden and Berlin Railway, a distance of 19¼ miles.

Consumption of Fuel.—The engine used about 7 lbs. of fuel per mile.

Water.—It ran about 9¼ miles without taking water.

Firing.—It ran about 7½ miles without fresh fuel being required on the fire.

Traction.—On a gradient of 1 in 40 the car, in addition to its own weight, drew up a loaded waggon weighing about 15 tons. On a level the car drew seven partially laden railway waggons, weighing in all about 85 tons.

Grades.—The car ascended with ease a gradient of 1 in 20, on a curve of 314 feet radius, 722 feet long.

Curves.—The sharpest curve passed over had a radius of 50 feet.

Brake Power.—In descending a gradient in 1 in 200, with a speed of 19 miles an hour, the car was stopped in nine seconds. On a level it was stopped by signal in four seconds in a length of 17 feet. When the speed was limited to that of the common street tramways, 10 miles per hour, about one-half of the above time and space were occupied in stopping. The engineman had no difficulty in stopping and starting the car on the steep gradient of 1 in 20.

The engine worked throughout almost noiselessly, without perceptible smoke or steam, the latter being completely condensed.

The whole of the trials. took place under the management of Officers, detailed for that purpose, from the Royal Railway Regiment, and the car was throughout worked only by the men belonging to that Regiment.

The above results are collected and attested by the Royal Railway Regiment of Prussia.

In some of the above particulars still better results have since been obtained.—F. C. R.

Report of the Commission Appointed by the Danish Government to Consider the "Rowan" Steam Car System for Tramways and Light

Railways.

This report, which is very voluminous, containing a full description of the cars, together with detailed particulars of the trials made, after declaring that the steam cars fully comply with the requirements of the Danish Law, as to safe use on public roads, the non-emission of steam and smoke, &c., sums up as follows:—

"Referring to the foregoing statement, the Commission considers the proposed system to be specially adapted for passenger traffic in and about towns, and for short lines running through thickly populated districts; and the Commission therefore considers that it would be advisable to grant concessions for such undertakings. *The Commission sees no objection to a trial of the 'Rowan' system on a tramway across country, provided that the construction be earned out in such a manner that, if necessary, ordinary railway rolling-stock could be employed on it at a future date. Even if, with a view to this possibility, the permanent way were made stronger than proposed, and the use of such steep grades and sharp curves, as advocated by Mr. Rowan, were not permitted, the Extra Cost of Construction that this would Entail, would, in our Opinion, be Counterbalanced by Cheaper Working and a Diminution in the Yearly Expenses.*"

December, 1877.

(Signed)

Koch,
Tegner,
E. Dalgas,
C. Bayer,
Otto Busse.

For further information respecting prices, etc., apply to the undersigned,

F. C. Rowan,

Sole agent in the Australasian Colonies for Messrs. Kitson and Co., of Leeds, and for the "Scandia" Company of Copenhagen.

Address: 57, Bourke Street, West, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Lyon and Blair, Steam Printers and Lithographers, Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Diagram of a train carriage

Diagram of a train carriage

Diagram of a train carriage

Diagram of a train carriage

Diagram of a train carriage

Report on Proposed System of Tramways for Roslyn, Half-Way Bush, and Surrounding Districts.

December, 1878 Reid and Duncans, *Civil Engineers*.

Graphic border Dunedin: Mackay, Bkacken, and Co., General Printers, Moray Place. MDCCCLXXVIII

View showing Dummy and Car ascending an Incline of 1 in 6.

To Property Holders, and Residents in the Roslyn, Half-Way Bush, and surrounding Districts,—

graphic border

GENTLEMEN,—

THROUGH our official connection with the Roslyn Council, we imagine it will not be out of place to bring

before you a scheme for the purpose of laying down a system of Tramways extending from the City of Dunedin to the Municipality of Roslyn, and which may be extended to the Half-Way Bush, with branches running towards the Boroughs of Mornington and Maori Hill.

Having had this in view for some time past, we have leisurely been acquiring the necessary information requisite for giving you an opinion as to the best system to be adopted, together with the estimates necessary to complete the undertaking. It is with pleasure that we now lay before you our views, and trust that it may be the means of assisting to develop a scheme which must prove of immense benefit to the City and its higher suburbs.

The Municipality of Roslyn is suitable at an elevation of about 600 feet above the sea level, and is approached from the City by roads having continuous steep inclinations, the gradients ranging from about 1 in 6 to 1 in 12. The distance traversed is about one mile, so that it is at once seen that a considerable amount of energy is expended in overcoming the ascent.

Owing to the difficulty of access many have been compelled to take up residences in the lower levels, who would have preferred living in the higher suburbs; and, as a consequence, the population has increased slowly in proportion to other rural and suburban municipalities adjoining Dunedin, which have easy access by rail.

From observation it has been found that the number travelling to and from Roslyn daily may be estimated at about 1800, while another 300 may be taken for residents in the upper parts of the City from Arthur Street westwards. With such a large travelling population it is apparent that sufficient inducement is held out to allow of a tramway being laid down which financially would prove successful.

PROPOSED SYSTEMS.

As previously mentioned, the steepest gradient may be estimated at about 1 in 6, and as this inclination is impracticable for ordinary locomotive power, some other system will have to be adopted which will meet the requirements. In addition to the use of horse power, several methods have been brought forward in different parts of the world for working lines of tram and railways up steep inclines. They may be stated as follows.—

- Tramways worked by compressed air engines.
- The centre-rail system to allow of friction wheels.
- The endless wire rope system, worked with stationary engines.

The first method has not yet been sufficiently worked to allow of an estimate being formed of its suitability for street traffic, or of the expenditure involved in its construction and expense of working.

The Centre-rail System was adopted in the Mont Cenis Railway, but owing to the complications involved in the construction of the locomotive, and its liability to be thrown out of gear, it is questionable whether it could be adopted profitably as a permanent mode of transit. Another objection to this system would be the position of the centre rail, which would require to be elevated above the level of the street, and this would interfere with the ordinary traffic.

The third method is now in use in San Francisco, California, where three lines are laid down in different parts of the city. It has worked admirably, and financially is a great success.

It appears to us that this last system is the most practicable, and will be most suitable for working the steep incline. Such being the case a brief description of the *modus operandi* will be sufficient in the meantime to convey a fair idea of the general working arrangements.

An endless wire rope, *lin.* in diameter is laid down on the incline between any two fixed points, and is weighted at one end so as to keep it always in the proper tension. The rope is supported on sheaves fixed in iron or timber tubes, laid below the ground. These tubes are made with a continuous slot which runs the whole length, to admit of the connection with the car. The wire rope is made to revolve continuously during the hours the line is open for traffic, by means of a stationary engine fixed at either end of the incline. The tramway has a double line of rails, and the tubes are fixed in the centre of each line. The whole of the permanent way is laid below the surface of the ground so that ordinary dray traffic will not be interfered with.

The working of the cars may be described as follows:—A traction car or dummy is constructed which takes the place of a locomotive and to this the passenger car is coupled. The dummy is connected to the wire rope by an arm projecting downwards through the slot in the tube and carrying at its lower end a gripping cast iron jaw; this jaw can be made by the car conductor to grip the wire rope, which then draws the dummy with the car attached to it. On releasing the grip the dummy is free of the rope and can be brought to a standstill by the brake, so that cars can be stopped and started at any portion of the incline, for the purpose of taking up and letting down passengers. The dummy and car are provided with brakes, which can be applied instantaneously, doing away with almost any liability to accident.

The working of the cars is so arranged that an equal number are travelling up and down on the incline at the

same time, thus reducing the amount of power that would otherwise be required from the stationary engine.

PROPOSED ROUTE.

The accompanying sketch shows the route of the proposed tramway.

The section from the city to the top of incline at Roslyn will have its terminus at the intersection of Rattray and Maclaggan streets. It will then follow up Rattray street to its junction with Arthur street and York Place. From this point it will continue in a direct line over the town belt, to the top of Leven street, Roslyn. This section will be worked on the endless wire rope system.

The objects for making use of Rattray street are:—That from its present steep gradients it is seldom used for dray traffic, and likewise with the exception of one curve, an almost continuous straight line will be obtained, and this is a matter of primary importance in wire rope traction.

Leven street in Roslyn is also too steep for dray traffic, and it is centrally situated.

The second section viz., from the top of Leven street onwards. The two lines of trains are shewn as branching off to the Half-Way Bush, Maori Hill and Mornington.

The termini of these branches could be determined at a future time but they are limited in the meantime to the boundaries of the Roslyn Municipality.

On this section the ordinary line of tramway would be laid down, and although some of the road lines are of steep inclinations, with slight improvement the cars could run safely with locomotive or by horses.

ESTIMATE.

The estimated cost of constructing and equipping the proposed tramways may be approximated as follows:—

The above estimates do not include any compensation that may be required by the City or any of the municipalities.

GENERAL REMARKS.

The estimated cost of the scheme may, at first sight, appear to be a very heavy undertaking, yet a little investigation will show that it will prove, independent of other advantages it possesses, a safe and profitable investment for capital.

Taking the present travelling population as a basis for calculation, it shews somewhat as follows:—

This amounts to, say, £7,500 per annum, which, after allowing a very large margin for working expenses will leave a balance of over £3,000, or equivalent to at least twenty per cent annually on the amount of £15,000 invested in the construction and equipment of Section No. 1.

Regarding the other section of the line, there is not sufficient data on which to base any financial calculations but it may be assumed that it will pay a fair interest on the amount expended.

But it is not the present travelling population that should be taken into account.

In all parts of the world where easy and cheap communication has been provided, the travelling population has increased to a very great extent, and in proportion with the advantages gained

In San Francisco, on the Clay street tramway which is similarly placed and worked on the principle recommended, it has proved, after running for 5 years, that hill property in the vicinity has increased treble in value and as a proportionate number of new residences have been built; the travelling population could be fairly estimated to have increased to an even greater extent.

The projected scheme should commend itself on the following grounds:—

That it will be the means of bringing the favourite residential suburbs within easy communication with the City.

It will open up and render valuable a considerable extent of land lying vacant in Roslyn, Half-Way Bush and Kaikorai Valley, together with the Dunedin Corporation Reserves which in all probability will be sub-divided and leased as building sites.

It will add to the wealth and prosperity of Roslyn and the suburbs generally, and will prove a safe and remunerative investment for capital.

We have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servants,

Reid & Duncans, C.E.

Plan Showing Approximate Route of Proposed Roslyn Tramway

Mr. R. Stout, M.P.C., addressed his constituents at the Forbury School-house on Friday, 6th inst. Mr. Rutherford was in the chair. There were about 80 electors present.

Mr. STOUT said that he appeared before them that evening because he always considered that it was the duty and privilege of a representative to address his constituents, in order to give an account of the trust which they had reposed in him. If it should happen that he and his constituents disagreed, then it would be the duty of such representative to retire from his position. It was more particularly the duty of a politician to meet his constituents on the present occasion, in view of the impending changes which were about to be carried out. If the Provinces were abolished he intended to retire from political life, and in such case his present address might be regarded as being his farewell speech to them. He therefore thanked them now for the many kindnesses which he had received at the hands of the electors of the Caversham district. He would have to ask their attention for a somewhat longer time than usual that evening, in order that they might come to a rational conclusion on the various schemes which were at present before the public of the Colony. There was no greater curse to New Zealand than apathy on the part of electorates. Many would remember the stand taken in the year 1870 against the grand scheme introduced by Mr. Vogel; many protested against it—not that the scheme was bad in itself, but that in one involving such grave changes the people should be consulted, and calmly discuss the matter. But unfortunately they did not do so, but said, "We will have no discussion; we want the scheme, and nothing but it." This impending Abolition is the fruit of the action then taken by the electorate. Had the people shown a firm front when that change was first introduced, and told their legislators in the Assembly that they would not allow it, they would not now behold a scene in the New Zealand Parliament which was not to be found elsewhere, namely, a Parliament without an Opposition. Schemes involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands passed in a single night without criticism or discussion. This was one of the many things from which the electorate had to suffer in consequence of its not discussing these measures as they should have been. If those whom the people in Otago termed obstructionists had their way, and some scheme adopted for the purpose of securing to it its own revenue, and providing for financial separation, they would not have suffered as they had done in past years, and as they should suffer in the future. Before dealing with General Government politics he would allude to what took place in the Provincial Council during its last session. When the Council met, Mr. Reid was in office. The schemes which he brought down in reference to the proclamation of Hundreds, and also the selection of blocks of land for deferred payments, were approved of. Nothing was opposed until the Estimates came on for consideration; then a cry arose about turning out the Government. The Opposition comprised many of the members for Southland, who thought that their district was being slighted. The question at issue was not one of principle, but one of the distribution of money throughout the various districts. It was this which led to the defeat of the Reid Government. He was not going to mention names, as he always wished to avoid personalities. The Reid party, however, again returned to power, and of course they all now knew who constituted the Executive. It was unfortunate that the Reid Government should have been put out on a question in which no principle was involved beyond the mere expenditure of money, as large capital was being made out of it in the General Assembly. He need not point out to them the various bills which had been passed by the Provincial Council during its last session. There was a matter which he had opposed most strongly—that was, the introduction into the Otago Harbour Bill of the vicious principle of nomineeism. He contended that its members should be elected by the people, and not by the Government. He called for division after division, for the purpose of having the principle of nomineeism eliminated from the bill. The Provincial Council, however, was in favour of it, and it was carried. Referring to the land question, he said that he knew many who were then in the room, and who had only recently arrived in the district, were probably ignorant of its provisions and history. He would point out what had been the nature of the agitation which had taken place in reference to it. He did not intend to deal with the regulation which had been made by Sir George Grey in reference to it, but would come down to the year 1865, when the run holders' licenses having nearly expired, and the Province at that time not being in a good financial position, they offered to give an increased rent for their runs, on condition of the Government granting them an extension of their leases for 10 years, they also offering to give 3s. 6d a head for cattle, and 7d. a head for sheep, which they would depasture on the runs held by them. This was agreed to, and became the Waste Lands Act of 1866, which continued in force until 1869,

when an Act termed the Otago Hundreds Regulation Act was carried. It provided that the runholder should be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of 2s. 6d. an acre, and also that the land opened should contain a certain portion of agricultural land. This was not approved of by the Council, which resolved not to open any land under these provisions. Mr. Stout then sketched the history of the land legislation down to the year 1872, and the changes he desired. He had advocated that the landed estate of the Province should not be sold at all, but that they should adopt a State leasing system, as this, he considered, was the only way of effectually preventing a monopoly in land. On the occasion of his speech at Caversham last year, he pointed out some of the benefits which would result from it if carried into effect. Land was not ordinary property, as it was limited in quantity. The earth had been well termed the mother of everything, and being limited in quantity, it must necessarily be a monopoly. Great evils had resulted from it in the Old Country, and they were beginning to make themselves felt in this Colony already. The only way to avoid the evils of landlordism was to adopt a State leasing system. When he first brought this under the notice of the public he introduced nothing new, as it had been discussed previously by political philosophers. Though he had at first met with considerable opposition in reference to it, the feeling of the people in Otago was now more in its favour. In Victoria Messrs. Higinbotham and Grant, and others, had, in the Assembly of that Colony, supported the principle of the State leasing its lands. If the electors would only consider the matter they would see that the people had the right to the use of the land, and, if put out of it, to be paid compensation for any improvements which they might have effected upon it. This was no new system, as it was carried out by large capitalists on their private estates, and when such was the case, why could not the same thing prevail in the case of the public estate? Ten years ago the flat, there, was worth but little, but it had since risen in value. This was not due to any act of the proprietors, but rather to the whole country. Why, then, should the former get the whole of the benefit? The educational reserves of the Province were also leased. If nothing were done to check the monopoly of land the result would be that it would fall entirely into the hands of the wealthy. In coming to the Colony many of them thought that they were going out of the reach of the evils of landlordism, and of lords and dukes who dictated to people how they should vote. In Canterbury, where the price of land was £2 an acre, large tracts of country extending for 10 or 15 miles, were converted into sheepwalks. He brought this land question prominently before them, because it was one of the main political questions of the day, and one which should not be lost sight of. He pointed out that they should be warned by what had taken place in Victoria on the attempt, in the time of Wilson Gray, to introduce a liberal law. The cry of Free-Trade and Protection was raised, and the land question avoided. Many squatters joined the Protectionists in order to do this. He had touched on this question because it led up to something he intended to say in respect to the

Abolition Bill.

And if there was no other objection to it than that it took the whole administration of the waste lands of Otago out of the hands of the people of Otago, that should of itself be sufficient to cause its rejection. He did not exalt the land revenue to the position of first place—the administration of our waste lands was, in his opinion, of as much importance to us the revenue to be derived from them; and this bill took the administration of the waste lands out of the hands of the people, and vested it in the General Assembly, in connection with which there was an Upper House that had done everything in its power to prevent a liberal land bill being passed. (Applause.) But that was not all the bill did, as he would show hereafter. It not only took away the administration of the waste lands, but introduced a most vicious system, that of allowing the people to be governed by nomineeism. He was not, as they would see, opposing this nominee system because it was introduced into the Abolition Bill. He had opposed the same thing as introduced in the Harbour Board's Bill in the Provincial Council, and because, as he stated, he would never consent to nomineeism having anything to do with government; therefore he was now simply asserting the same principle that he asserted in the Provincial Council before this question of abolition came up. Now, what did this bill propose? They might say they did not want a Superintendent and Executive. But this bill provided for a nominee Superintendent; and the only difference what they had now and what was proposed was this: At the present time the people elected the Superintendent; under this bill the Governor elected him; and they would even find in the bill that there was a provision for officers in lieu of Executive officers. He (Mr. Stout) quoted the 9th section of the bill, which provided that the functions performed heretofore by the Executive officers should be exercised or performed by any person or persons from time to time appointed for the purpose by the Governor; so that it would be seen they would, even if the bill was passed, have their Superintendent left, and their Provincial Executive left; but with this distinction, that they would have no voice in their election. Therefore, this was another step on the road to this vicious system of nomineeism. With respect to the general phases of the bill, they would remember that last year, when the resolutions were introduced in the House, he addressed meetings at Caversham and at

Mornington, and then said two things which were found fault with by the Press. According to the report of his meeting at Mornington he said: "To those who said that they must believe in Mr. Vogel's sincerity when he said he would not touch the Middle Island land fund or abolish the Middle Island Provinces, he would merely ask them to remember Mr. Vogel's action in reference to the capitation allowance, which showed what political exigencies compelled Mr. Vogel to do. Mr. Vogel's proposals for the abolition of the North Island Provinces must end in there being a common purse for the whole Colony. The whole of the lands will be administered from Wellington, and the proceeds of the land will be taken to pay the Colonial debt." Now, he would prove that every word he then uttered, everything he said, had come to pass; but what did the *Star* say? The *Star* said this: "We are told that in revenge they (that is, the North Island Provinces) will never rest until Provincialism is abolished in this island. This is the bugbear held up to frighten us, and if we allow ourselves to be terrified by it we shall deserve what will inevitably follow. If Northern Provincialism is maintained, our land revenue will pass from us." So that the *Evening Star* was so prophetic as to say that there was no intention to abolish the Provinces in the Middle Island, and that the people ought themselves to trust to Mr. Vogel's sincerity and Mr. Reynolds' honesty, and that the abolition of the Provinces in the Middle Island would not be carried out. He (Mr. Stout), however, stated at the time that the *Star* was making a statement that would within a year be shown not to be a fact, and he now asked the meeting whether he or the *Star* had been right in their prophetic conclusions as to the future? (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Mr. Reynolds, when he came to Dunedin, stated—and, of course, that gentleman was always very careful what he did say—that there was no chance of the abolition of the Provinces in the Middle Island. In fact, Mr. Reynolds told them that if such proved to be the case, he would retire from the Ministry. (Hear, hear.) Then Mr. Reynolds was asked what guarantee Canterbury and Otago would have that Provincialism would not be abolished in those Provinces. This was his sapient reply: "The guarantee Canterbury and Otago had that their Provincial Governments would not be abolished was, that if their members, and other strong members, opposed the project, a Government could not stand before them for an hour." Therefore, they would see that the question of Provincialism was brought before the people in the Middle Island under the distinct guarantee that whatever happened in the Northern Provinces, in the South it should not be interfered with. That, in fact, was dinned into the people's ears daily by the Press, and by members for Otago who supported abolition in the North; and yet those men now came forward and said that the Middle Island people had never opposed the abolition of Provincialism. But they must acknowledge that the people had been misled on this question, and led to believe, also, that it would not affect the Middle Island people at all. He (Mr. Stout) had said this much to make them cautious of the promises of politicians. The promises of politicians were likened by an American to a Western road, which opened out broad and fair, but ultimately ended in a squirrel track up a tree. That was the type of the promises of a politician of the present day. (Laughter.) Everything was beautiful and fine; everybody was to get lollies; but when they came to guage them they were not what they protended to be. He had brought forward this matter to show that what he said last year had been fulfilled to the letter. Now, it had been admitted that the abolition of the Provinces would confer a boon on the North Island. That, indeed, could not be got over; they might cloak it and endeavour to disguise it as they pleased—the funds of the Middle Island would be taken for the benefit of the North. He did not care how the matter was put. He would guarantee to show any man who would consent to discuss the question with him—he would, he said, guarantee to show any man, by figures, that such was the fact, and some of the papers had already admitted it. He would quote from the GUARDIAN of last year. First, the GUARDIAN said—"There is no foundation for the rumour at all,"—namely, that the land fund would be absorbed. Then the Guardian also said—"Would it not be better for Otago to have a rich and prosperous neighbour living across Cook's Strait, than a needy and struggling one—a neighbour able and willing to buy its merchandise and produce, and foster and increase its trade?" Well, that certainly was a novel proposition—that in order to get a trade for the Middle Island they must provide the North Island with funds. Let them apply the same proposition to commercial life. Let them take, for instance, a storekeeper who started business on the flat. He had got a small trade, and his neighbours were not able to buy his groceries, but in order to enable them to do so, he went and furnished them with money. (Laughter.) That was precisely the position which the GUARDIAN took up, namely, that the Middle Island should give money to the North Island to enable them to buy their produce. No doubt there would be plenty of buyers, if a storekeeper only furnished his customers with plenty of money. (Hear, hear.) Now, there were two views of

Provincialism.

There was the money view and the political or theoretical view. He was willing to meet the Abolitionists on both grounds. He did care whether they took the mere money point of view or what might be termed the theoretical or political point of view; in respect to either, he was prepared to prove that on neither ground

should Provincialism be abolished. Let them just look at what might be termed the money point of view. But first, he asked, were the Otago electors to look at every political question from a money point of view? For example, this Abolition Bill had not been introduced as he contended a Constitution Act should be introduced, as a form of government to be placed before the people under which they were to live. It was clogged with money questions. Here the centres of population were treated as in the evil days of ancient Rome. Whenever it was desired to carry a measure in Rome the mass of the electors were bribed by some largesses or bounties. The same thing was attempted by this bill. Municipalities were to get bribes of 20s. and road boards 40s. per £1 on the rate. This system of bribery was adopted in 1870, for Provincialists were told that if they supported the scheme 40s. per head would be given to the Provinces. Next year, however, some charges were taken over by the Colonial Government and the capitation reduced to 15s., and now, if this bill were carried, there would be no capitation at all. This was the way attempts to bribe the electorate were made. No one could read the Colonial Treasurer's statement without seeing that he had tried to bribe Christchurch in respect to the fees and fines. Christchurch did not get what Dunedin got for license fees, &c., neither had they such a large landed endowment as Dunedin possessed. The Municipal Council asked the Provincial Council to give them the license fees and other sources of revenue, but the Provincial Council declined to accede to their demands. The Provincial Council said, "You have got the city, and you can tax yourselves to maintain the streets. Thereupon the Colonial Treasurer stepped in and promised that if the Municipal Council would support abolition he would give them the license fees, &c., and a bonus of £1 for £1 on the rates. That a bribe thrown out to Christchurch and a like bribe was given to the populations of the cities. He said that that was a conclusive argument against those who said that Provincialism in Otago or other parts had been a modified Centralism put up to the injury of the outlying districts, and it was not doing the outlying districts justice. This then was the manner in which the proposal to abolish the Provinces had been introduced. It had been introduced and made a mere money question. The people had been told that if they would only support it they should get £1 for £1, the license fees, &c., forgetting what happened in connection with the capitation allowance—that this bonus for bonus must cease; that the Colony could not afford to give this bonus all round as promised; and next year they would hear of a proposed reduction, as had taken place in respect to capitation allowance. That was the bribery to which he alluded, and that was the reason why he had approached the question from a money point of view. Now let them see how the Abolition question affected them so far as Otago was concerned. Supposing the Provinces to be abolished, what would they save by it? He had already told them that they did not get rid of the Superintendent, nor of the Executive. The only thing they would get rid of by abolition was the Provincial Council; and by getting rid of the Provincial Council they would save some £3,000 or £4,000. All the present political offices must be kept up. First, there was the storekeeper; he had to look after all contracts, and could not possibly be dispensed with. He also acted as Secretary to the Superintendent. Then there were only two Executive Council clerks—that was all the staff of the Provincial Executive, and if the Provinces were abolished to-morrow, those clerks could not be dispensed with. Additional clerks would have to be employed to conduct the correspondence at Wellington. The Waste Lands Board Department, the Survey Department, and all the other departments of the Provincial Government would have to be increased, and not diminished, because of the additional correspondence that would ensue with the General Government. There was no simplification whatever of the Government functions by abolition; but, on the contrary, there will be a large increase of road board clerks, civil servants, &c., and the cost of the Government to the people would not be diminished, but increased. Therefore all the saving at the first glance—though it was not a saving—was the sum of £3,000 to £4,000 for the abolition of Provincial Councils; and he asserted that, even if it were a saving, it would be better to pay the £4,000 annually and keep the administration of the lands in their own hands. Now, what really did they lose? The appropriation of the capitation allowance was done away with. Their revenue consisted of the capitation allowance, gold export duty, gold-fields revenue (which was estimated at £8,000 only this year), tolls on roads, and their railways, and that was all; and the expenditure on roads and works, bridges, and buildings, exceeded the revenue from the sale of land. Therefore, when they heard people talking about the alleged wasteful expenditure of Provincial Councils, they should recollect that they could prove for themselves by figures that the expenditure on roads, works, bridges, and buildings exceeded the ordinary land revenue.

The Conservation of Our Land Revenue

was made a great deal of; the Provinces were to be split up into shires or road districts, and the road boards were to do very much what the Otago road boards did—although he thought it would be found it meant the maintenance of main roads, too, because shire councils got no additional revenue—had to maintain the main roads. The whole revenue arising from Crown land sales was made a separate account, and out of this account

the first thing taken was the interest and sinking fund on loans. That was the first charge made on the land revenue. The interest on our loans was taken out of it; the capitation allowance was formerly sufficient to pay that. The next thing that came out of the land revenue was the pound for pound on rates that were raised in the various districts. At present, 258. was paid to road boards—part was paid by the Provincial Council and part by the General Government. The £1 for £1 for municipalities came out of the Consolidated Fund. Well, that was how the land fund was conserved to them; and this would entail an endless cost on the Colony, because there would have to be separate accounts for each Province. It was the same as if the Caversham people had a large sum of money to spend on public works in the district, after the ordinary maintaining of the roads had been accomplished, and they went to all the road districts and asked where they should spend the money on various parts of the Flat. Now, the land revenue was Otago revenue, and made so by the Colonial Treasurer in his Statement. He stated that the Parliament of New Zealand was to decide where public works in Otago were to be executed, and where Otago money was to be spent. Now, that was at variance with all ideas of government, because it was allowing people not interested in the Province to decide in what portion of the Province money was to be spent. But it was said that by this arrangement our land revenue would be preserved. At the first flush they might think that the land revenue was secured, but it was the same as if they put money into two pockets and did not let one hand know what the other hand was doing. He would take Auckland, which realised from its land revenue £4,713 in 1873-4, and its interest and sinking fund amounted to £47,000. It could not pay its interest out of its loan revenue, neither would it have anything left for public works or road boards. "Oh," said the Treasurer, "that is all very well, but you must put Auckland in an independent financial position." The proposal made was something like Macawber's way of paying debts. When Micawber was in difficulty, he gave a bill; and that was what the Colonial Treasurer proposed when a Province was hard up; that Province must give a bill. The 17th section of the Act provided for the raising of Treasury bills should the land fund be insufficient to meet the land charges made on it. There were several Provinces in the Colony totally unable to pay the interest on their debts out of the loan revenue, but to enable them to do so, Treasury bills were to be raised. The Colonial Treasurer said they should be charged against the land fund, but what would be the use of that? Where was the future land fund to come from? What they were asked to do by the bill was this: That the Provinces unable to pay for their loans, &c., and give money to the municipalities to provide for education and other purposes, should obtain it from the Middle Island. He thought that, sooner than have this system of separate accounts kept up, and different expenditures, it would have been far more honest if the Government had said the Colony was to have only one purse, and that all Provinces should be dealt with alike. (Hear, hear.) It was simply nonsense to say that the Middle Island revenue was not absorbed. The land fund was just as much taken away by the bill as if the Colonial Parliament had been honest enough to say that they looked upon the Colony as a whole, and intended to put every Province in the same position. Where, then, was their gain? They only saved £4,000 at the most. But it must also be remembered that if the bill was passed they would keep the Parliament in session perhaps eight months in the year, at a very considerable additional cost. Members must be paid double, or perhaps treble, what they were paid now, because they could not expect men to go to Wellington without remuneration, unless they were men of capital. They might have two sets of men—capitalists, and political Micawbers waiting for something to turn up. (Hear, hear.) That would cost an additional sum to be voted; and in consequence of the complication of accounts, also, that would follow abolition, they would not be one whit better off—because these public works must be carried on; and there were the gaols, hospitals, and other institutions. It was simply, as he had already stated, putting the whole Colony on the same level. Those who knew anything about the history of the Colony knew that some had allowed miles and miles of the best lands to pass into the hands of a few capitalists for a few shillings. They should make those persons pay taxes if the Provinces had little revenue. He could show that so far as the bill was concerned, it conferred no boon—that it simply amounted to another way of taking their land revenue; and it would therefore have been more honest for the General Government to have said it was their intention that there should be one common purse, and that they should vote money independent of Provincial sections of the Colony. But the bill was "a sham, a delusion, and a snare." There was no boon given to the outlying districts. Did they expect the diggers were going to form road boards and tax themselves out of the rates? They had tried the county system in Westland, and had failed. The miners of Otago would have formed road boards long ago if they had so desired, and have got their subsidy at the rate of £2 to £1. Not a single digging district had formed a road board, the reason being that, they were better cared for by the Provincial Councils. Where, then, was the advantage they were to get from this bill? Now, let them look at it from a financial point of view. He had the Local Government Bill there. It contained 270 clauses, but there was but little difference between it and the present Road Board Ordinance. He then commented upon the bill. There was a further view in which to look at Provincialism. It was that which had been constantly dinned into their ears, namely, that they must get the Assamby to manage their affairs because they would be better managed. He denied that such would be the case. He held that things were better managed by Governments when the eyes were continually on them. They

did not expect, for example, when they got members to go to Wellington, that they would vote more in accordance with the desires of the people than if they had met in a Provincial Council. They had not that public opinion here which other Colonies possessed, and which was so necessary for the proper discharge of Government functions. The Otago journals were scarcely ever read beyond the bounds of Otago, and one only saw the other Provincial journals in the Athenæums or at hotels. They had not such a public opinion as tended to keep down those gross abuses to which all centralised Governments were liable—abuses such as had been perpetrated by the Assembly in the disposal of 200,000 or 300,000 acres of land in the North Island to a few individuals for a few shillings, and a monopoly of the finance of the Colony to one bank, that had the Colony's millions lodged in its coffers. The people seemed helpless to get rid of these monopolies. They would not get their affairs better managed after abolition than now. It had been stated that if they had their affairs removed from local control the greatest purity would exist. The fact was, there was the greatest jobbery and corruption in the biggest Legislatures. Local Governments can manage local affairs best of all. People on the Flat did not require to call the people of Morning-ton or the Taieri to enable them to expend their road rates; but the Colonial Treasurer admitted that in the past it had been practically impossible for the General Assembly to distribute the matter equitably, and that the House had voted money in the interest of localities without any reference to the Colony's necessities. They could not abolish locality-feeling. Indeed, the Colonial Treasurer perpetuated it by keeping up the present Provincial boundaries. Referring to the other point of view in which he proposed to consider the matter, namely, in its

Theoretical Aspect,

he would say this, that as far as Governments were concerned, there was no such thing as an absolutely perfect system. They should look at the various surroundings, such as the number of people and the requirements of the country. No one had yet discovered a constitution suitable to all circumstances. He did not mean to assert that Provincial Governments were the best that could be had, nor the General Assembly either. Governments must grow, not be formed in accordance with theory. The Provincial Governments were more democratic than that of the General Assembly. They heard it continuously urged in favour of the General Government that it tended to unite the Colony, and create a national feeling, whereas Provincialism did not. If such were so, why preserve the Provincial boundaries, as was done in the Abolition Bill? If they desired to keep up this national feeling, why not abolish Provincial boundaries altogether? Indeed, there was nothing to prevent it being kept up under the Provincial system. An inhabitant of Vermont, Ohio, or Maine, was none the less a citizen of the United States. The States, and State Governments, were far more independent and separate than those of the Provinces. They established their own courts, and managed the whole of their civil administration, and possessed far greater powers than the Provinces. It was nonsense to say that Provincial institutions had the tendency to destroy national feeling. To do an injustice to any portion of the inhabitants of this Colony, was far more likely to do so. He then referred to Ireland as being in point, and said its government was taken away by bribery, the same as was now being done with the Provinces. Did the Irish people become national in consequence of its Parliament being abolished? He believed more ill-feeling was engendered by the destruction of it than by any act which the English Government had done in regard to Ireland. (Applause.) When the people of the Southern Island would see their revenues being taken from them, a feeling would arise in it which would do far more to destroy the national feeling and unity than the existence of Provincialism ever would. If they were to sacrifice everything to centralisation, why not carry the principle to its full extent and have one Parliament in Melbourne for the whole of the Australasian Colonies? Then, should they want a sludge-channel at the Highbury, or a water-race at Tuapeka, they would have to apply there for it. This would simply be carrying the matter to its logical conclusion. He would ask them to look at the question from an ideal point of view. If Sir George Grey's idea was carried out, namely, that of federalism, such would lead to the highest form of government. There was a maxim in biology that if efficiency was required, it would be necessary to have specialisation of function. If they wished to make a man a good bootmaker, they did not seek to do so by teaching him other trades. If they desired to have able lawyers, they would not expect them to be doctors and clergymen as well. So, if they wanted good government, it would also require to have special functions to perform. Mr. Godley, the founder of the Canterbury Province, had even insisted upon the powers of the Legislature being properly defined. He said: "It is essential, therefore, that when the Central Legislature shall have formally abandoned certain powers to the Provinces, from thenceforward all questions of jurisdiction be referred to the Supreme Court of the Colony, and that this Court, moreover, shall be so constituted as not to be, nor even appear, dependent or partial." He regretted that the Canterbury people had not paid more attention to Godley's speeches in this discussion. Speaking on the question of the probable abolition of Provincialism, he said: "As communications become more frequent and easy, and as, in the progress of wealth and civilisation, a

leisured class comes into existence, able and willing to make politics a profession, and devote their whole time to such pursuits, it becomes possible and desirable to abolish Provincial distinctions, and to centralise governmental power. The extent, therefore, to which political subdivision should be carried in any political case is quite arbitrary." That federal government was the best form, they need only look to America and Switzerland. In the former country, on the occasion of the secession of the Southern States, they adopted a system of government similar to that under which they had previously lived. It was a great mistake to suppose that one large central government was the best. The larger the central government, the greater the amount of corruption which prevailed. In proof of this they need only refer to the resolutions passed by the Provincial Councils of New Zealand. These were always marked by a much greater degree of liberality than those of the General Assembly. In theory he altogether denied that a central form of government was the best, but asserted the contrary. The mischief attending the administration of distant governments was well pointed out by Godley in the following passage:—"If I were asked what is the main lesson I have learned from my Colonial experience, I would say it was the blighting and ruinous effect of distant government. I stand here myself, the agent of a distant and irresponsible governing body, to say that I think no amount of abilities, no amount of theoretical knowledge, no amount of zeal and disinterestedness, can over approach to compensating for the enormous disadvantage of being without personal interest in its local affairs. It appears to me to be as indisputable as an axiom in Euclid, that 'a country governed from a distance will either be jobbed and tyrannised over, or altogether neglected.'" What was true then was also true at the present time. He would also tell them that with a central government possessing more power they would get more despotism as well. There were many other things to which he might refer, but he would now cut short, his remarks by making a few further observations upon this question. He thought, so far as revenue was concerned, the abolition of the Provinces would not result in any gain to the Middle Island, and had also pointed out some of the evils which would result from the measure being carried out. Notwithstanding what the *Star* and GUARDIAN had said in regard to the abolition of the Middle Island Provinces, his warning had proved true. They could take his statements against those of the Press, with Mr. Vogel's sincerity thrown in, that if they supported the bill, they would, in return for the bribe offered them, be allowing the whole of their land revenue to be taken away from them, and power removed from their hands. The Christchurch people had supported it, so had Timaru; but the people of the latter district wanted all their own money. This idea of mixing up money matters with constitutional changes was a most vicious one. What would have been thought of it had such been done when the people of England asked for the lowering of the franchise? If they made politics merely a scramble for money, they would do more injury than all the good which national unity could confer upon them. It was degrading politics to do so. What led to political degradation in America? Simply that the Government of a State was looked upon as being a fit object of plunder. If, instead of desiring to see New Zealand progress, they simply wished to get money from the Government, then they were relegating politics to an ignoble position. If they placed confidence in what he had said, then he would ask them to use their influence among their friends, and demand, before any constitutional changes took place, that they should be calmly and rationally discussed. They should also demand from the Press that in discussing these questions it should defend its position upon substantial grounds, and not delude the people with the cry of "bonuses for road boards!" while at the same time their money was being filched from them. He besought them that, if they thought what he had stated was fair and reasonable, and not stretched in any way, they should think well before they consented to this inroad upon their Constitution, and which, once sanctioned, they would be utterly powerless to redress. (Applause.) He spoke for about two hours, and after answering a few unimportant questions,

Mr. BARROWMAN said he looked upon the abolition of Provinces as an agitation having its origin not with the people, but with the Press. Such a proposal should have emanated from the people. This was being forced on them. He then alluded to Mr. Reynolds' speech and to his declaration that the Middle Island Provinces should not be abolished, and moved, "That this meeting disapproves of the Abolition of Provinces Bill, as being a measure not in the interests of the people, nor called for by them." (Applause.)

Mr. M'INDOE seconded, and the resolution was carried without one dissident.

Mr. HALLIGAN moved, and Mr. MALONEY seconded, "That the Chairman be requested to transmit the resolution to his Honor the Superintendent in Wellington," which was carried unanimously.

Mr. THOMSON moved, and Mr. EASTON seconded, "a vote of thanks to, and confidence in, Mr. Stout, as the representative of the district," which was carried unanimously.

Mr. STOUT returned thanks to the audience for the vote, and for the patient hearing that had been accorded him, and moved a vote of thanks to the chair, which was carried with acclamation. The meeting then dispersed.

Printed by the "Guardian" Co., High Street, Dunedin

Lyttelton to Timaru.

THE entrance to Port Cooper, or Lyttelton, is marked by Godley Head, a bold promontory so named after Mr. Godley, head of the small body of pilgrims who first settled Canterbury. Passing up the harbour, the quarantine island and pilot station are passed on the left; while the right view comprises the Lyttelton hills, along whose rugged sides may be traced at intervals the remains of the first Public Works policy in this part of the colony. The "roads" on this side of the harbour were not nearly so successful as the "Rhodes" on the other side, at Purau Bay. Lyttelton was named after the late Lord Lyttelton, Chairman of the Canterbury Association. It seemed at one time to have a great future before it; but, instead of that, it only has a great tunnel behind it, through which all its prosperity escaped. In the early days, the only line of communication between Lyttelton and the plains was the bridle-path, which may still be seen zigzagging over the mountain. A good smart walk over that path every day is admitted by the obese to beat Banting hollow. The attractiveness of the surrounding scenery at a score or more of points in the ascent is said to be extraordinary. The steamer moors alongside the Gladstone Pier, so named after Mr. Gladstone, an English politician of some note, who, by-the-by, would appear to have always objected to be made a peer. Lyttelton has been said by some to resemble Naples, but it will probably be thought more like Venice, because it has at all events a prison on one hand. In this establishment is collected the crime of Canterbury, or, rather, so much of it as comes under the severer punishment of the law. The harbour works have mainly been constructed by prison labour. The other leading features of Lyttelton are the Orphanage, far away to the left, the church, the Colonists' Hall, and the Government Buildings. Leaving the railway station, we plunge into the gloom of the Moorhouse Tunnel, formerly known as "the 'ole in the 'ill." This is, so to speak, a burrow between two boroughs, and owes its existence to the supreme contempt for dirty dollars of a former Superintendent of Canterbury. There was a time when the project was scouted as "the wildest chimera that ever addled the crazy brain of a demented visionary." They knew how to sling ink in those days. Now people run through it without a thought, as if it were a work of nature, not of art. It is a curious fact that the same number of posts would suffice to make a fence over the mountain above the tunnel, as to make one through it. Work it out on paper with a pencil, and see if it is not the case. The change from the darkness of the tunnel to the light of the valley is generally admitted to be pleasing, though it is not easy to say why. The line presently crosses the River Heathcote at the pretty Village of Opawa. The house in the plantation on the left of the station is built of stone brought from the very middle of the tunnel. It happened that the strata were straighter there than elsewhere. a few minutes' travelling from Opawa brings us to the City of Christchurch, otherwise called "the Cathedral City," or "the City of the Plains." Christ-church was so called in accordance with the plan by which Canterbury was made in the first instance a Church of England settlement. The whole thing was really an ingenious device on the part of Edward Gibbon Wakefield—who eared no more for the Church of England than he did for the Shrine of Vishnu, to interest the "heelite and bong tong" at Homo in his scheme of colonization. It was certainly very successful as far as nomenclature is concerned, and the "churchiness" of the place is everywhere apparent—Even the streets of the city are named after the various bishopricks, and its squares after the Protestant martyrs. The best things to be seen a Christchurch are the museum, the schools, the public gardens, the Godley statue by Woolner, and the artesian wells. A row up the Avon on a fine day will be found a new sensation by visitors from other parts of the colony. It is the quiet, the stone buildings, and the deciduous trees, more than anything else, which give Christchurch its peculiarly English air. This is specially striking when it is remembered that less than thirty years ago it was a howling wilderness of swamp and sandhills, unbroken by any tree save the clump of native bush at Papanui, long since extinct, and that at Riccarton, now completely enclosed in exotic growth. An Australian visitor recently described it as a nice place, but very backward in bush-clearing. A caustic public writer once said that the founders of Canterbury made two mistakes: the first being the choice of Lyttelton as the port, and the second the choice of Christchurch as the capital. It will probably be admitted, though, that the settlement has managed very well to outlive its youthful indiscretions. If there is one thing more than another upon which the Canterbury people plume themselves it is their *ton*, and this too is plainly discernible in their local nomenclature. Thus along the line of railway there are found Lyttelton, Addington, Middleton, Templeton, Rolleston, and a number of others, each expressive of the *hauteur*, *pur sang*, and *je ne sais quoi* of the aristocratic pilgrims. The immediate suburbs of Christchurch are densely planted and populated; but, after quitting them, the country will be found very dreary and uninteresting for a long distance. One of the few objects to break the monotony is the Industrial School at Burnham, where the crooked ways of the juvenile larrikins of Canterbury are straightened out. Near this spot the "Transit of Venus" expedition established their station, in the belief that the stony plain afforded a good, steady foundation for their instruments. a very slight wobble in a lens makes a difference when the radius of sight is a hundred millions of miles long. It was a cloudy day, though, at Burnham when Venus transited, and the steadiness of the stony plains was all wasted, which was very discouraging to the stony plain. They will most likely have a healthy young earthquake on hand in those parts when the next batch of star-gazers come round. The Selwyn and Rakaia Rivers will probably be viewed without emotion. It was a different thing when the traveller had to cross them on horseback, or even in a

coach. He took an interest in them and had a respect for them then, and not unfrequently he became so attached to their cooling Hoods, that when he once got in he could not be prevailed upon to come out again. Engineers formerly decreed, *ex cathedrâ*, that the Canterbury rivers could not by any possibility be bridged. It is not the only mistake that engineers have made. The Town of South Rakaia is mainly remarkable for its hotels. Indeed, if the hotels were taken away, the rest of the town might be thrown into the bargain. This is the principal habitat of the dreaded simoon, the dust-storm of the desert, which occasionally obscures the landscape so completely that the traveller, who is compelled to keep his eyes fast shut, cannot see anything at all. In former days the interval between Rakaia and Ashburton, eighteen miles in length, was the longest and most trying stage in the coach journey; but now it is divided by several railway stations. The old song says,—

Let the steampot hiss till it's hot—
Give me the pace of the Tantiery trot!

and there may be something in the sentiment on good turnpike roads, and when time is no object It will not hold water for a moment, though, in the case of Cobb and Co., and the bumping thumping, dusty, dreary plains. Ashburton, five. years ago, consisted of a melancholy little accommodation-house, a blacksmith's shop, and a police station. It is now a town of two thousand people, and is increasing at the most alarming rate. It is the centre of a vast farming district and its distance, fifty-two miles from any port enables it to hold its own as a genuine inland town. In the course of a few years, perhaps it will be as large as Manchester, which it is said to resemble; but then, on the other hand, perhaps it will not. Time will show. *Nous [unclear: verrons]*. Allez! The Ashburton also is a very nice river to cross on a bridge. On the south side of it is the little Town of Tinwald, which has sprung up like a mushroom within the last year, and which threatens to rival Ashburton itself in the rapidity of its growth. The people of the district found it went against the grain to carry all their corn across the bridge, so they established stores at Tinwald, where they put their produce on the railway. It is pleasant thus to see the real progress in the cereal production of the plains, which, until recently, were looked upon as the sheepest of sheep country. "Wheat and Wool" is now the favourite toast. with the Canterbury farmers, just as "Wine and Women" was with those shocking cavaliers; or "A sickly season and a bloody war" with the fire-eating Indian officers. So easily do men adapt themselves to the circumstances which surround them. The scenery between Tinwald and the Rangitata is not exactly picturesque. In fact there is not any scenery at all, except the distant mountains, which are always beautiful. The principal peaks in view from the railway are Mount Hutt, Mount Somers, Mount Peel, and Mount Four-Peaks, the Rangitata River running out between Mount Somers and Mount Peel. This river, like the Rhine, has its legendery lore, which makes it the abode in olden days of an aboriginal myth named Rangi. This deity, or demon, or whatever he may have been, the legend represents as a highly-cultivated personage—a regular swell, in fact—and when the first bnlockdriver disturbed his ancient solitary reign, he was so shocked by the language of the intruder that he wished him a graceful farewell, and vanished from the earth for ever. That is why the river is called the Rangi "Ta-ta!" It is admitted that just a shade of doubt rests on the authenticity of this derivation, but it is at least as probable as many that are readily accepted. The Rangitata Island is a cheerful spot enclosed between the north and south streams of that river. It is not exactly the place where one would go to mingle in the maddening crowd, or plunge into the whirl of gay and thoughtless dissipation. Yet there is a good deal of society there. It is of the kind referred to by Lord Byron in "Childe Harold,"—

There is a rapture on the lonely shore,
There is society where none intrudes,

Nobody ever intrudes on the Rangitata Island. Two or three miles below the railway bridge is what is called the lower crossing—one of the most dangerous fords in any of the Canterbury rivers. There used to be an accommodation-house and a ferry-service there, but not even the knowledge of experienced guides sufficed to take the traveller safely across the treacherous tide. It was here that Mr. Hunt, head-master of the Timaru School, and his wife and mother, were all drowned together, some three years ago. In times of flood the Rangitata is a boiling torrent from bank to bank, tearing along at the rate of eighteen or twenty miles an hour. It is quicker to walk ten miles and catch the train than to try to wade it on those occasions; but the latter course is the cheaper. It saves funeral expenses. The district of South Canterbury is now entered, and the scenery becomes much pleasanter. On the right, seven or eight miles away, may be seen the Waihi Bush, and further on Geraldine, nestling under the wooded point at the foot of Mount Four-Peaks. The pretty homestead on the north bank of the Orari is a specimen of the home of the bloated squatter, whom free selection has almost improved

off the face of nature. From the Orari forward civilization everywhere asserts itself. The next station is Winchester, which has a good deal to make up before it equals its namesake at Home in size or beauty. The old-fashioned cottages on the right, just beyond the station, are the homes of a number of immigrants who, when the barraeks were over-crowded, were given £10 a piece in money or material, and allowed to build for themselves. It will be seen that, though the tenor of the arrangement was that they should have no fixed tenure, they did very well with their "tenner." Temuka is the capital of the County of Geraldine, but, as the Counties Act is not in force there, it takes but little interest in it. It contains about a thousand people, and is a considerable depôt for the grain trade of the district. About five miles away to the left, beyond the plantations at Green Hayes, is the famous Milford Lagoon. At present it is not visible from the railway, but when the harbour is completed its *locale* will be plainly distinguished by the forest of masts and spars. The two rivers which are crossed by long bridges immediately after leaving Temuka are—the Temuka—properly Te Mukaka—and the Opihi, and it is the embouchure of these which forms the sheet of water which it is proposed to utilize for harbour purposes. The intervening patch of land is the Temuka Island, and the melancholy group of cottages on the left is Georgetown, a private township, the privacy of which the public declined to disturb to any great extent. On the right is an old Maori settlement, where a few of the dusky lords of the soil still maintain their native dignity. The real name of this locality is Arowhenua, an euphonious word which the rough-tongued Europeans have corrupted into Elephanoa. The line now skirts the Levels Plains on the right, the Levels Station being marked by a dense mass of gum trees, and the Seadown Estate on the left. This last is one of the blocks bought under what are known as "Sir Georges Grey's Regulations," at 10s. an acre. To buy land under that system was better than finding a gold mine. This property was sold a year ago, by the original purchaser, for £15 an acre. The Washdyke is one of the chief stations of the New Zealand Meat-Preserving Company, whose works are clearly discernible with the naked eye. The smell of them is generally very clearly discernible with the naked nose. The Washdyke Lagoon is a shallow expanse of brackish water, a great place for shooting ducks and pukeko in the season, and for skating during hard frosts. We now arrive at the pretty suburbs of Timaru, passing on either side the residences of the older settlers, who have nestled down cosily under their own gum trees. After emerging from the narrow pass under the high bridge, the little Waimatnitai Lagoon appears on the left, and it was on the rocky point to the north of it that the ill-fated barque "Melrose" was wrecked on Sunday last. The viaducts opposite the pretty gardens of Beverley are the bugbear of nervous travellers, and were at one time certainly very cranky. They have now been strengthened and propped up, though, and will probably last our time. A circumbendibus course now brings us to the Timaru Station, on the very verge of the Pacific—misnamed, as far as this part of it is concerned, at all events.

Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean—roll!
 Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee in vain;
 Man marks the earth with ruin—his control
 Stops with the shore; upon the watery plain
 The wrecks are all thy deed * * *

Timaru is a town of about five thousand people, and is the centre of the largest grain-producing district in the colony. The name signifies "The Shelter," and, as a matter of fact, here was the only landing-place for many miles along this iron-bound coast. This, being resorted to first by whalers, and afterwards by the sheepowners of the neighbourhood for the purpose of shipping their wool, made it the nucleus of the present thriving town. What is it Virgil says,—

Urbs antiqua fuit; Tyrii tenuere coloni.

In this case, though, the colonists were not of Tyre but of Rhodes, that family having been the original settlers at Timaru. Visitors will doubtless look out with interest for the celebrated Timaru Breakwater. Let them scan the horizon keenly, and if there are any clouds hanging about, let them seek in them the object of their inquiry. The breakwater, in fact, is yet *in nubibus*. The first preliminary steps, however, have been taken by the contractors, at a spot a little to the north of the Railway Station, and, if sanguine hopes are of any avail, the work ought to be successfully completed within a very few years. It must be admitted that there is no instance on record of a breakwater being constructed of sanguine hopes; but, still, when all other gifts flew out of Pandora's box, Hope remained, and it augurs well, for the darling project of the Timaruvians that, in spite of all discouragements, they themselves have never lost confidence in it. The best things at Timaru are the hospital, the public school, the domain, and the flour-mills. For the rest it is in a hobbledehoy state, half-way between

village; infancy and civic manhood, and is, therefore, not particularly attractive to the visitor, though its own citizens are warmly attached to it. To use a Hibernianism, the surrounding country is the best part of the town.

My task is done, my song hath ceased, my theme
Has died into an echo; it is fit
The spell should break of this protracted dream.
* * * * *

Farewell! a word that must be and hath been—
A word that makes us linger;—yet—farewell!

Opening Christchurch and Dunedin Railway.

Time-table of Special Trains.

Leave Christchurch September 6th, at 6 a.m.; arrive at Dunedin at 6 p.m.

Special train for Lawrence.—Leave Dunedin Station, Saturday, 7th, at 7 a.m.; return to Dunedin at 6 p.m.

Special train returns to Christchurch from Dunedin, Monday, 9th, at 6 a.m.

A Popular Exposition of Mr. Darwin of the Origin of Species.

by henry fawcett.

No scientific work that has been published within this century has excited so much general curiosity as the treatise of Mr. Darwin. It has for a time divided the scientific world into two great contending sections. A Darwinite and an anti-Darwinite are now the badges of opposed scientific parties. Each side is ably represented. In the foremost ranks of the opposition against Darwin have already appeared Professor Owen, Mr. Hopkins, Sir B. Brodie, and Professor Sedgwick; whilst Professor Huxley, Professor Henslowe, Dr. Hooker, and Sir Charles Lyell, have given the new theory a support more or less decided. We shall endeavour most carefully to avoid the partiality of partisanship; and, as our object is neither to attack nor to defend, but simply to expound, we shall have no necessity to assume the tone of ungenerous hostility exhibited in the *Edinburgh Review*, or to summon from theology the asperities contained in the *Quarterly*. Such may be appropriate to controversy, but can give those who are unacquainted with Mr. Darwin's work no idea of his theory; which, all must agree, has been stated with the most perfect impartiality, and is the result of a life of most careful scientific study.

It will be, in the first place, advisable to enunciate, as clearly as possible, the problem which the treatise on the Origin of Species suggests for solution. And this cannot be done unless we possess a distinct conception of the words we employ? Let us therefore inquire, what is the meaning of the word species? The necessity of classifying the various objects in the animal and vegetable kingdoms was fully recognised by Socrates when he applied his dialectical mode of investigation to test the meaning of general terms. The object of classification was to carve out the organic world into distinct groups, each of which possessed some common property. "Family" was the most comprehensive, then "Genus," then "Species," and then "Variety." A Family would thus include many Genera, a Genus many Species, and a Species many Varieties. These divisions are to some extent arbitrary and artificial; for in nature many of the distinctions, which in certain cases seem most marked and decided, are not universally preserved, but fade gradually away. Thus no distinction might appear to be more easily recognisable than that which exists between animals and vegetables; but, as we descend to the less highly-organised forms of creation, the most distinctive characteristics of animals and vegetables become fainter, and at length we meet with organisms with regard to which even the highest scientific acumen finds it difficult to decide whether they are vegetables or animals. And, similarly, it is impossible accurately to define the exact amount or the exact kind of difference which is sufficient to place two organisms in two distinct Families or two distinct Genera. This difficulty and doubt increases as we descend to the lower classificatory divisions, and it is admitted that it is impossible to frame any exact definition of a specific difference. This difficulty is strikingly exhibited in botany. A most eminent botanist, Mr. Bentham, maintains that there are only one thousand two hundred species of English plants. An equally high botanical authority, Mr. Babington, affirms that there are two thousand species. A similar difference of opinion exists amongst naturalists. For instance, it was long a disputed point whether or not the dog and wolf were varieties of one species.

The following definition of a species is sometimes given: that two animals or vegetables belong to different species when they are infertile with each other. This hardly deserves the name of a definition. It is enunciated in deference to pre-conceived notions, and assumes the incorrectness of the theory which it is afterwards used to disprove. This definition can manifestly have little influence in diminishing that difficulty, which has been above alluded to, of deciding what is a specific difference; for it requires a test which can rarely be applied to the existing organic world, and is entirely inapplicable to those numerous species which have passed away. Thus it would be almost impossible to ascertain whether different molluscs, or insects, or testacea, are fertile with each other; and, manifestly, such an imperfect experiment in breeding cannot be made upon those animals and plants of which we have solely a geological record. Therefore it would seem that the classification of species must remain so arbitrary, that equally high scientific authorities may continue to dispute whether the plants of a limited area like England should be held to constitute two thousand or one thousand two hundred species. The question of species may thus, at the first sight, appear to be a dispute about an arbitrary classification, and it may naturally be asked, Why, therefore, does the problem of the Origin of Species assume an aspect of supreme scientific interest?

The common assumption that species are infertile with each other, and that the descendants of any particular species always belong to that species, at once suggests this difficulty:—How can a new species be introduced into the world? There is abundant evidence that new species have been introduced. If we go back to a comparatively modern geological epoch, it will be found that all the fossil animals belong to undoubtedly distinct species from any which exist at the present time. This is admitted by every naturalist and geologist, whatever may be his opinion on the origin of species. The geological record shows us that past species have died out, and that existing species have been gradually introduced. What is the cause which has produced this extinction of species? What is the agency by which the new species have been placed upon the earth? These are the questions to which Mr. Darwin has sought to give an answer. The same question has been asked again and again, and it admits only two kinds of answers. If the ordinary assumption is admitted that no two members of different species can be the progenitors of a mixed race, and if it is also supposed that the descendants of any varieties of a particular species must always be considered as belonging to this species, and that, however much in succeeding ages such descendants may differ from the parent stock, this difference can never entitle them to be ranked as distinct species—if these propositions are admitted, it then becomes quite manifest that the statement that a new species has appeared is tantamount to the assertion that a living form has been introduced upon the earth which cannot have been generated from anything previously living. It therefore becomes necessary to suppose that the same effort of Creative Will, which originally placed life upon this planet, is repeated at the introduction of every new species; and thus a new species has to be regarded as the offspring of a miraculous birth. "We are as powerless to explain by physical causes this miracle as we are any other. To hope for an explanation would be as vain as for the human mind to expect to discover by philosophy the agency by which Joshua made the sun and moon stand still. Our ignorance, therefore, of the origin of species is absolute and complete, if every new species is supposed to require a distinct and independent act of the will of an Omnipotent Creator. When it was supposed that every heavenly body had its path guided by a direct omnipotent control, all are now ready to admit that the cause of the motion of these bodies was unknown, and that this want of knowledge was not the less complete because it was disguised under such expressions as the harmonies of the universe. Those, therefore, who attempt to render unnecessary the belief in these continuously-repeated creative fiats, seek to explain hitherto unexplained phenomena of the highest order of interest and importance in natural history. Whenever this explanation shall have been given, a similar service will have been done to this science, as was performed by Newton for astronomy, when he enunciated his law of gravitation. Newton's discovery is now found in numerous religious works as a favourite illustration of the wisdom of the Creator; and it is now considered that a hymn of praise is sung to God when we expound the simplicity of the Newtonian laws. The day will doubtless come when he who shall unfold, in all their full simplicity, the laws which regulate the organic world, will be held, as Newton is now, in grateful remembrance for the service he has done not only to science, but also to religion.

Aptly, indeed, has the origin of species been described as the mystery of mysteries; for, as long as a phenomenon is accounted for by creative fiats, it is enshrouded in a mystery which the human mind is powerless to penetrate. Mr. Darwin has endeavoured to bring this subject within the cognisance of man's investigations, by supposing that every species has been produced by ordinary generation from the species which previously existed. Such a supposition is the only alternative for those who reject the doctrine of creative fiats.

We shall now proceed to expound the agency by which Mr. Darwin conceives that this development of, new species from previous ones has taken place. We think our exposition will indicate the great difference between the speculations of Mr. Darwin and those of other theorists upon the transmutation of species, such as Lamarck and the author of the "Vestiges of Creation." But it may perhaps conduce to clearness to remark

beforehand upon a Very unfair and very erroneous test which, has been applied to Mr. Darwin's work. Every hostile criticism repudiates. the theory, because, as it is asserted, it is not based upon a rigorous induction. There is much philosophic cant about this rigorous induction. An individual who is supremely ignorant of science finds no difficulty in uttering some such salvo as, "This is not the true Baconian method." Such, expressions, which too frequently are mere meaningless phrases were repeated *ad nauseam* at the British Association. They are revived in an article on Mr. Darwin in the *Quarterly Review*. There we find it reiterated, "This is not a true Baconian induction." In reply to all this, it should at once be distinctly stated that Mr. Darwin does not pretend that his work contains a proved theory, but merely an extremely probable hypothesis. The history of science redundantly illustrates that through such a stage of hypothesis all those theories have passed which are now considered most securely to rest on strict inductive principle. Dr. Whewell has remarked, "that a tentative process has been the first step towards the establishment scientific truths." Some association perchance, as the falling apple, first aroused in Newton's mind a suspicion of the existence of universal gravitation. He then had no proof of the particular law of this gravitating force; he made several guesses. The inverse square was the only one which caused calculation to agree with observation; the inverse square was therefore assumed to be the true law. The most complicated calculations were based upon this assumption; they have been carefully corroborated by observation, and in this manner the law of gravitation has been proved true beyond all dispute. Those who attack the philosophic method of Mr. Darwin ought explicitly to state how they would proceed to establish a theory on the origin of species by what they term a rigorous induction. Is such an example to be found in the doctrine of creative fiat? The greatest of logicians has remarked,

Mill's Logic, vol. i. book iii chap. xi. p. 491.

"The mode of investigation which, from "the proved inapplicability of direct "methods of observation and experiment, remains to us as the main source "of the knowledge we possess, or can "acquire, respecting the conditions and "laws of recurrence of the more complex "phenomena, is called in its most general expression the deductive method, "and consists of three operations—the "first, one of direct induction; the "second, of ratiocination; and the third, "of verification. The method here indicated Mr. Darwin has most rigorously observed. A life devoted to the most careful scientific observations and experiments, and to the accumulation of a most comprehensive knowledge of the details of natural history, has suggested to Mr. Darwin's mind a certain hypothesis with regard to the origin of species. The results which have been deduced from this hypothesis he has endeavoured to verify by a comparison with observed phenomena. Mr. Darwin has been himself most careful to point out that this verification is not yet complete. Until it becomes so, Mr. Darwin's theory must be ranked as an hypothesis. The eminently high authorities who have already welcomed Mr. Darwin's theory as a probable hypothesis, should induce the general public to welcome it as a legitimate step towards a great scientific discovery; and those who cannot take any special part in the controversy will render science a great service if they resent bigoted prejudice, and earnestly seek to give both parties in the dispute a fair hearing.

It has been previously remarked that every species is composed of individuals, which are grouped into varieties, these varieties being distinguished from each other by a varying amount of difference. For instance, all the breeds of dogs are varieties of the same species. The characteristic points of these breeds strike the most casual observer. There is the utmost diversity in size; the heads vary in form, the coats in colour and texture, the legs in length; and animals varying in these respects inherit also different constitutions and different capabilities. But all these breeds are considered to belong to the same species, because each variety of dog is perfectly fertile with every other. Now that it is found that a fertile cross can be with facility obtained between the wolf and the dog, these animals are classed in the same species. A less difference may very reasonably be thought to exist between the horse and the ass than between the poodle and the mastiff; but the mule, which is the offspring of the horse and the ass, is sterile, and therefore these animals are regarded as distinct species. The various breeds of dogs have been produced by a method with which, as applied to the varieties of other species, every agriculturist and gardener is perfectly familiar. Mr. Darwin supposes that a similar method is at work throughout the whole range of animated nature. He has himself for years made most careful experiments upon the breeding of pigeons, and the art may be thus explained:—Suppose a breeder is anxious to produce pigeons with some particular characteristic, for instance, a short beak. It is a law which is always in operation, but which, at the same time, cannot be explained, that the offspring of the same parents possess some individual differences. The most casual observer must have remarked the many points of difference which the same litter of pups presents. Similarly, when a number of pigeons, the offspring of the same parents, are minutely examined, it will be invariably found that there are already existing some slight points of diversity in the particular organ which it is sought still further to modify. If the object, therefore, is to produce short beaks, those young pigeons must be selected which have the shortest beaks. Another universal but still inexplicable law can be enunciated, that individual peculiarities are inheritable, and thus the young pigeons, which are bred from those which have been previously selected for their short beaks, will, on the average, possess shorter beaks than those which have been bred from unselected parents. A second selection is now made. The

shortest-beaked birds are again reserved; and thus at last, by continuing the process, these small differences will be constantly accumulated, until at length the shortened beak becomes a decided characteristic, and a new breed or variety will have been thus established. In this manner all our breeds of domestic animals and all our varieties of plants and flowers might have been produced. Thus a gardener may have raised a plot of seedling geraniums from seed all taken from the same plant. The flowers and leaves of these seedling geraniums will in all probability present some points of difference in colour and size. It may be the gardener's object to produce a flower of some particular colour. Amongst his seedlings he selects those which approach most nearly to this colour. Very possibly out of many hundreds he may find very few which offer a sufficient approximation. Let us suppose that he has selected two. As plants are more prolific when not fertilized with their own pollen, he fertilizes one of these geraniums with the pollen of the other. Amongst the geraniums which are raised from this seed, only a few will probably possess any tendency towards the colour which it is sought to produce. Those which exhibit the strongest tendency towards this colour are again preserved; the process is again repeated, until at length the skill of the gardener is rewarded, the new colour is obtained, and a new variety of geranium is the result. Then there will be no difficulty in perpetuating this variety by means of cuttings, which always produce plants true to the one from which they have been taken. And thus the horticulturists and the breeders of animals avail themselves of two universal laws of nature, which are—

1st. The constant tendency towards individual variations.

2dly. The constant tendency to inherit individual peculiarities.

These resources are supplied to man in the original constitution of organic life, and enable varieties to be produced when the selection is directed by man's intelligence. In nature, a selection cannot be thus directed. Is there, therefore, in nature any such selection regulated by fixed laws? Mr. Darwin maintains that this power of selection is supplied by the struggle for life; and the main fundamental object of his theory is, to show that this struggle for existence is ever at work, constantly tending to produce and to perpetuate, by definite laws, varieties of organisms no less distinct and decided than those which man creates amongst domesticated animals and cultivated plants.

There are those who dispute whether the struggle for existence is capable of effecting all that Mr. Darwin attributes to it; but the reality of this struggle for existence throughout the whole of nature is a demonstrated truth. Mr. Darwin remarks: "This struggle for existence inevitably follows from "the high geometrical ratio of the "increase of all organic beings throughout "the world." This is the doctrine of Malthus applied to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms. The mention of Mr. Malthus will, we fear, not induce conviction; for our leading public journal, no doubt very accurately, repeated the popular ignorance and prejudice with regard to Mr. Malthus, when he was lately described as that "morose," hard-hearted old man, whose theories "now are entirely exploded." But the intensity of the struggle for existence, necessitated by the laws of propagation which regulate the increase of animals and plants, can be abundantly illustrated by a few facts. "There is no exception" to the rule, that every organic being "naturally increases at so high a rate, "that, if not destroyed, the earth would "soon be covered by the progeny of a "single pair. Even races of slow-breeding men have been doubled in twenty-five years; and at this rate, in a few "thousand years, there would be literally "not standing-room for his progeny. "Linnæus has calculated that, if an annual plant produced only two seeds—"and there is no plant so unproductive "as this—and their seedlings next year "produced two, and so on, then in "twenty years there would be a million "plants. The elephant is reckoned the "slowest breeder of all known animals, "and I have taken some pains to "estimate its probable minimum rate of "natural increase. It will be under the "mark to assume that it breeds when "thirty years old, and goes on breeding "until ninety years old, bringing forth "three pairs of young in this interval. "If this be so, at the end of the fifth "century there would be alive fifteen "million elephants descended from the "first pair."

Therefore, as long as the earth is peopled with a multitudinous variety of living creatures, and as long as its surface is adorned with a highly-variegated vegetation, an exterminating war through-out the whole of nature must ceaselessly be waged. Who are the victims in this conflict? Shall we say that everything is determined by inexplicable chance, and that we have no further insight into the laws which regulate those who are slain than we have in a battle waged by the passions of man? The conflict is so severe, and so equally balanced, that the slightest advantage in structure will tell unerringly in the result. Mr. Darwin supposes that, in consequence of the universal tendency towards individual variations—a law upon which we have already remarked—relative advantages and disadvantages will always exist. An animal may require a particular weapon against its most powerful foe. There will be individual variations in this weapon; and those who possess it in its most effective state will prevail against the dangers with which they are surrounded, and will be preserved when their less fortunate companions are sacrificed. The laws of nature, in fact, select a portion to live, because a particular individual variation is possessed. Man, we have seen, is enabled to make a similar selection; but his choice is not unfrequently directed by caprice. Nature's choice is, however, regulated by undeviating laws, which never cease to act, but which depend on complicated conditions beyond our powers to analyze. And, when this force

of selection existing throughout nature is distinctly perceived, there can be no difficulty in understanding that an analogous process to that which is adopted by man in the breeding of animals and in horticulture, can secure the perpetuation in nature of varieties of animals and plants. Thus the struggle for life selects a certain number of individuals out of every species to live, because they possess some individual variation. In deference to that second universal law of organic life which has been enunciated, the offspring of those which are thus selected will show a tendency to inherit those modifications of structure which have previously determined the selection. Those who inherit these modifications of structure with the greatest intensity will be again selected in the struggle for existence; the process will be continuously repeated; and, as long as this struggle for life is carried on under the same surrounding physical conditions, the conflict will require similar weapons of defence and offence, and the modifications will constantly accumulate in the same direction. Few can deny the reality of this struggle for existence, and few can dispute the method of its action and the tendency of its results. The main ground of controversy is, Will this constant accumulation of inherited variations ever constitute a specific difference? The most hostile critics of Mr. Darwin acknowledge the value of his theory so far as it accounts for the origin of varieties, but maintain that he has failed to prove that the accumulated inheritance of these small variations, singled out by a process of natural selection, will ever constitute a specific difference, or, in other words, would produce in any organism a variation so great as to cause it to be infertile with the stock from which it originated. As we have before remarked, Mr. Darwin's theory cannot pretend to be completely proved; we are therefore bound not to apply to it those tests supplied by logic to which every proof ought to be submitted. It is a question of probability; and, as long as it remains so, everything which can be either said in support or contradiction ought to be fairly stated and maturely weighed. We will therefore endeavour to give a correct statement of the leading arguments on both sides.

Many common animals are sculptured upon ancient Egyptian tombs; many have also been preserved as mummies; and, when it is found that, during the three thousand years which have elapsed, the ibis, for instance, has remained unchanged, it is maintained that the process of development supposed by Mr. Darwin's theory cannot have occurred.

An individual would excite a smile of ridicule who, having discovered that Mont Blanc three thousand years ago was of the same altitude as it is at the present time, should consider that he had refuted those theories of modern geology which suppose that the stupendous peaks of Switzerland were lifted from off their ocean bed, and that every physical change in this earth's appearance has been produced by the indefinitely prolonged operation of the same physical causes which on every side around us continue in ceaseless activity. The extinction of species and the introduction of new ones are associated with periods which can only be described as geological epochs; and the time which has elapsed since the occurrence of the most remote recorded historical event is but an instant compared with the period which is indicated by the deposition of one of the strata which tell the history of this planet's structure.

The three thousand years which have elapsed since the animals were sculptured upon the Egyptian tombs have not sufficed to produce any change in the physical geography of the valley of the Nile. We have no reason to suppose but that the soil was then of the same fertility as it is now, the temperature of the same warmth, the air of the same moisture, and that the mighty river itself rolled down the same volume of water and sedimentary matter to the sea. The struggle for existence was carried on then under precisely the same conditions as it is now; particular animals and plants possessed then as now the same relative advantages and disadvantages in their structure; and the causes which determine success in this struggle for life have remained absolutely unaltered. But let us look forward to the geological epoch. Egypt may not be then what she is now; the land may be upheaved; the Nile may have changed its course; and many animals and plants which flourish there now will be unsuited to these changed physical circumstances; they will then probably not prevail in the struggle for existence, but will pass away as extinct species, and their place will be occupied by other organisms which are adapted to the changed conditions of life. The fossils in every stratum unmistakeably indicate such successive revolutions in the animal and vegetable world. No one will dispute that old forms of life are thus succeeded by new ones. The question to be determined is, Must we continue to confess complete ignorance of the laws which regulate the introduction of these new forms of life? A confession of this ignorance is made whenever we resort to the doctrine of creative fiat.

Those who, like Mr. Darwin, endeavour to explain the laws which regulate the succession of life, do not seek to detract one iota from the attributes of a Supreme Intelligence. Religious veneration will not be diminished, if, after life has been once placed upon this planet by the will of the Creator, finite man is able to discover laws so simple that we can understand the agency by which all that lives around us has been generated from those forms in which life first dawned upon this globe.

The distinctness of the groups of the fossil animals which compose the geological records supplies the most formidable argument against Mr. Darwin's theory; and, unless the difficulty thus suggested can be explained away, the main support of the theory is gone. We cordially rejoice that this theory is ultimately to be refuted or

established by the principles of geology. We were therefore not a little astonished, that in the discussions upon Mr. Darwin at the British Association at Oxford geology was not even alluded to. It was sad, indeed, to think that the opponents of the theory sought to supply this omission by summoning to their aid a species of oratory which could deem it an argument to ask a professor if he should object to discover that he had been developed out of an ape. The professor aptly replied to his assailant by remarking, that man's remote descent from an ape was not so degrading to his dignity as the employment of oratorical powers to misguide the multitude by throwing ridicule upon a scientific discussion. The retort was so justly deserved, and so inimitable in its manner, that no one who was present can ever forget the impression it made. Happy are we to be able to escape from such recriminations, for there is some chance of a satisfactory solution when we can appeal to physical principles.

The argument to which allusion has just been made shall be stated in Mr. Darwin's own words; for, so singular is his impartiality, and so sincere his love of truth, that he has himself advanced, in their utmost force, all the most important arguments which can be opposed to his theory. "The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly "existed on the earth must be truly "enormous. Why, then, is not every "geological formation, and every stratum, full of such intermediate links? "Geology assuredly does not reveal any "such finely graduated organic chain; "and this, perhaps, is the most obvious "and gravest objection to my theory. "The explanation lies, as I believe, in "the extreme imperfection of the geological record."

The mode therefore is plainly indicated by which the incorrectness of Mr. Darwin's speculations can be completely established. If the physical philosopher can demonstrate that the geological record has not this character of extreme imperfection, Mr. Darwin will doubtless be amongst the first to admit that his theory can then be no longer maintained. Mr. Hopkins

See *Fraser* of June and July, 1860.

of Cambridge, than whom no one can be better qualified, has commenced this mode of attack; and such is the spirit with which Mr. Darwin receives a fair and generous antagonist, that we believe he was amongst the first to welcome and acknowledge the hostile criticism of Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. Darwin attributes. imperfection to the geological record upon two different grounds:—

First.—An extremely incomplete examination has yet been made of any existing strata, and the animals and plants which are preserved in any strata can only form a very small portion of those which were living when the strata were deposited.

Secondly.—The strata which now exist form but a small proportion of those which have been deposited. Between the strata now remaining numerous intermediate ones have been completely removed by denudation.

The first of these propositions rests upon the following considerations:—Strata have only been examined with a scientific purpose for the last few years. The geology of many countries is as yet unknown; only those portions which now happen to be dry land are exposed to view. Certain conditions are requisite for the preservation of an animal or plant in a fossil state. For instance, when a dead body sinks to the bottom of the sea it will decay, unless there is a sufficiently rapid deposition of sediment to surround and inclose the animal before decay commences. In every case, also, the soft tegumentary portions of an organism must perish. The late Professor Forbes has remarked, "Numbers" of our fossil species are known and "named from single and broken specimens, or from a few specimens collected on some one spot." These considerations are important, and would suffice to account for the non-appearance of *complete* series of transitional forms. But Mr. Darwin frankly admits that the explanation of the almost *entire* absence of transitional forms must be mainly based upon those other causes which, according to his explanation, have made the geological record so extremely imperfect. The efficiency of denudation in completely removing every trace of a stratum, impressed itself upon Mr. Darwin's mind when, in the *Beagle*, he examined the western coast of South America. This coast along many hundred miles of its length is, by subterraneous agency, gradually rising with a uniform velocity of about three feet in a century. Suppose this upheaval has been continuous, the time will then have been comparatively recent since many portions of this shore which are now dry land were undoubtedly covered with the ocean. Along this coast the rocks are being ceaselessly worn by the action of the waves, and rivers are constantly bearing to the sea sedimentary matter. It will therefore inevitably follow that upon the bed of the ocean strata are being continuously accumulated. Similar strata must have been formed upon the adjacent dry land before it was upheaved from the ocean; therefore it might be expected that here would be found a considerable accumulation of tertiary strata. Such, however, is not the case; the tertiary strata are so poorly developed, that they will be inevitably removed by rain and other atmospheric agencies before the expiration of a comparatively brief geological epoch. What, then, has become of those considerable strata which were undoubtedly accumulated upon this land when it formed the bed of the ocean? There is one way, and only one, by which we can account for this removal of strata. As the bed of the ocean became gradually upheaved, different portions of the land, before emerging from the ocean, became subject to the action of coast-waves. Denudation consequently occurred; and the power and extent of this denudation is recorded by the fact, that of

these stratified deposits the remains are too small to enable any permanent record of their former existence to be long preserved. Such considerations, Mr. Darwin maintains, may be extended to the whole world; for modern geology requires us to suppose that in every portion of this globe there have been alternate periods of depression and upheaval. There is reason to suppose that life can rarely be maintained beneath water of a certain depth. It has, for instance, been clearly demonstrated that those minute animals which build up our coral reefs require a certain amount of light, and that therefore they must work at a fixed distance beneath the surface of the ocean. Coral reefs exist on the coast of Australia many hundreds of feet in perpendicular height. The bed of the ocean, therefore, must have subsided with exactly the same rapidity as the walls of these coral reefs have risen in perpendicular height. In a similar manner, a deposit of great thickness filled with the same kind of fossil shells probably indicates that during the formation of this deposit the ocean remained of a uniform depth; or, in other words, the subsidence kept pace with the deposition of sedimentary matter. When this subsidence ceased, and an upheaval commenced, the rate of this upward movement may perhaps have been uniform with the former downward motion. The strata would then, as they approach the surface of the ocean, be subjected to a denudation by the coast-waves during a period equal to that which sufficed for their deposition. By this denudation Mr. Darwin maintains that we have every reason to suppose that a series of strata might be completely removed in a similar manner to those tertiary strata which, as we have before remarked, have been washed from off the rising coast of South America. Against this theory of denudation, Mr. Hopkins has advanced an argument which is well worthy of serious consideration. In order that it may be stated in its full force, Mr. Hopkins's own words shall be used:—

"We believe the entire destruction of "any sedimentary bed of considerable "horizontal extent to have been of rare "occurrence. All the more important "denudations of which we have any "evidence have been preceded by large-"upheavals, by which the strata have "been tilted; and thus, while those "portions of each stratum which have "been most elevated may have been ex-"posed to enormous denudation, those "portions which have been least elevated "or perhaps depressed, have been thus "kept out of the reach of the denuding "agencies. The entire obliteration of a "stratum would require in general that "it should be upheaved in such a manner as never to deviate sensibly from "a horizontal position. In fact, this "approximation to horizontality must "be closer than it frequently may be "during the time of deposition, for the "smallest dip in an extensive stratum "would place it in a condition as to "denudation similar to that above "described as due to large upheavals. "The higher portions might be denuded, "while the lower remain untouched. "The Weald affords one of the best "elucidations of denudation accompanied only by the partial destruction "of strata. We have no reason to "suppose that a single stratum has been "obliterated by this denudation, which, "while it has left scarcely a remnant of "the removed beds in the central portion of the district, has left portions "of them untouched on its borders, "where they dip beneath the existing "surface."

We cannot here enter more fully into this deeply interesting question. Our object has been to indicate as much of the character of the argument on both sides as would convince the reader that the solution of the problem which is here suggested involves many of the most complicated and profound principles of physical geology. And yet Mr. Darwin admits that with the solution of this question his whole theory must either stand or fall. Why, then, have his speculations in some quarters been received in so unscientific a spirit, when he maintains that they are based upon scientific principles, and boldly challenges these same principles to prove their incorrectness?

It might appear according to the geological record that whole groups of allied species have suddenly come upon the earth. This suggests another difficulty, which deserves careful consideration. Low down in the chalk, groups of teleostean fishes are found in great numbers, and it has been supposed that before them no traces are preserved of any species allied to these teleostean fishes. Yet such allied forms must undoubtedly have existed, if this new species has been introduced by a process of gradual development. The whole question, therefore, turns upon the degree of perfection which is to be attributed to the geological record. Mr. Darwin's position upon this subject has been most powerfully strengthened by a recent discovery in paleontology. Sessile cirripedes are found largely distributed over all tertiary strata, and they are of the most ubiquitous families of testacea existing at the present time. Until within a very few years not the slightest trace of a sessile cirripede had been found in any secondary strata, and the sessile cirripedes might have been quoted against Mr. Darwin with even more effect than the teleostean fishes. It was, in fact, repeatedly said, "Here are a group of "animals so easily preserved that they "are fossilized in great numbers in "all tertiary strata. They cannot be "found in any secondary strata. Is it "not therefore evident that they could "not have been gradually developed, "but that they were suddenly created "at the commencement of the tertiary "period?"

Mr. Darwin would then, as he does now, have in vain besought his opponents not to place too implicit confidence in the perfection of the geological record. But within the last few months a skilful paleontologist, M. Bosquet, has sent Mr. Darwin a drawing of a perfect specimen of an unmistakeable sessile cirripede, which he had himself extracted from the chalk of Belgium. And, as if to make the case as striking as possible, this sessile

cirripede was a *Chthamalus*, a very large and ubiquitous genus, of which not one specimen has as yet been found, even in any tertiary stratum. Hence we now positively know that sessile cirripedes existed during the secondary period; and these cirripedes might have been the progenitors of our many tertiary and existing species.

Since, before this discovery, nothing appeared more improbable than that sessile cirripedes were to be found in the secondary period, ought we to regard the difficulty suggested by the teleostean fishes as insuperable? For who can say that in a similar manner advancing knowledge may not some day remove it? Already M. Pictet has carried the existence of the teleostean fishes one stage beyond the period when it has been supposed they were suddenly created. Other eminent paleontologists incline to the belief "that some much "older fishes, whose affinities are as yet "imperfectly known, are really teleostean."

Mr. Darwin appears desirous to maintain, as a probable inference from his theory, that every past and present organism has descended from four original forms. Such an inference is at once met by a very obvious objection; for it requires us to suppose that life existed upon this planet long previous to the deposition of those Silurian rocks which afford us the first traces of fossil remains. Mr. Darwin is consequently compelled to assert that fossil-bearing rocks of a date long anterior to the Silurian period were once deposited, but have been either removed or transformed.

Many of those who may be inclined to agree with Mr. Darwin that all organisms have descended from a few original forms will, perhaps, think that it is unfortunate to lay stress upon such a supposition. It is not involved in the theory, nor is it a necessary inference from it; it cannot, therefore, be advisable to allow speculative difficulties to add to the obstacles against which the theory has to contend. There is a great problem to be solved, and its *enunciation* may involve nothing which can even be disputed; for it is a demonstrated truth, that those organisms of which we have the first record were succeeded by new and distinct species, and that the same process has been again and again repeated. What has been the agency to affect this succession of life? All must admit that such a problem really presents itself for solution. Why, then, attempt to make the solution likewise indicate the form in which life was first introduced upon this earth? Transmutationists and non-transmutationists must agree that life was originally introduced by an act of Creative Will, and a transmutationist need not necessarily concern himself with the number of forms which were thus first spontaneously created.

In an earlier part of this paper we have endeavoured to point out the analogy between the process of natural selection and the method which is pursued by the horticulturist and the breeder of animals. The question will very probably arise, What has the horticulturist and the breeder of animals effected towards the creation of a new species? It is important to consider this question, because it will lead to the perception of that imperfection in the common definition of species which we have already alluded to. Breeds of pigeons which have undoubtedly descended from the same original stock have been made by the pigeon-fancier, so different in their structure that, if they were found as fossils, they would be undoubtedly classed as distinct species. But they are not regarded as distinct species, because they are fertile with each other. Man has never yet made two varieties from the same stock to differ so much from each other as to possess the great characteristic of distinct species, namely, infertility. If this is ever effected, it will be the greatest experimental corroboration of Mr. Darwin's theory. Man, therefore, has already produced what may be termed a morphological species, but he has not produced a physiological species. This is a distinction which ought to be kept carefully in view; for there is not any amount of structural difference which would enable us *a priori* to predict whether two animals were infertile with each other—this being the only reliable test of physiological species. Thus the horse differs from the ass in only two particulars. The horse has a bushy tail; the ass a tufted tail. The horse has callosities on the inner side of both the fore and hind legs; the ass has callosities only on the inner side of the fore legs.

Further information upon this subject will be found in a most able Essay on Mr. Darwin, in the *Westminster Review* for April, 1860

No trace of these characteristic differences could be found in fossil specimens of the horse and ass. If, therefore, found fossil, they could but be classed as belonging to the same species; but, when the physiological test is applied, they are at once ranked as distinct species, because the offspring of the horse and the ass are infertile. And, therefore, with reference to the classification of species, we often argue in a vicious circle. Thus, formerly, every botanist considered the cowslip and the primrose as belonging to two distinct species; but within the last few years horticulturists have unmistakably produced the cowslip from the primrose; and, therefore, it would appear that they might claim to have produced a species by the accumulation of the differences presented by varieties. Thus one species would have been generated from another species; and the great species question could be regarded as solved. But then it is at once rejoined, "This has not, by an ocular demonstration of the efficiency of development, been done. Our original classification was wrong. It is true we should not have discovered its error unless you had made your experiment, because, without such an experiment, we must have continued to believe that the cowslip and the primrose were specifically distinct."

We have now exhausted all the space we can claim; we trust we have devoted it to a candid exposition of the leading points of Mr. Darwin's theory, and that we have fairly stated the most important arguments on the other side. Our object will be fully attained if we induce those who do not know the work itself to peruse it with an unprejudiced mind. It is not for us to hazard a prediction as to the ultimate fate of the theory itself. Dr. Hooker, a man of the highest scientific reputation, when closing a most remarkable discussion at the late meeting of the British Association, used emphatic words to the following effect:—"I knew "of this theory fifteen years ago; I was "then entirely opposed to it; I argued "against it again and again; but since "then I have devoted myself unremittingly to natural history; in its pursuit "I have travelled round the world. "Facts in this science which before were" inexplicable to me became one by one "explained by this theory, and conviction has been thus gradually forced "upon an unwilling convert." Other minds may perhaps pass through similar stages of primary doubt and ultimate belief; but, be that as it may, if Mr. Darwin's theory were disproved to-morrow, the volume in which it has been expounded would still remain one of our most interesting, most valuable, and most accurate treatises on natural history.

Tom Brown at Oxford.

By the Author of "Tom Brown's School Days.'

Chapter XXXIII.

Brown' Patronus.

ON a Saturday afternoon in August, a few weeks after his eventful ride, Tom returned to Englebourn Rectory, to stay over Sunday and attend Betty Winburn's funeral. He was strangely attracted to Harry by the remembrance of their old boyish rivalry; by the story which he had heard from his cousin, of the unwavering perseverance with which the young peasant clung to and pursued his suit for Simon's daughter; but, more than all, by the feeling of gratitude with which he remembered the effect his visit to Betty's sick-room had had on him, on the day of his ride from Barton Manor. On that day he knew that he had ridden into Englebourn in a miserable mental fog, and had ridden out of it in sunshine, which had lasted through the intervening weeks. Somehow or another he had got set straight then and there, turned into the right road and out of the wrong one, at what he very naturally believed to be the most critical moment of his life.

Without stopping to weigh accurately the respective merits of the several persons whom he had come in contact with on that day, he credited them all with a large amount of gratitude and good will, and Harry with his mother's share as well as his own. So he had been longing to *do* something for him ever since. The more he rejoiced in, and gave himself up to his own new sensations, the more did his gratitude become as it were a burden to him; and yet no opportunity offered of letting off some of it in action. The Magistrates, taking into consideration the dangerous state of his mother, had let Harry off with a reprimand for his assault; so there was nothing to be done there. He wrote to Katie offering more money for the Winburns; but she declined—adding, however, to her note, by way of postscript, that he might give it to her clothing club or coal club. Then came the news of Betty's death, and an intimation from Katie that she thought Harry would be much gratified if he would attend the funeral. He jumped at the suggestion. All Englebourn, from the Hawk's Lynch to the Rectory, was hallowed ground to him. The idea of getting back there, so much nearer to Barton Manor, filled him with joy, which he tried in vain to repress when he thought of the main object of his visit.

He arrived in time to go and shake hands with Harry before dinner; and, though scarcely a word passed between them, he saw with delight that he had evidently given pleasure to the mourner. Then he had a charming long evening with Katie, walking in the garden with her between dinner and tea, and after tea discoursing in low tones over her work table, while Mr. Winter benevolently slept in his arm-chair. Their discourse branched into many paths, but managed always somehow to end in the sayings, beliefs, and perfections of the young lady of Barton Manor. Tom wondered how it had happened so when he got to his own room, as he fancied he had not betrayed himself in the least. He had determined to keep resolutely on his guard, and to make a confidant of no living soul till he was twenty-one, and, though sorely tempted to break his resolution in favour of Katie, had restrained himself. He might have spared himself all the trouble; but this he did not know, being unversed in the ways of women, and all unaware of the subtlety and quickness of their intuitions in all matters connected with the heart. Poor, dear, stolid, dim-sighted mankind, how they do see through us and walk round us!

The funeral on the Sunday afternoon between churches had touched him much, being the first he had ever attended. He walked next behind the chief mourner—the few friends, amongst whom David was conspicuous, yielding place to him. He stood beside him in Church, and at the open grave, and made the responses as firmly as he could, and pressed his shoulder against his, when he felt the strong frame of the son trembling with the

weight and burden of his resolutely suppressed agony. When they parted at the cottage door, to which Tom accompanied the mourner and his old and tried friend David, though nothing but a look and a grasp of the hand passed between them, he felt that they were bound by a new and Invisible bond; and, as he walked back up the village and past the churchyard, where the children were playing about on the graves—stopping every now and then to watch the sexton as he stamped down, and filled in the mould on the last made one, beside which he had himself stood as a mourner—and heard the bells beginning to chime for the afternoon service, he resolved within himself that he would be a true and helpful friend to the widow's son. On this subject he could talk freely to Katie; and he did so that evening, expounding how much one in his position could do for a young labouring man if he really was bent upon it, and building up grand castles for Harry, the foundations of which rested on his own determination to benefit and patronize him. Katie listened half doubtingly at first, but was soon led away by his confidence, and poured out the tea in the full belief that, with Tom's powerful aid, all would go well. After which they took to reading the Christian Year together, and branched into discussions on profane poetry, which Katie considered scarcely proper for the evening, but which, nevertheless, being of such rare occurrence with her, she had not the heart to stop.

The next morning Tom was to return home. After breakfast he began the subject of his plans for Harry again, when Katie produced a small paper packet, and handed it to him, saying—

"Here is your money again!"

"What money?"

"The money you left with me for Harry Winburn. I thought at the time that most probably he would not take it."

"But are you sure he doesn't want it? Did you try hard to get him to take it?" said Tom, holding out his hand reluctantly for the money.

"Not myself. I couldn't offer him money myself, of course; but I sent it by David, and begged him to do all he could to persuade him to take it."

"Well, and why wouldn't he?"

"Oh, he said the club-money which was coming in was more than enough to pay for the funeral, and for himself he didn't want it"

"How provoking! I wonder if old David really did his best to get him to take it?"

"Yes, I am sure he did. But you ought to be very glad to find some independence in a poor man."

"Bother his independence! I don't like to feel that it costs me nothing but talk—I want to pay."

"All, Tom, if you knew the poor as well as I do, you wouldn't say so. I am afraid there are not two other men in the parish who would have refused your money. The fear of undermining their independence takes away all my pleasure in giving."

"Undermining! Why, Katie, I am sure I have heard you mourn over their stubbornness and unreasonableness."

"Oh, yes, they are often provokingly stubborn and unreasonable, and yet not independent about money, or anything they can get out of you. Besides, I acknowledge that I have become wiser of late; I used to like to see them dependent, and cringing to me, but now I dread it."

"But you would like David to give in about the singing, wouldn't you?"

"Yes, if he would give in I should be very proud. I have learnt a great deal from him; I used positively to dislike him; but, now that I know him, I think him the best man in the parish. If he ever does give in—and I think he will—it will be worth anything, just because he is so independent."

"That's all very well; hut what am I to do to show Harry Winburn that I mean to be his friend, if he won't take money?"

"You have come over to his mother's funeral—he will think more of that than of all the money you could give him; and you can show sympathy for him in a great many ways."

"Well, I must try. By the way, about his love affair; is the young lady at home? I have never seen her, you know."

"No, she is away with an aunt, looking out for a place. I have persuaded her to get one, and leave home again for the present. Her father is quite well now, and she is not wanted."

"Well, it seems I can't do any good with her, then; but could not I go and talk to her father about Harry? I might help him in that way."

"You must be very careful; Simon is such an odd-tempered old man."

"Oh, I'm not afraid; he and I are great chums, and a little soft soap will go a long way with him. Fancy, if I could get him this very morning to 'sanction Harry's suit,' as the phrase is, what should you think of me?"

"I should think very highly of your powers of persuasion."

Not the least daunted by his cousin's misgivings, Tom started in quest of Simon, and found him at work in front of the greenhouse, surrounded by many small pots and heaps of finely-sifted mould, and absorbed in his

occupation.

Simon was a rough, stolid Berkshire rustic, somewhat of a tyrant in the bosom of his family, an unmanageable servant, a cross-grained acquaintance; as a citizen, stiff-necked and a grumbler, who thought that nothing ever went right in the parish; but, withal, a thorough honest worker; and, when allowed to go his own way—and no other way would he go, as his mistress had long since discovered—there was no man who earned his daily bread more honestly. He took a pride in his work, and the rectory garden was always trim and well kept, and the beds bright with flowers from early spring till late autumn.

He was absorbed in what he was about, and Tom came up close to him without attracting the least sign of recognition; so he stopped, and opened the conversation.

"Good day, Simon; it's a pleasure to see a garden looking so gay as yours."

Simon looked up from his work, and, when he saw who it was, touched his battered old hat, and answered,—

"Mornin, Sir! Ees, you finds me allus in blume."

"Indeed I do, Simon; but how do you manage it? I should like to tell my father's gardener."

"'Tis no use to tell un if a hev'nt found out for his self; 'tis nothing but lookin' a bit forrard and farm-yard stuff as does it."

"Well, there's plenty of farm-yard stuff at home, and yet, somehow, we never look half so bright as you do."

"May be as your gardener just takes and hits it auver the top o' the ground, and lets it lie. That's no kinder good, that beant—'tis the roots as wants the stuff; and you med jist as well take and put a round o' beef agin my back bwone as hit the stuff auver the ground, and never see as it gets to the roots o' the plants."

"No, I don't think it can be that," said Tom, laughing; "our gardener seems always to be digging his manure in, but somehow he can't make it come out in flowers as you do."

"Ther' be mwore waays o' killin' a cat besides choking on un wi' cream," said Simon, chuckling in his turn.

"That's true, Simon," said Tom; "the fact is, a gardener must know his business as well as you to be always in bloom, eh?"

"That's about it, Sir," said Simon, on whom the flattery was beginning to tell.

Tom saw this, and thought he might now feel his way a little further with the old man.

"I'm over on a sad errand," he said; "I've been to poor Widow Winburn's funeral—she was an old friend of yours, I think?"

"Ees; I minds her long afore she wur married," said Simon, turning to his pots again.

"She wasn't an old woman, after all," said Tom.

"Sixty-two year old cum Michaelmas," said Simon.

"Well, she ought to have been a strong woman for another ten years at least; why, you must be older than she by some years, Simon, and you can do a good day's work yet with any man."

Simon went on with his potting without replying, except by a carefully-measured grunt, sufficient to show that he had heard the remark, and was not much impressed by it.

Tom saw that he must change his attack; so, after watching Simon for a minute, he began again.

"I wonder why it is that the men of your time of life are so much stronger than the young ones in constitution. Now, I don't believe there are three young men in Englebourn who would have got over that fall you had at Farmer Groves' so quick as you have; most young men would have been crippled for life by it."

"Zo 'em would, the young wosbirds. I dwon't make no account on 'em," said Simon.

"And you don't feel any the worse for it, Simon?"

"Narra mossel," replied Simon; but presently he seemed to recollect something, and added, "I wun't saay but what I feels it at times when I've got to stoop about much."

"Ah, I'm sorry to hear that, Simon. Then you oughtn't to have so much stooping to do; potting, and that sort of thing, is the work for you, I should think, and just giving an eye to everything about the place. Anybody could do the digging and setting out cabbages, and your time is only wasted at it."—Tom had now found the old man's weak point.

"Ees, Sir, and so I tells Miss," he said; "but wi' nothin' but a bit o' glass no bigger'n a cowcumber frame 'tis all as a man can do to keep a few plants alive droo' the winter."

"Of course," said Tom, looking round at the very respectable green-house which Simon had contemptuously likened to a cucumber-frame, "you ought to have at least another house as big as this for forcing."

"Master ain't pleased, he ain't," said Simon, "if he dwont get his things, his spring wegebatles, and his strawberries, as early as though we'd a got forcin pits and glass like other folk. 'Tis a year and mwore since he promised as I sh'd hev glass along that ther' wall, but 'tis no nigher comin' as I can see. I be to spake to Miss about it now, he says, and, when I spakes to her, 'tis, 'Oh, Simon, we must wait till the 'spensary's 'stablished,' or

'Oh, Simon, last winter wur a werry tryin wun, and the sick club's terrible bad off for funds,'—and so we gwoes on, and med gwo on, for aught as I can see, so long as ther's a body sick or bad off in all the parish. And that'll be alius. For, what wi Miss's wisitin on em, and sendin' on em dinners, and a'al the doctors stuff as is served out o' the 'spensary—wy, tis enough to keep em bad a'al ther lives. Ther aint no credit in gettin' well. Ther wur no sich a caddie about sick folk when I wur a buoy."

Simon had never been known to make such a long speech before, and Tom augured well for his negotiation.

"Well, Simon," he said, "I've been talking to my cousin, and I think she will do what you want now. The dispensary is set up, and the people are very healthy. How much glass should you want now along that wall?"

"A matter O' twenty fit or so," said Simon.

"I think that can be managed," said Tom; "I'll speak to my cousin about it; and then you would have plenty to do in the houses, and you'd want a regular man under you."

"Ees; t'would take two on us reg'lar to kep things as should be."

"And you ought to have somebody who knows what he is about. Can you think of any one who would do, Simon?"

"Ther's a young chap as works for Squire Wurley. I've heard as he wants to better hisself."

"But he isn't an Englebourn man. Isn't there any one in the parish?"

"Ne'er a one as I knows on."

"What do you think of Harry Win-burn—he seems a good hand with flowers?" The words had scarcely passed his lips when Tom saw that he had made a mistake. Old Simon retired into himself at once, and a cunning distrustful look came over his face. There was no doing anything with him. Even the new forcing house had lost its attractions for him, and Tom, after some further ineffectual attempts to bring him round, returned to the house somewhat crest-fallen.

"Well, how have you succeeded?" said Katie, looking up from her work, as he came in and sat down near her table. Tom shook his head.

"I'm afraid I've made a regular hash of it," he said. "I thought at first I had quite come round the old savage by praising the garden, and promising that you would let him have a new house."

"You don't mean to say you did that!" said Katie, stopping her work.

"Indeed, but I did, though. I was drawn on, you know. I saw it was the right card to play; sò I couldn't help it."

"Oh, Tom! how could you do so? We don't want another house the least in the world; it is only Simon's vanity. He wants to beat the gardener at the Grange at the flower-shows. Every penny will have to come out of what papa allows me for the parish."

"Don't be afraid, Katie; you won't have to spend a penny. Of course I reserved a condition. The new house was to be put up if he would take Harry as under gardener."

"What did he say to that?"

"Well, he said nothing. I never came across such an old Turk. How you have spoiled him! If he isn't pleased, he won't take the trouble to answer you a word. I was very near telling him a piece of my mind. But he *looked* all the more. I believe he would poison Harry if he came here. What can have made him hate him so?"

"He is jealous of him. Mary and I were so foolish as to praise poor Betty's flowers before Simon, and he has never forgiven it. I think, too, that he suspects, somehow, that we talked about getting Harry here. I ought to have told you, but I quite forgot it."

"Well, it can't be helped. I don't think I can do any good in that quarter; so now I shall be off to the Grange, to see what I can do there."

"How do you mean?"

"Why, Harry is afraid of being turned out of his cottage. I saw how it worried him, thinking about it; so I shall go to the Grange, and say a good word for him. Wurley can't refuse, if I offer to pay the rent myself—it's only six pounds a year. Of course, I shan't tell Harry; and he will pay it all the same; but it may make all the difference with Wurley, who is a regular screw."

"Do you know Mr. Wurley?"

"Yes, just to speak to. He knows all about me, and he will be very glad to be civil."

"No doubt he will; but I don't like your going to his house. You don't know what a bad man he is. Nobody but men on the turf, and that sort of people, go there now; and I believe he thinks of nothing but gambling and game-preserving."

"Oh yes, I know all about him. The county people are beginning to look shy at him; so he'll be all the more likely to do what I ask him."

"But you won't get intimate with him?"

"You needn't be afraid of that."

"It is a sad house to go to—I hope it won't do you any harm."

"Ah, Katie!" said Tom, with a smile, not altogether cheerful, "I don't think you need be anxious about that. When one has been a year at Oxford, there isn't much snow left to soil; so now I am off. I must give myself plenty of time to cook Wurley."

"Well, I suppose I must not hinder you," said Katie. "I do hope you will succeed in some of your kind plans for Harry."

"I shall do my best; and it is a great thing to have somebody besides oneself to think about and try to help—some poor person—don't you think so, even for a man?"

"Of course I do. I am sure you can't be happy without it, any more than I. "We shouldn't be our mother's children if we could be."

"Well, good-bye, dear; you can't think how I enjoy these glimpses of you and your work. You must give my love to Uncle Robert."

And so they bade one another adieu, lovingly, after the manner of cousins, and Tom rode away with a very soft place in his heart for his cousin Katie. It was not the least the same sort of passionate feeling of worship with which he regarded Mary. The two feelings could lie side by side in his heart with plenty of room to spare. In fact, his heart had been getting so big in the last few weeks, that it seemed capable of taking in the whole of mankind, not to mention woman. Still, on the whole, it may be safely asserted, that, had matters been in at all a more forward state, and could she have seen exactly what was passing in his mind, Mary would probably have objected to the kind of affection which he felt for his cousin at this particular time. The joke about cousinly love is probably as old, and certainly as true, as Solomon's proverbs. However, as matters stood, it could be no concern of Mary's what his feelings were towards Katie, or any other person.

Tom rode in at the lodge gate of the Grange soon after eleven o'clock, and walked his horse slowly through the park, admiring the splendid timber, and thinking how he should break his request to the owner of the place. But his thoughts were interrupted by the proceedings of the rabbits, which were out by hundreds all along the sides of the plantations, and round the great trees. A few of the nearest just deigned to notice him by scampering to their holes under the roots of the antlered oaks, into which some of them popped with a disdainful kick of their hind legs, while others turned round, sat up, and looked at him. As he neared the house, he passed a keeper's cottage, and was saluted by the barking of dogs from the neighbouring kennel; and the young pheasants ran about round some twenty hen-coops, which were arranged along opposite the door where the keeper's children were playing. The pleasure of watching the beasts and birds kept him from arranging his thoughts, and he reached the hall-door without having formed the plan of his campaign.

A footman answered the bell, who doubted whether his master was down, but thought he would see the gentleman if he would send in his name. Whereupon Tom handed in his card; and, in a few minutes, a rakish-looking stable-boy came round for his horse, and the butler appeared, with his master's compliments, and a request that he would step into the breakfast-room. Tom followed this portly personage through the large handsome hall, on the walls of which hung a buff coat or two and some old-fashioned arms, and large paintings of dead game and fruit—through a drawing-room, the furniture of which was all covered up in melancholy cases—into the breakfast-parlour, where the owner of the mansion was seated at table in a lounging jacket. He was a man of forty, or thereabouts, who would have been handsome, but for the animal look about his face. His cheeks were beginning to fall into chops, his full lips had a liquorish look about them, and bags were beginning to form under his light blue eyes. His hands were very white and delicate, and shook a little as he poured out his tea; and he was full and stout in body, with small shoulders, and thin arms and legs; in short, the last man whom Tom would have chosen as bow in a pair oar. The only part of him which showed strength were his dark whiskers, which were abundant, and elaborately oiled and curled. The room was light and pleasant, with two windows looking over the park, and furnished luxuriously, in the most modern style, with all manner of easy chairs and sofas. A glazed case or two of well-bound books showed that some former owner had cared for such things; but the doors had, probably, never been opened in the present reign. The master, and his usual visitors, found sufficient food for the mind in the Racing Calendar, Boxiana, the Adventures of Corinthian Tom, and *Bell's Life*, which lay on a side table; or in the pictures and prints of racers, opera dancers, and steeple-chases, which hung in profusion on the walls. The breakfast-table was beautifully appointed, in the matter of China and plate; and delicate little rolls, neat pats of butter in ice, and two silver hot dishes containing curry and broiled salmon, and a plate of fruit, piled in tempting profusion, appealed, apparently in vain, to the appetite of the lord of the feast.

"Mr. Brown, Sir," said the butler, ushering in our hero to his master's presence.

"Ah, Brown, I'm very glad to see you here," said Mr. Wurley, standing up and holding out his hand. "Have any breakfast?"

"Thank you, no, I have breakfasted," said Tom, somewhat astonished at the intimacy of the greeting; but it was his cue to do the friendly thing—so he shook the proffered hand, which felt very limp, and sat down by the

table, looking pleasant.

"Ridden from home this morning?" said Mr. Wurley, picking over daintily some of the curry to which he had helped himself.

"No, I was at my uncle's, at Englebourne, last night. It is very little out of the way; so I thought I would just call on my road home."

"Quite right I'm very glad you came without ceremony. People about here are so d—d full of ceremony. It don't suit me, all that humbug. But I wish you'd just pick a bit"

"Thank you. Then I will eat some fruit," said Tom, helping himself to some of the freshly-picked grapes; "how very fine these are!"

"Yes, I'm open to back my houses against the field for twenty miles round. This curry isn't fit for a pig. Take it out, and tell the cook so." The butler solemnly obeyed, while his master went on with one of the frequent oaths with which he garnished his conversation, "You're right, they can't spoil the fruit. They're a set of skulking devils, are servants. They think of nothing but stuffing themselves, and how they can cheat you most, and do the least work." Saying which, he helped himself to some fruit; and the two ate their grapes for a short time in silence. But even fruit seemed to pall quickly on him, and he pushed away his plate. The butler came back with a silver tray, with soda water, and a small decanter of brandy, and long glasses on it.

"Won't you have something after your ride?" said the host to Tom; "some soda water with a dash of bingo clears one's head in the morning."

"No, thank you," said Tom, smiling, "its bad for training."

"Ah, you Oxford men are all for training," said his host, drinking greedily of the foaming mixture which the butler handed to him. "A glass of bitter ale is what you take, eh? I know. Get some ale for Mr. Brown."

Tom felt that it would be uncivil to refuse this orthodox offer, and took his beer accordingly, after which his host produced a box of Hudson's Regalias, and proposed to look at the stables. So they lighted their cigars, and went out. Mr. Wurley had taken of late to the turf, and they inspected several young horses which were entered for country stakes. Tom thought them weedy-looking animals, but patiently listened to their praises and pedigrees, upon which his host was eloquent enough; and, rubbing up his latest readings in *Bell's Life*, and the racing talk which he had been in the habit of hearing in Drysdale's rooms, managed to hold his own, and asked, with a grave face, about the price of the Coronation colt for the next Derby, and whether Scott's lot was not the right thing to stand on for the St. Leger, thereby raising himself considerably in his host's eyes. There were no hunters in the stable, at which Tom expressed his surprise. In reply, Mr. Wurley abused the country, and declared that it was not worth riding across—the fact being that he had lost his nerve, and that the reception which he was beginning to meet with in the field, if he came out by chance, was of the coldest.

From the stables they strolled to the keeper's cottage, where Mr. Wurley called for some buckwheat and Indian corn, and began feeding the young pheasants, which were running about almost like barn-door fowls close to them.

"We've had a good season for the young birds," he said; "my fellow knows that part of his business, d—n him, and don't lose many. You had better bring your gun over in October; we shall have a week in the covers early in the month."

"Thank you, I shall be very glad," said Tom; "but you don't shoot these birds?"

"Shoot 'em! what the devil should I do with them?"

"Why, they're so tame I thought you just kept them about the house for breeding. I don't care so much for pheasant shooting; I like a good walk after a snipe, or creeping along to get a wild duck, much better. There's some sport in it, or even in partridge shooting with a couple of good dogs, now—"

"You're quite wrong. There's nothing like a good dry ride in a cover with lots of game, and a fellow behind to load for you."

"Well, I must say, I prefer the open."

"You've no covers over your way, have you?"

"Not many."

"I thought so. You wait till you've had a good day in my covers, and you won't care for quartering all day over wet turnips. Besides, this sort of tiling pays. They talk about pheasants costing a guinea a head on one's table. It's all stuff; at any rate, mine don't cost *me* much. In fact, I say it pays, and I can prove it."

"But you feed your pheasants?"

"Yes, just round the house for a few weeks, and I sow a little buckwheat in the covers. But they have to keep themselves pretty much, I can tell you."

"Don't the farmers object?"

"Yes, d—n them; they're never satisfied. But they don't grumble to *me*; they know better. There are a dozen fellows ready to take any farm that's given up, and they know it. Just get a beggar to put a hundred or two into the ground, and he won't quit hold in a hurry. Will you play a game at billiards?"

The turn which their conversation had taken hitherto had offered no opening to Tom for introducing the object of his visit, and he felt less and less inclined to come to the point. He looked his host over and over again, and the more he looked the less he fancied asking anything like a favour of him. However, as it had to be done, he thought he couldn't do better than fall into his ways for a few hours, and watch for a chance. The man seemed good-natured in his way; and all his belongings—the fine park and house, and gardens and stables—were not without their effect on his young guest. It is not given to many men of twice his age to separate a man from his possessions, and look at him apart from them. So he yielded easily enough, and they went to billiards in a fine room opening out of the hall; and Tom, who was very fond of the game, soon forgot everything in the pleasure of playing on such a table.

It was not a bad match. Mr. Wurley understood the game far better than his guest, and could give him advice as to what side to put on and how to play for cannons. This he did in a patronizing way, but his hand was unsteady and his nerve bad. Tom's good eye and steady hand, and the practice he had had at the St. Ambrose pool-table, gave him considerable advantage in the hazards. And so they played on, Mr. Wurley, condescending to bet only half-a-crown a game, at first giving ten points, and then five, at which latter odds Tom managed to be two games ahead when the butler announced lunch, at two o'clock.

"I think I must order my horse," said Tom putting on his coat.

"No, curse it, you must give me my revenge. I'm always five points better after lunch, and after dinner I could give you fifteen points. Why shouldn't you stop and dine and sleep? I expect some men to dinner."

"Thank you, I must get home to-day."

"I should like you to taste my mutton; I never kill it under five years old. You don't get that every day."

Tom, however, was proof against the mutton; but consented to stay till towards the hour when the other guests were expected, finding that his host had a decided objection to being left alone. So after lunch, at which Mr. Wurley drank the better part of a bottle of old sherry to steady his nerves, they returned again to billiards and Hudson's regalias.

They played on for another hour; and, though Mr. Wurley's hand was certainly steadier, the luck remained with Tom. He was now getting rather tired of playing, and wanted to be leaving, and he began to remember the object of his visit again. But Mr. Wurley was nettled at being beaten by a boy, as he counted his opponent, and wouldn't hear of leaving off. So Tom played on carelessly game after game, and was soon again only two games ahead. Mr. Wurley's temper was recovering, and now Tom protested that he must go. Just one game more his host urged, and Tom consented. Wouldn't he play for a sovereign? No. So they played double or quits; and after a sharp struggle Mr. Wurley won the game, at which he was highly elated, and talked again grandly of the odds he could give after dinner.

Tom felt that it was now or never, and so as he put on his coat, he said,

"Well, I'm much obliged to you for a very pleasant day, Mr. Wurley."

"I hope you'll come over again, and stay and sleep. I shall always be glad to see you. It is so cursed hard to keep somebody always going in the country."

"Thank you; I should like to come again. But now I want to ask a favour of you before I go."

"Eh, well, what is it?" said Mr. Wurley, whose face and manner became suddenly anything but encouraging.

"There's that cottage of yours, the one at the corner of Englebourn copse, next the village."

"The woodman's house, I know," said Mr. Wurley.

"The tenant is dead, and I want you to let it to a friend of mine; I'll take care the rent is paid."

Mr. Wurley pricked up his ears at this announcement. He gave a sharp look at Tom; and then bent over the table, made a stroke, and said, "Ah, I heard the old woman was dead. Who's your friend, then?"

"Well, I mean her son," said Tom, a little embarrassed; "he's an active young fellow, and will make a good tenant, I'm sure."

"I dare say," said Mr. Wurley, with a leer; "and I suppose there's a sister to keep house for him, eh?"

"No, but he wants to get married."

"Wants to get married, eh?" said Mr. Wurley, with another leer and oath. "You're right; that's a deal safer kind of thing for you."

"Yes," said Tom, resolutely disregarding the insinuation which he could not help feeling was intended; "it will keep him steady, and if he can get the cottage it might make all the difference. There wouldn't be much trouble about the marriage then, I dare say."

"You'll find it a devilish long way. You're quite right, mind you, not to get them settled close at home; but Englebourn is too far, I should say."

"What does it matter to me?"

"Oh, you're tired of her! I see. Perhaps it won't be too far, then."

"Tired of her! who do you mean?"

"Ha, ha!" said Mr. Wurley, looking up from the table over which he was leaning, for he went on knocking the balls about; "devilish well acted! But you needn't try to come the old soldier over me. I'm not quite such a fool as that."

"I don't know what you mean by coming the old soldier. I only asked you to let the cottage, and I will be responsible for the rent. I'll pay in advance if you like."

"Yes, you want me to let the cottage for you to put in this girl,"

"I beg your pardon," said Tom, interrupting him, and scarcely able to keep his temper; "I told you it was for this! young Winburn."

"Of course you told me so. Ha, ha!"

"And you don't believe me?"

"Come now, all's fair in love and war. But, I tell you, you needn't be mealy-mouthed with me. You don't mind his living there; he's away at work all day, eh? and his wife stays at home."

"Mr. Wurley, I give you my honour I never saw the girl in my life that I know of, and I don't know that she will marry him."

"What did you talk about your friend for, then?" said Mr. Wurley, stopping and staring at Tom, curiosity beginning to mingle with his look of cunning un-belief.

"Because I meant just what I said."

"And the friend, then?"

"I have told you several times that this young Winburn is the man."

"What, *your friend*?"

"Yes, my friend," said Tom; and he felt himself getting red at having to call Harry his friend in such company. Mr. Wurley looked at him for a few moments, and then took his leg off the billiard table, and came round to Tom with the sort of patronizing air with which he had lectured him on billiards.

"I say, Brown, I'll give you a piece of advice," he said. "You're a young fellow, and haven't seen anything of the world. Oxford's all very well, but it isn't the world. Now I tell you, a young fellow can't do himself greater harm than: getting into low company and talking as you have been talking. It might ruin you in the county. That sort of radical stuff won't do, you know, calling a farm labourer your friend."

Tom chafed at this advice from a man who, he well knew, was notoriously in the habit of entertaining at his house, and living familiarly with, betting men and trainers, and all the riff-raff of the turf. But he restrained himself by a considerable effort, and, instead of retorting, as he felt inclined to do, said, with an attempt to laugh it off, "Thank you, I don't think there's much fear of my turning radical But will you let me the cottage?"

"My agent manages all that. We talked about pulling it down. The cottage is in my preserves, and I don't mean to have some poaching fellow there to be sneaking out at night after my pheasants."

"But his grandfather and great-grandfather lived there."

"I dare say, but it's my cottage."

"But surely that gives him a claim to it."

"D—n it! it's my cottage. You're not going to tell me I mayn't do what I like with it, I suppose."

"I only said that his family having lived there so long gives him a claim."

"A claim to what? These are some more of your cursed radical notions. I think they might teach you something better at Oxford."

Tom was now perfectly cool, but withal in such a tremendous fury of excitement that he forgot the interests of his client altogether.

"I came here, sir," he said, very quietly and slowly, "not to request your advice on my own account, or your opinion on the studies of Oxford, valuable as no doubt they are: I came to ask you to let this cottage to me, and I wish to have your answer."

"I'll be d—d if I do; there's my answer."

"Very well," said Tom; "then I have only to wish you good morning. I am sorry to have wasted a day in the company of a man who sets up for a country gentleman with the tongue of a Thames bargee and the heart of a Jew pawnbroker."

Mr. Wurley rushed to the bell and rang it furiously. "By—!" he almost screamed, shaking his fist at Tom, "I'll have you horse-whipped out of my house;" and then poured forth a flood of uncomplimentary slang, ending in another pull at the bell, and "By—I'll have you horse-whipped out of my house."

"You had better try it on—you and your flunkies together," said Tom, taking a cigar-case out of his pocket and lighting up, the most defiant and exasperating action he could think of on the spur of the moment. "Here's one of them; so I'll leave you to give him his orders, and wait five minutes in the hall, where there's more room." And so, leaving the footman gaping at his lord, he turned on his heel, with the air of Bernardo del Carpio after he had bearded King Alphonso, and walked into the hall.

He heard men running to and fro, and doors banging, as he stood there looking at the old buff-coats, and

rather thirsting for a fight. Presently a door opened, and the portly butler shuffled in, looking considerably embarrassed, and said,—

"Please, sir, to go out quiet, else he'll be having one of his fits."

"Your master, you mean?"

"Yes, sir," said the butler, nodding, "D. T., sir. After one of his rages the black dog comes, and its hawful work; so I hope you'll go, sir."

"Very well, of course I'll go. I don't want to give him a fit." Saying which, Tom walked out of the hall-door, and leisurely round to the stables, where he found already signs of commotion. "Without regarding them, he got his horse saddled and bridled, and, after looking him over carefully, and patting him, and feeling his girths, in the yard, in the presence of a cluster of retainers of one sort or another, who were gathering from the house and offices, and looking sorely puzzled whether to commence hostilities or not, mounted and walked quietly out.

After his anger had been a little cooled by the fresh air of the wild country at the back of the Hawk's Lynch, which he struck into on his way home soon after leaving the park, it suddenly occurred to him that, however satisfactory to himself the results of his encounter with this unjust landlord might seem, they would probably prove anything but agreeable to the would-be tenant, Harry Winburn. In fact, as he meditated on the matter, it became clear to him that in the course of one morning he had probably exasperated old Simon against his aspirant son-in-law, and put a serious spoke in Harry's love-wheel, on the one hand, while, on the other, he had insured his speedy expulsion from his cottage, if not the demolition of that building. Whereupon he became somewhat low under the conviction that his friendship, which was to work such wonders for the said Harry, and deliver him out of all his troubles, had as yet only made his whole look-out in the world very much darker and more dusty. In short, as yet he had managed to do considerably less than nothing for his friend, and he felt very small before he got home that evening. He was far, however, from being prepared for the serious way in which his father looked upon his day's proceedings. Mr. Brown was sitting by himself after dinner when his son turned up, and had to drink several extra glasses of port to keep himself decently composed, while Tom narrated the events of the day in the intervals of his attacks on the dinner which was brought back for him. When the servant had cleared away, Mr. Brown proceeded to comment on the history in a most decided manner.

Tom was wrong to go to the Grange in the first instance; and this part of the homily was amplified by a discourse on the corruption of the turf in general, and the special curse of small country races in particular, which such men as Wurley supported, and which, but for them, would cease. Racing, which used to be the pastime of great people, who could well afford to spend a few thousands a year on their pleasure, had now mostly fallen into the hands of the very worst and lowest men of all classes, most of whom would not scruple—as Mr. Brown strongly put it—to steal a copper out of a blind beggar's hat. If he must go, at any rate he might have done his errand and come away, instead of staying there all day accepting the man's hospitality. Mr. Brown himself really should be much embarrassed to know what to do if the man should happen to attend the next sessions or assizes. But, above all, having accepted his hospitality, to turn round at the end and insult the man in his own house! This seemed to Brown *père* a monstrous and astounding performance.

This new way of putting matters took Tom entirely by surprise. He attempted a defence, hut in vain. His father admitted that it would be a hard case if Harry were turned out of his cottage, but wholly refused to listen to Tom's endeavours to prove that a tenant in such a case had any claim or right as against his landlord. A weekly tenant was a weekly tenant, and no succession of weeks' holding could make him anything more. Tom found himself rushing into a line of argument which astonished himself and sounded wild, but in which he felt sure there was some truth, and which, therefore, he would not abandon, though his father was evidently annoyed, and called it mere mischievous sentiment. Each was more moved than he would have liked to own; each in his own heart felt aggrieved, and blamed the other for not understanding him. But, though obstinate on the general question, upon the point of his conduct in leaving the Grange Tom was fairly brought to shame, and gave in at last, and expressed his sorrow, though he could not help maintaining that, if his father could have heard what took place, and seen the man's manner, he would scarcely blame him for what he had said end done. Having once owned himself in the wrong, however, there was nothing for it but to write an apology, the composition of which was as disagreeable a task as had ever fallen to his lot.

Chapter XXXIV.

greek or latin text

HAS any person, of any nation or language, found out and given to the world any occupation, work, diversion, or pursuit, more subtly dangerous to the susceptible youth of both sexes than that of nutting in pairs? If so, who, where, what? A few years later in life, perhaps district visiting, and attending schools together, may in certain instances be more fatal; but, in the first bright days of youth, a day's nutting against the

world! A day in autumn, warm enough to make sitting in sheltered nooks in the woods, where the sunshine can get, very pleasant, and yet not too warm to make exercise uncomfortable; two young people who have been thrown much together, one of whom is conscious of the state of his feelings towards the other, and is, moreover, aware that his hours are numbered, that in a few days at furthest they will be separated for many months, that persons in authority on both sides are beginning to suspect something (as is apparent from the difficulty they have had in getting away together at all on this same afternoon)—here is a conjunction of persons and circumstances, if ever there was one in the world, which is surely likely to end in a catastrophe. Indeed, so obvious to the meanest capacity is the danger of the situation that, as Tom had, in his own mind, staked his character for Resolution with his private self on the keeping of his secret till after he was of age, it is hard to conceive how he can have been foolish enough to get himself into a hazel copse alone with Miss Mary on the earliest day he could manage it after the arrival of the Porters, on their visit to Mr. and Mrs. Brown. That is to say, it would be hard to conceive, if it didn't just happen to be the most natural thing in the world.

For the first twenty-four hours after their meeting in the home of his fathers, the two young people, and Tom in particular, felt very uncomfortable. Mary, being a young lady of very high spirits, and, as readers may probably have discovered, much given to that kind of conversation which borders as nearly upon what men commonly call chaff as a well-bred girl can venture on, was annoyed to find herself quite at fault in all her attempts to get her old antagonist of Commemoration to show fight. She felt in a moment how changed his manner was, and thought it by no means changed for the better. As for Tom, he felt foolish and shy at first to an extent which drove him half wild; his words stuck in his throat, and he took to blushing again like a boy of fourteen. In fact, he got so angry with himself that he rather avoided her actual presence, though she was scarcely a moment out of his sight. Mr. Brown made the most of his son's retreat, devoted himself most gallantly to Alary, and was completely captivated by the first night of their arrival, and triumphed over his wife when they were alone at the groundlessness of her suspicions. But she was by no means so satisfied on the subject as her husband.

In a day or two, however, Tom began to take heart of grace, and to find himself oftener at Mary's side, with something to say, and more to look. But now she, in her turn, began to be embarrassed, for all attempts to re-establish their old footing failed; and the difficulty of finding a satisfactory new one remained to be solved. So for the present, though neither of them found it quite satisfactory, they took refuge in the presence of a third party, and attached themselves to Katie, talking at one another through her. Nothing could exceed Katie's judiciousness as a medium of communication; and through her a better understanding began to establish itself, and the visit which both of them had been looking forward to so eagerly seemed likely, after all, to be as pleasant in fact as it had been in anticipation. As they became more at ease, the vigilance of Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Porter seemed likely to revive. But in a country house there must be plenty of chances for young folk who mean it to be together; and so they found and made use of their opportunities, giving at the same time as little cause to their natural guardians as possible for any serious interference. The families got on, on the whole, so well together that the visit was prolonged from the original four or five days to a fortnight; and this time of grace was drawing to a close when the event happened which made the visit memorable to our hero.

On the morning in question, Mr. Brown arranged at breakfast that he and his wife should drive Mr. and Mrs. Porter to make calls on several of the neighbours. Tom declared his intention of taking a long day after the partridges, and the young ladies were to go and make a sketch of the house from a point which Katie had chosen. Accordingly, directly after luncheon the carriage came round, and the elders departed, and the young ladies started together, carrying their sketching apparatus with them.

It was probably a bad day for scent, for they had not been gone a quarter of an hour when Tom came home, deposited his gun, and followed on their steps. He found them sitting under the lee of a high bank, sufficiently intent on their drawings, but neither surprised nor sorry to find that he had altered his mind and come back to interrupt them. So he lay down near them, and talked of Oxford, and Englebourn, and so from one thing to another, till he got upon the subject of nutting, and the sylvan beauties of a neighbouring wood. Mary was getting on badly with her drawing, and jumped at the idea of a ramble in the wood; but Katie was obdurate, and resisted all their solicitations to move. She suggested, however, that they might go; and, as Tom declared that they should not be out of call, and would be back in half an hour at furthest, Mary consented, and they left the sketcher, and strolled together out of the fields, and into the road, and so through a gate into the wood. It was a pleasant oak wood. The wild flowers were over, but the great masses of ferns, four or five feet high, made a grand carpet round the stems of the forest monarchs, and a fitting couch for here and there one of them, which had been lately felled, and lay in fallen majesty, with bare shrouded trunk awaiting the sawyers. Further on the hazel underwood stood thickly on each side of the green rides, down which they sauntered side by side. Tom talked of the beauty of the wood in Spring-time, and the glorious succession of colouring—pale yellow and deep blue and white and purple—which the primroses and hyacinths and starwort and fox-gloves gave, each in their turn, in the early year, and mourned over their absence. But Mary preferred Autumn, and would not agree

with him. She was enthusiastic for ferns and heather. He gathered some sprigs of the latter for her, from a little sandy patch which they passed, and some more for his own button-hole; and then they engaged in the absorbing pursuit of nutting, and the talk almost ceased. He caught the higher branches, and bent them down to her, and watched her as she gathered them, and wondered at the ease and grace of all her movements, and the unconscious beauty of her attitudes. Soon she became more enterprising herself, and made little excursions into the copse, surmounting briars, and passing through tangled places like a Naiad, before he could be there to help her. And so they went on, along the rides and through the copse, forgetting Katie and time, till they were brought up by the fence on the further side of the wood. The ditch was on the outside, and on the inside a bank with a hedge on the top, full of tempting hazel bushes. She clapped her hands at the sight, and, declining his help, stepped lightly up the bank, and began gathering. He turned away for a moment, jumped up the bank himself, and followed her example.

He was standing up in the hedge, and reaching after a tempting cluster of nuts, when he heard a short sharp cry of pain behind him, which made him spring backwards, and nearly miss his footing as he came to the ground. Recovering himself, and turning round, he saw Mary lying at the foot of the bank, writhing in pain.

He was at her side in an instant, and dreadfully alarmed.

"Good heavens! what has happened?" he said.

"My ankle!" she cried; and the effort of speaking brought the sudden flush of pain to her brow.

"Oh! what can I do?"

"The boot! the boot!" she said, leaning forward to unlace it, and then sinking back against the bank. "It is so painful. I hope I sha'n't faint."

Poor Tom could only clasp his hands as he knelt by her, and repeat: "Oh, what can I do—what can I do?"

His utter bewilderment presently roused Mary, and her natural high courage was beginning to master the pain.

"Have you a knife?"

"Yes—here," he said, pulling one out of his pocket, and opening it; "here it is."

"Please cut the lace."

Tom, with beating heart and trembling hand, cut the lace, and then looked up at her.

"Oh, be quick—cut it again; don't be afraid."

He cut it again; and, without taking hold of the foot, gently pulled out the ends of the lace.

She again leaned forward, and tried to take off the boot. But the pain was too great; and she sank back, and put her hand up to her flushed face.

"May I try?—perhaps I could do it."

"Yes, pray do. Oh, I can't bear the pain!" she added, next moment; and Tom felt ready to hang himself for having been the cause of it.

"You must cut the boot off, please."

"But perhaps I may cut you. Do you really mean it?"

"Yes, really. There, take care. How your hand shakes. You will never do for a doctor."

His hand did shake certainly. he had cut a little hole in the stocking; but, under the circumstances, we need not wonder—the situation was new and trying. Urged on by her, he cut and cut away, and, at last, off came the boot, and her beautiful little foot lay on the green turf. She was much relieved at once, but still in great pain; and now he began to recover his head.

"The ankle should be bound up; may I try?"

"Oh, yes; but what with?"

Tom dived into his shooting-coat pocket, and produced one of the. large, many-coloured neck-wrappers which were fashionable at Oxford in those days.

"How lucky," he said, as. he tore it into strips. "I think this will do. Now, you'll stop me, won't you, if I hurt, or don't do it right?"

"Don't be afraid; I'm much better. Bind it tight—tighter than that."

He wound the strips as tenderly as he could round her foot and ankle, with hands all alive with nerves, and wondering more and more at her courage as she kept urging him to draw the bandage tighter yet. Then, still under her direction, he fastened and pinned down the ends; and, as he was rather neat with his fingers, from the practice of tying flies and splicing rods and bats, produced, on the whole, a creditable sort of bandage. Then he looked up at her, the perspiration standing on his forehead, as if he had been pulling a race, and said:

"Will that do? I'm afraid it's very awkward."

"Oh, no; thank you so much! But I'm so sorry you have torn your handkerchief."

Tom made no answer to this remark, except by a look. What could he say, but that he would gladly have torn his skin off for the same purpose, if it would have been of any use; but this speech did not seem quite the thing for the moment.

"But how do you feel? Is it very painful?" he asked.

"Bather. But don't look so anxious. Indeed, it is very bearable. But what are we to do now?"

He thought for a moment, and said, with something like a sigh,—

"Shall I run home, and bring the servants and a sofa, or something to carry you on?"

"No, I shouldn't like to be left here alone."

His face brightened again.

"How near is the nearest cottage?" she asked.

"There's none nearer than the one which we passed on the road—on the other side of the wood, you know."

"Then I must try to get there. You must help me up."

He sprang to his feet, and stooped over her, doubting how to begin helping her. He had never felt so shy in his life. He held out his hands.

"I think you must put your arm round me," she said, after looking at him for a moment. Her woman's instinct was satisfied with the look. He lifted her on to her feet.

"Now, let me lean on your arm. There, I daresay I shall manage to hobble along well enough," and she made a brave attempt to walk. But the moment the injured foot touched the ground, she stopped with a catch of her breath, and a shiver, which went through Tom like a knife; and the flush came back into her face, and she would have fallen had he not again put his arm round her waist, and held her up. "I am better again now," she said, after a second or two.

"But Mary, dear Mary, don't try to walk again, for my sake. I can't bear it."

"But what am I to do?" she said. "I must get back somehow."

"Will you let me carry you?"

She looked in his face again, and then dropped her eyes, and hesitated.

"I wouldn't offer, dear, if there were any other way. But you mustn't walk. Indeed, you must not; you may lame yourself for life."

He spoke very quietly, with his eyes fixed on the ground, though his heart was beating so that he feared she would hear it.

"Very well," she said; "but I'm very heavy."

So he lifted her gently, and stepped off down the ride, carrying his whole world in his arms, in an indescribable flutter of joy, and triumph, and fear. He had gone some forty yards or so, when he staggered, and stopped for a moment.

"Oh, pray put me down—pray do! You'll hurt yourself. I'm too heavy."

For the credit of muscular Christianity, one must say that it was not her weight, but the tumult in his own inner man, which made her bearer totter. Nevertheless, if one is wholly unused to the exercise, the carrying a healthy young English girl weighing hard on eight stone, is as much as most men can conveniently manage.

"I'll just put you down for a moment," he said. "Now take care of the foot;" and he stooped, and placed her tenderly against one of the oaks which bordered the ride, standing by her side without looking at her. Neither of them spoke for a minute. Then he asked, still looking away down the ride, "How is the foot?"

"Oh, pretty well," she answered, cheerfully. "Now, leave me here, and go for help. It is absurd of me to mind being left, and you mustn't carry me any more."

He turned, and their eyes met for a moment, but that was enough.

"Are you ready?" he said.

"Yes, but take care. Don't go far. Stop directly you feel tired."

Then he lifted her again, and this time carried her without faltering, till they came to a hillock covered with soft grass. Here they rested again, and so by easy stages he carried her through the wood, and out into the road, to the nearest cottage, neither of them speaking.

An old woman came to the door in answer to his knock, and went off into ejaculations of pity and wonder in the broadest Berkshire, at seeing Master Tom and his burthen. But he pushed into the house and cut her short with—

"Now, Mrs. Pike, don't talk, that's a dear good woman, but bustle about, and bring that arm-chair here, and the other low one, with a pillow on it, for the young lady's foot to rest on."

The old woman obeyed his injunctions, except as to talking; and, while she placed the chairs and shook up the pillow, descanted on the sovereign virtues of some green oil and opodeldoc, which was as good as a charm for sprains and bruises.

Mary gave him one grateful look as he lowered her tenderly and reluctantly into the chair, and then spoke cheerfully to Mrs. Pike, who was foraging in a cupboard, to find if there was any of her famous specific in the bottom of the bottle. As he stood up, and thought what to do next, he heard the sound of distant wheels, and looking through the window saw the carriage coming homewards. It was a sorrowful sight to him.

"Now, Mrs. Pike," he said, "never mind the oil. Here's the carriage coming; just step out and stop it."

The old dame scuttled out into the road. The carriage was within one hundred yards. He leant over the rough arm-chair in which she was leaning back, looked once more into her eyes; and then, stooping forwards, kissed her lips, and the next moment was by the side of Mrs. Pike, signalling the coachman to stop.

In the bustle which followed he stood aside, and watched Mary with his heart in his mouth. She never looked at him, but there was no anger, but only a dreamy look in her sweet face, which seemed to him a thousand times more beautiful than ever before. Then, to avoid inquiries, and to realize all that had passed in the last wonderful three hours, he slipped away while they were getting her into the carriage, and wandered back into the wood, pausing at each of their halting places. At last he reached the scene of the accident, and here his cup of happiness was likely to brim over, for he found the mangled little boot and the cut lace, and securing the precious prize, hurried back home, to be in time for dinner.

Mary did not come down, but Katie, the only person of whom he dared to inquire, assured him that she was doing famously. The dinner was very embarrassing, and he had the greatest difficulty in answering the searching inquiries of his mother and Mrs. Porter, as to how, when, where, and in whose presence the accident had happened. As soon as the ladies rose, he left his father and Mr. Porter over their old port and politics, and went out in the twilight into the garden, burthened with the weight of sweet thought. He felt that he had something to do—to set himself quite right with Mary; he must speak somehow, that night, if possible, or he should not be comfortable or at peace with his conscience. There were lights in her room. He guessed by the shadows that she was lying on a couch by the open window, round which the other ladies were flitting. Presently lights appeared in the drawing-room; and, as the shutters were being closed, he saw his mother and Mrs. Porter come in, and sit down near the fire. Listening intently, he heard Katie talking in a low voice in the room above, and saw her head against the light as she sat down close to the window, probably at the head of the couch where Alary was lying. Should he call to her? If he did how could he say what he wanted to say through her?

A happy thought struck him. He turned to the flower-beds, hunted about and gathered a bunch of heliotrope, hurried up to his room, took the sprig of heather out of his shooting coat, tied them together, caught up a reel and line from his table, and went into the room over Mary's. He threw the window open, and, leaning out, said gently, "Katie." No answer. He repeated the name louder. No answer still, and, leaning out yet further, he saw that the window had been shut. He lowered the bunch of flowers, and, swinging it backwards and forwards, made it strike the window below—once, twice; at the third stroke he heard the window open.

"Katie," he whispered again, "is that you?"

"Yes, where are you? What is this?"

"For her," he said in the same whisper. Katie untied the flowers, and he waited a few moments, and then again called her name, and she answered.

"Has she the flowers?"

"Yes, and she sends you her love, and says you are to go down to the drawing-room;" and with that the window closed, and he went down with a lightened conscience into the drawing-room, and after joining in the talk by the fire for a few minutes, took a book, and sat down at the further side of the table. Whether he ever knew what the book was may be fairly questioned, but to all appearances he was deep in the perusal of it till the tea and Katie arrived, and the gentlemen from the dining-room. Then he tried to join in the conversation again; but, on the whole, life was a burthen to him that night till he could get fairly away to his own room, and commune with himself, gazing at the yellow harvest moon with his elbows on the window-sill.

The ankle got well very quickly, and Mary was soon going about with a gold-headed stick which had belonged to Mr. Brown's father, and a limp which Tom thought the most beautiful movement he had ever seen. But, though she was about again, by no amount of patient vigilance could he now get the chance of speaking to her alone. But he consoled himself with the thought that she must understand him; if he had spoken he couldn't have made himself clearer.

And now the Porters' visit was all but over, and Katie and her father left for Englebourn. The Porters were to follow the next day, and promised to drive round and stop at the rectory for lunch. Tom petitioned for a seat in their carriage to Englebourn. He had been devoting himself to Mrs. Porter ever since the accident, and had told her a good deal about his own early life. His account of his early friendship for Betty and her son, and the renewal of it on the day he left Barton Manor, had interested her, and she was moreover not insensible to his assiduous and respectful attentions to herself, which had of late been quite marked: she was touched too at his anxiety to hear all about her boys, and how they were going on at school. So on the whole Tom was in high favour with her, and she most graciously assented to his occupying the fourth seat in their barouche. She was not without her suspicions of the real state of the case with him; but his behaviour had been so discreet that she had no immediate fears; and, after all, if anything should come of it some years hence, her daughter might do worse. In the meantime she would see plenty of society in London; where Mr. Porter's vocations kept him during the greater part of the year.

They reached Englebourn after a pleasant long morning's drive; and Tom stole a glance at Mary, and felt that she understood him, as he pointed out the Hawk's Lynch and the clump of Scotch firs to her mother; and told how you might see Barton from the top of it, and how he loved the place, and the old trees, and the view.

Katie was at the door ready to receive them, and carried off Mary and Mrs. Porter to her own room. Tom walked round the garden with Mr. Porter, and then sat in the drawing-room, and felt melancholy. he roused himself however when the ladies came down and luncheon was announced. Mary was full of her reminiscences of the Englebourn people, and especially of poor Mrs. Winburn and her son, in whom she had begun to take a deep interest, perhaps from overhearing some of Tom's talk to her mother. So Harry's story was canvassed again, and Katie told them how he had been turned out of his cottage, and how anxious she was as to what would come of it.

"And is he going to marry your gardener's daughter after all?" asked Mrs. Porter.

"I am afraid there is not much chance of it," said Katie; "I cannot make Martha out."

"Is she at home, Katie?" asked Mary; "I should like to see her again. I took a great fancy to her when I was here."

"Yes, she is at the lodge. We will walk there after luncheon."

So it was settled that the carriage should pick them up at the lodge; and soon after luncheon, while the horses were being put to, the whole party started for the lodge after saying goodbye to Mr. Winter, who retired to his room much fatigued by his unwonted hospitality.

Old Simon's wife answered their knock at the lodge door, and they all entered, and Mrs. Porter paid her compliments on the cleanliness of the room.

Then Mary said, "Is your daughter at home, Mrs. Gibbons?"

"Ees, miss, someweres handy," replied Mrs. Gibbons; "her hav'n't been gone out not dree minutes."

"I should like so much to say goodbye to her," said Mary. "We shall be leaving Barton soon, and I shall not see her again till next summer."

"Lor bless'ee, miss, 'tis werry good ov ee," said the old dame, very proud; "do'ee set down then while I gives her a call." And with that she hurried out of the door which led through the back kitchen into the little yard behind the lodge, and the next moment they heard her calling out—

"Patty, Patty, whar bist got to? Come in and see the gentle-folk."

The name which the old woman was calling out made Tom start.

"I thought you said her name was Martha," said Mrs. Porter.

"Patty is short for Martha in Berkshire," said Katie, laughing.

"And Patty is such a pretty name, I wonder you don't call her Patty," said Mary.

"We had a housemaid of the same name a year or two ago, and it made such a confusion—and when one once gets used to a name it is so hard to change—so she has always been called Martha"

"Well, I'm all for Patty; don't you think so?" said Mary, turning to Tom.

The sudden introduction of a name which he had such reasons for remembering, the memories and fears which it called up—above all, the bewilderment which he felt at hearing it tossed about and canvassed by Mary in his presence, as if there were nothing more in it than in any other name—confused him so that he floundered and blundered in his attempt to answer, and at last gave it up altogether. She was surprised, and looked at him inquiringly. His eyes fell before hers, and he turned away to the window, and looked at the carriage, which had just drawn up at the lodge door. he had scarcely time to think how foolish he was to be so moved, when he heard the back kitchen door open again, and the old woman and her daughter come in. he turned round sharply, and there on the floor of the room, curtsying to the ladies, stood the ex-barmaid of the Choughs. His first impulse was to hurry away—she was looking down, and he might not be recognised; his next, to stand his ground, and take whatever might come. Mary went up to her and took her hand, saying that she could not go away without coming to see her. Patty looked up to answer, and, glancing round the room, caught sight of him.

He stepped forward, and then stopped and tried to speak, but no words would come. Patty looked at him, dropped Mary's hand, blushed up to the roots of her hair as she looked timidly round at the wondering spectators, and, putting her hands to her face, ran out of the back door again.

"Lawk a massy! what ever can ha' cum to our Patty?" said Mrs. Gibbons, following her out.

"I think we had better go," said Mr. Porter, giving his arm to his daughter, and leading her to the door.

"Good bye, Katie; shall we see you again at Barton?"

"I don't know, uncle," Katie answered, following with Mrs. Porter in a state of sad bewilderment.

Tom, with his brain swimming, got out a few stammering farewell words, which Mr. and Mrs. Porter received with marked coldness as they stepped into their carriage. Mary's face was flushed and uneasy, but at her he scarcely dared to steal a look, and to her was quite unable to speak a word.

Then the carriage drove off, and he turned, and found Katie standing at his side, her eyes full of serious wonder. His fell before them.

"My dear Tom," she said, "What is all this? I thought you had never seen Martha?"

"So I thought—I didn't know—I can't talk now—I'll explain all to you—don't think very badly of me, Katie—God bless you!" with which words he strode away, while she looked after him with increasing wonder and then turned and went into the lodge.

He hastened away from the Rectory and down the village street, taking the road home mechanically, but otherwise wholly unconscious of roads and men. David, who was very anxious to speak to him about Harry, stood at his door making signs to him to stop in vain, and then gave chase, calling out after him, till he saw that all attempts to attract his notice were useless, and so ambled back to his shop-board much troubled in mind.

The first object which recalled Tom at all to himself was the little white cottage looking out of Englebourne copse towards the village, in which he had sat by poor Betty's death-bed. The garden was already getting wild and tangled, and the house seemed to be uninhabited. He stopped for a moment and looked at it with bitter searchings of heart. Here was the place where he had taken such a good turn, as he had fondly hoped—in connexion with the then inmates of which he had made the strongest good resolutions he had ever made in his life perhaps. What was the good of his trying to befriend anybody? His friendship turned to a blight; whatever he had as yet tried to do for Harry had only injured him, and now how did they stand? Could they ever be friends again after that day's discovery? To do him justice, the probable ruin of all his own prospects, the sudden coldness of Mr. and Mrs. Porter's looks, and Mary's averted face, were not the things he thought on first, and did not trouble him most. He thought of Harry, and shuddered at the wrong he had done him as he looked at his deserted home. The door opened and a figure appeared. It was Mr. Wurley's agent, the lawyer who had been employed by farmer Tester in his contest with Harry and his mates about the pound. The man of law saluted him with a smirk of scarcely concealed triumph, and then turned into the house again and shut the door, as if he did not consider further communication necessary or safe. Tom turned with a muttered imprecation on him and his master, and hurried away along the lane which led to the heath. The Hawk's Lynch lay above him, and he climbed the side mechanically and sat himself again on the old spot.

He sat for some time looking over the landscape, graven on his mind as it was by his former visit, and bitterly, oh, how bitterly! did the remembrance of that visit, and of the exultation and triumph which then filled him, and carried him away over the heath with a shout towards his home, come back on him. He could look out from his watch-tower no longer, and lay down with his face between his hands on the turf, and groaned as he lay.

But his good angel seemed to haunt the place, and soon the cold fit began to pass away, and better and more hopeful thoughts to return. After all, what had he done since his last visit to that place to be ashamed of? Nothing. His attempts to do Harry service, unlucky as they had proved, had been honest. Had he become less worthy of the love which had first consciously mastered him there some four weeks ago? No; he felt, on the contrary, that it had already raised him, and purified him, and made a man of him. But this last discovery, how could he ever get over that? Well, after all, the facts were just the same before; only now they had come out. It was right that they should have come out; better for him and for every one that they should be known and faced. He was ready to face them, to abide any consequences that they might now bring in their train. His heart was right towards Mary, towards Patty, towards Harry—that he felt sure of. And, if so, why should he despair of either his love or his friendship coming to a bad end?

And so he sat up again, and looked out bravely towards Barton, and began to consider what was to be done. His eyes rested on the rectory. That was the first place to begin with. he must set himself right with Katie—let her know the whole story. Through her he could reach all the rest, and do whatever must be done to clear the ground and start fresh again.

At first he thought of returning to her at once, and rose to go down to Englebourne. But anything like retracing his steps was utterly distasteful to him just then. Before him he saw light, dim enough as yet, but still a dawning; towards that he would press, leaving everything behind him to take care of itself. So he turned northwards, and struck across the heath at his best pace. The violent exercise almost finished his cure, and his thoughts became clearer and more hopeful as he neared home. He arrived there as the household were going to bed, and found a letter waiting for him. It was from Hardy, saying that Blake had left him, and he was now thinking of returning to Oxford, and would come for his long-talked-of visit to Berkshire, if Tom was still at home and in the mind to receive him.

Never was a letter more opportune. Here was the tried friend on whom he could rely for help and advice and sympathy—who knew all the facts too from beginning to end! His father and mother were delighted to hear that they should now see the friend of whom he had spoken so much; so he went up stairs, and wrote an answer, which set Hardy to work packing his portmanteau in the far west, and brought him speedily to the side of his friend under the lee of the Berkshire hills.

To be continued.

The Lost Expedition.

By Thomas Hood.

LIFT—lift, ye mists, from off the silent coast,
Folded in endless winter's chill embraces;
Unshroud for us awhile our brave ones lost!
Let us behold their faces!

In vain—the North has hid them from our sight;
The snow their winding sheet,—then only dirges
The groan of ice-bergs in the polar night
Racked by the savage surges.

No Funeral Torches with a smoky glare
Shone a farewell upon their shrouded faces;—
No monumental pillar tall and fair;—
Towers o'er their resting-places.

But Northern Streamers flare the long night through
Over the cliffs stupendous, fraught with peril,
Of ice-bergs, tinted with a ghostly hue
Of amethyst and beryl.

No human tears upon their graves are shed—
Tears of Domestic Love, or pity Holy;
But snow-flakes from the gloomy sky o'erhead,
Down-shuddering, settle slowly.

Yet History shrines them with her mighty dead,
The hero-seamen of this isle of Britain,
And, when the brighter scroll of Heaven is read,
There will their names be written!

The English Evangelical Clergy.

THE Rev. Dr. Peal's, a well-known clergyman of the Evangelical school, in a visitation sermon preached last June, and lately published, expresses himself as follows: "Of all misfortunes which "may happen to the Church, none surely "is more disastrous than that the clergy "should be behind their age; that, "while the laity, led by a few eager and "active intellects, are pushing on into "new fields of inquiry, every day "widening the range of speculation, and "venturing on ground before thought "dangerous or untenable, the appointed "guides and teachers of the people "should be found toiling far in the rear, "treading the old worn path of definitions and dogmas, or aiming pointless "shafts at positions which have been "long since abandoned." Bearing this undoubted truth in view, it may be worth while to examine in an impartial spirit what the present position of the Evangelical clergy is; how far they have developed, how far mistaken, the principles upon which the great

religious movement of the end of last century was based; what is the attitude which they collectively assume towards the rest of the Church; and what are the prospects of the party which is under their direction. It is in the existence of a healthy republic of intellect that much of the freedom of a nation lies; and that it contributes to this, by appealing to the judgment of the laity, is the benefit, and the only benefit, which the polemic warfare of the clergy can bestow.

For, in regard of its original principles, those which gave it power and success, the Evangelical party seems at first sight to have outlived its work. It started with certain ideas, proposed certain springs of action, of which it would not be entirely true to say that it is not still in possession, but of which it is undeniable that it has no longer a monopoly. The impulse has spread; the waves have widened till their centre has faded from view. If now an artificial attempt be made to retain the influence which was then so beneficial, and which, having served its legitimate use, has to some extent decayed, the attempt must fail, as will fail all other attempts to procure or keep power on false pretences; nor will the case be better, if any new principles are set up as substitutes for the old, and props for a falling party. The principles of which the Evangelical school was at first the expositor were chiefly two: it gave prominence to the intimate individual relation of each person to the unseen world; and it insisted strongly on the distinction between membership of the visible Church and the inner and mysterious communion within and independent of it. It was with these two subjects that all sermons were then filled, all social unions coloured, all missions inspired; and it was by them that men's hearts were excited to a new and wonderful life. There were then no tests of orthodoxy, no signing of articles, no appeal to the sentence of the multitude; even on the most serious topics, as whenever a great cause is being promoted, there was not unanimity of thought. They had then no journals of sectarian warfare, no shibboleths of personal adherence; it was the spirit, and not the letter, that made alive. The memoirs of Wesley, Grimshaw, and Wilberforce are full indeed of questions of doctrine; but it was on those greater realities that all the questions hung. Venn, of Huddersfield, says, in a letter dated August 12, 1778: "But never, on any account, "dispute. Debate is the work of the "flesh. No one is ever found disputing "about such external matters" (the question was one of baptism) "till "sorrow for sin, till love for Christ, and "communion with Him, . . . are departed from the heart entirely, or very "much enfeebled." Even Simeon, in 1829, writes, "I have neither taste nor "talent for controversy; nor do I on "the whole envy those by whom such "taste and talent are possessed." It is important to observe this feature of the new sect, which worked its way by the innate strength of its principles, not by the force of its associations, the nobility of its chairmen of meetings, or the circulation of its Thersitean prints. There are many now who remember its later years; who could tell how in the midst of neglect and hatred Cecil and Newton made men young again with visions of great aims and destinies, and Wilberforce spoke bravely and calmly of the strange experiences of the new life.

How has this spirit prevailed? How far has it altered? How far has it been supplanted by forms, and its motives of action petrified into prejudices? It is a sad and strange law which makes the second generation invariably seize on the accidents, instead of the substance, of the things which ennobled the first. It is true, indeed, that the one principle of individual religious life did assert itself so thoroughly that, while no party has lost it, all have gained much of its influence: beyond this, what has the present Evangelical party to show which will distinctively exhibit its character, and give it a right to perpetuate itself to the disunion of the Church? The party is remarkable at present chiefly for three things;—its social theories, its polemic organization, and its philanthropic activity. Besides this, it takes a very marked line on intellectual subjects, and pretends to a severity of conservatism on points of doctrine. In each of these topics it may be interesting to trace, where it is still traceable, the results of the original motive power, especially with regard to the attitude of the clergy, before offering a judgment on the position of the party collectively.

Perhaps that fatal law of the petrification of a principle into a canon is nowhere more evident than in the social theories of the Evangelical party. With them separation from "the world" was at first recommended, as it was to the early Christians, not as a valuable rule of life, but as almost a necessity of their being. It was not asceticism; it was not Puritanism; it was not a code of behaviour binding clergy chiefly, laity partially. Macaulay's keen remark on the objection of the Puritans to bull-baiting is well known: they objected, not because it gave pain to the bull, but because it gave pleasure to the spectator. But it was a different principle from this which animated Romaine, and Berridge, and Talbot. They had no difficulties as to where to draw the line between carnal and lawful amusements,—between "worldly vanity" and necessary intercourse with men. They simply felt that they were a peculiar people, and their life was a sanctified one. Such a principle as this must, at the first attempt to reduce it to a code, result in utter failure. Wesley could well say, and without affectation, to his followers, "You have no more business to be gentlemen than to be dancing-masters." Cecil writes, "It is a snare to a minister "when in company to be drawn out to "converse largely on the state of the "funds and the news of the day and urges that such conversation "gives a "consequence to these pursuits which "does not belong to them." This is the very spirit of the apostles; in our own day it appears only in a setting of external ordinances, and such advice as that of Mr. Ryle,—"A minister ought "not to spend a *whole* evening in

speaking merely of politics. ... I do not "mean to say we ought to be preaching "in every room we enter; but," &c. What now remains of that old spirit is simply a set of practical rules directed against some of the most popular amusements of the day, and enforced with an arbitrary severity of which the rest of the community is little aware. It is thought wrong, for example, for those who profess a religious life to cultivate the drama in any form, except that of reading Shakspeare; to attend horseraces—regattas are allowed—or evening parties where there is dancing, there being no objection to "at homes." Some out of door games are lawful: clergymen, however, must not play cricket or follow game. One of Lord Palmerston's bishops, it is stated in a weekly journal, not long ago refused to admit a candidate to orders until he gave a distinct pledge to give up shooting. In the evening, all may play chess, or minor games of chance; but the more intellectual rubber is strictly forbidden. The Rev. W. Mackenzie, in his sketch of Bickersteth's life, expresses this curiously enough: "It could not be said" that either father or mother was a "person of spiritual religion; indeed "the father had no scruple about a "game at cards, and the mother," &c. All Evangelical people may drink wine; but clergymen, at all events, must not smoke. Works of fiction are to some extent countenanced, though under protest. With respect to music, opinion is not accurately formed. The oratorio is the debated ground; and a dignitary of the Church was loudly attacked a few years since for having attended Exeter Hall in the evening. The chief religious organ of the party is constantly engaged in publishing the names of clergymen,—and even the families of clergymen,—who have lately been present at balls, a practice in which it is not pleasant to be obliged to confess that some leading Evangelical ministers are little behind it. "Do you find there the godly?" says one, alluding to balls; "I think not." (Sermon on Gal. vi. 15.) Now it would clearly be of no use here to argue that to create an artificial separation between one part of the Church and the rest is a system totally opposed to the constitution of man and the idea of Christianity; that it is directly contrary to the custom of the early Church, and the precepts of the apostles; that it creates vast ill-feeling, and still vaster jealousy and censoriousness. It would be of still less use to prove that it is entirely repugnant to the principles of the Church service, and inconsistent with the very words of the Liturgy. But, in looking at the present position of the body which professes these views, it is impossible not to see that it is in this code of ordinances, more than in any other point, that they exhibit a falling off from their original moving force; that they conciliate least respect, and secure most enemies; that they do least good to others, and produce most disloyalty amongst those of their own number who obey in practice the laws against which in their hearts they rebel.

The creed of social intercourse of which we have been speaking is sustained partly by the inherent vitality which seems to attach most signally to all formal legislation when the spirit which produced it has decayed or altered; and partly by the lay-organization of the school by which it is professed. This organization is not the less powerful from being indirect, or less operative from being in great measure unacknowledged and unaccredited. Clergymen have remarked in our hearing, "There is no such name as Evangelical "formally adopted by the party; we "are not a party, and have no party "titles." We could produce evidence, if necessary, to show that the title is formally adopted by those who are recognized as leaders; and that not casually, but purposely, and as a distinctive appellation. It was to a collective body, not a mere mass of individuals, that the Earl of Shaftesbury, during the late war, addressed, as though from some Vatican, his instructions as to the side which his followers were to favour in their prayers: and it is to a united sect, and not a mass of units, that the *Record* alludes when it speaks of "Christian people." It may perhaps be worth while to examine a little more fully into the nature and extent of this organization. One of its most characteristic features is, that it includes a very largo lay element. All who pay any attention to the subject are familiar with the names of numbers of laymen,—noblemen, bankers, retired officers, and others,—without whom no combined action takes place, and without whose authority no new step is considered to be satisfactorily accredited. There are many names whose duty it is to serve simply as guarantees to the provinces of the peculiar character of any movement, polemic or otherwise; and that they can serve no other object is evident from the fact that they appear so often, that the gentlemen who lend them could by no possibility attend in practice to all the interests which they profess to direct. At the head of these stands one nobleman, whose name it would be an affectation to omit. That any one man should have the directing power which Lord Shaftesbury possesses, should appoint bishops, preside at every great assembly, control personally nearly every leading man, inspire the press, represent in Parliament the interests of the party, and that on the strength simply of a good life and great activity in philanthropic movements, without extreme personal popularity, without distinguished talent for business, without commanding eloquence, without extensive knowledge, without profoundness of thought, without much soundness of judgment,—is a fact as strange as it is unfortunate;—unfortunate because it shows the change in the party, thus crystallized no less in its *personnel* than in its principles. Of the methods, however, by which the party is controlled,—without enlarging upon the Evangelical press, the office and power of which is well known, and accurately appreciated,—the first that deserves mention is the influence of constant changes in the subject of agitation suggested. An army long engaged at any one work becomes demoralised; give variety to their labours, and discipline is at once secured, "Let them have plenty of marching," said Lamoricière of the

Irish Brigade. Perhaps the time of great protests and declarations is now passed, when it was possible for any canvassing secretary to cast his eye over a printed list of his party, affirming as one man their prescribed adherence to this doctrine, or regulated abhorrence of that innovation. But whether it be a Gorham case or a Denison case, a Crystal Palace movement or a movement against Sunday bands, the cause of Indian education or the cause of a grant to Maynooth, the drill is unceasing. More than one "alliance" adopt it as their business to circulate among the clergy of their school information as to the progress of each battle, and instruction as to the petitions and funds which are to support the combatants engaged. The loyalty of each disciple is as well known by the petitions which he presents to Parliament from his parish, and the manner in which he receives the deputation from each "parent society," as the fig-tree is known by its fruit. It is this working together, this simultaneity of action, that gives its coherence to every result; that induces Mr. Ryle to speak of the rest of the clergy of the Church of England as "our adversaries;" that enables Canon Stowell to quote the text which speaks of the heavenly wisdom as "first pure, then peaceable," with the suggestive comment, "Purity first, peace afterwards."

Perhaps, however, organization depends more on the distribution of patronage than on any other element. The Evangelical school may be fairly said to have now in their hands the appointment of all the bishops, and about half the deans. The Evangelical bishops have on the whole been more successful than might have been expected; but, if the system is continued long, an entire preponderance of men wedded to a particular system must be very dangerous. Another arrangement, which secures a large number of the most important livings to the same party is that of trusteeship. A certain number of clergymen, who succeed by co-optation, are entrusted, by legacies and subscriptions, with the power of appointing to some of the largest, though often not the most lucrative cures of the Church. One of the most important of these is that which is known as Simeon's trust: which bestows the livings of Bath, Clifton, Derby, Cheltenham, Bradford, Beverley, and many others. It need hardly be said, that all the appointments are of one character.

The present trustees are the Rev. Messrs. Auriol, Carus, Holland, Marsh, and Venn.

But the Evangelical "Carlton" is the Church Pastoral-aid Society. This is an association, now in the twenty-sixth year of its existence, for supplying curates and Scripture-readers to populous places. The primary object is of course purely philanthropic; and no one will for a moment deny the vast amount of aid which it renders to the working clergy. But this is not all. The society requires, whenever a grant is given, that the assistant who is appointed to the parish shall be approved by the Committee, and subject to their veto if his principles are not such as are thought deserving of aid. Now, considering that the working members of the Committee are all of the strongest school of Evangelicals, it is not to be wondered at if the association is universally looked upon as the most active instrument of propagandism now existing. All the energies of the party are directed to its support. Three thousand clergymen give it active assistance. Its annual income, from subscriptions, exceeds 40,000*l.*; and it is a condition, expressed or implied, of every grant, that the recipient of the bounty shall undertake to urge the Society's claims on his congregation, at least on one stated occasion in the year. In some cases, leading men of the party do so on the distinct plea of its party character. Indeed, in the last report, the Committee draw particular attention to the evangelical nature of their principles, and ask their clerical friends to point it out more prominently to their flocks. They publish distinct attacks, not only on Romanism—one of their select preachers is described by his biographer as looking on popery with hatred and terror, "as if he saw the whole system steaming direct from Hell,"—but also on Puseyism. The following is a passage from one Incumbent's grateful letter, which is printed with official approbation:—

"Another case has struck me much. "A young man, highly educated and in "a responsible position, had been greatly "attracted by Puseyism. He had long "attended a Puseyite place of worship; "but, seeing a controversial lecture advertised, he determined to come and "hear it. He did so, and was so deeply "impressed, that he has never since returned to his former Church. He is "now a most valuable help to me."—(P. 38.)

The employment of lay agency, it may be mentioned, is an instrument of much power in the hands of the Evangelicals, some of whom push it to a remarkable excess. One clergyman of a manufacturing town last year himself appointed thirty lay-missionaries to hold prayer-meetings in his parish. One society, a very good and useful one, is established for the purpose of supplying these lay agents to the metropolis, and has more than a hundred in its pay. It is conducted on the same principles as the Pastoral-Aid. Indeed the arrangements of most of the religious societies is of an evangelical cast: and there are few in whose Exeter Hall meetings an attack on some other party of the Church is not received with the heartiness of cheering which only polemic zeal can raise. The Church Missionary Society, which has existed sixty years, which has revolutionized whole nations in the interest of civilisation and Christianity, whose converts are numbered by the hundred thousand, does service also as a party engine. Established in imitation of methodist and baptist associations for the same cause, and from the first under the guidance of Pratt, Thornton, Venn, and other Evangelicals of heroic mould, its committee-rooms are still headquarters of party agency, its officers the chief promoter's of the cause, and its publications contain elaborate attacks on Tractarianism.

See, for example, the "Church Missionary Intelligencer," January, 1855.

"In 'its choice of men,' says its select preacher in 1858, 'the Church Missionary Society has erred rather in 'excess than in defect of holy jealousy. 'And thus, directly or indirectly, it has 'become a rally-point and bulwark in 'our Church. . . . Let the Church Missionary Society be cajoled or frightened, 'and many an Eli would tremble."

There is again another means of united action which has been devised of late years for the same object,—clerical meetings. It has long been customary for the clergy of many districts to meet for conversation and mutual encouragement, though the custom has been chiefly adopted by those of the Evangelical school. But within the last few years a system of monster meetings has been brought into play. There assemble, at stated periods, around some well-known chief, a large number,—sometimes two or three hundred,—of those clergymen who are known to be of sound views, with a very few favoured laymen. Addresses are delivered, sermons preached, and statements made. Young clergymen make the acquaintance of the great leaders, some of whom are on such occasions never wanting: and from them they learn how war is waged, and battles won. In London, the time of the May Meetings in Exeter Hall is known as one of general rendezvous, and it is then that the inner circle of champions hold council on their policy and prospects. The largo meetings are held at various places; one, the origin, we believe, of the rest, at Weston-super-Mare; one at Peterborough, one at Bristol, a large one at Islington; and others. The addresses are prepared with great care, special subjects being generally allotted beforehand to each speaker; and they show study, and, except in the case of the chief leaders, a diffident sense of the greatness of the occasion. A small book is now before us, containing the addresses delivered at one of the largest of these meetings in the year 1858. It is called "The Church," is published by Wertheim and Macintosh, and edited by the Rev. Charles Bridges. Dr. McNeile, who is of course one of the speakers, seems to have urged the importance of the meeting, composed, as he says, of the Evangelical clergy of the Church: and reminds his hearers that they are the salt of the whole mass. Canon Stowell follows him in an address of which the following passages are select examples.

"After all, what is the real tendency 'of 'broad church principles,' as they 'are called? Why the very name is 'sufficient to brand them; for we know 'that 'broad is the way,' not of truth, 'but of error; and that 'narrow is the 'way' which leadeth to life eternal"—(P. 19.)

"There is as much hostility in the 'carnal mind to the distinctive doctrines 'of the gospel now as there was then; 'yes, and among the clergy as among 'the laymen, however much it may be 'reserved or disguised."—(P. 22.)

"There can be (with regard to India) 'no longer uncertainty as to what we 'have to apprehend, from the way in 'which Lord Stanley has spoken out. 'I thank God for his candour, while I 'bitterly deplore his godless sentiments."—(P. 38.)

The Rev. J. C. Ryle remarks that Exeter Hall is a fifth estate of the realm. He laments that young men are not as satisfactory as could be wished. "How often, after writing to friends, 'and then advertising in the *Record*, 'Evangelical clergymen are obliged to 'put up with curates not established in 'the faith, and not up to the mark, 'simply because no others are to be 'met with." He laments that no effort is made to 'put out of the Church" men who differ from him in their views of inspiration and future punishment. One more quotation we must give, and then dismiss the discourse with satisfaction:—

"It is not uncommon now to hear of 'High-churchmen saying to Evangelical 'clergymen, as was said in the time of 'Ezra and Nehemiah, by Sanballat and 'Tobiah, 'Let us build with you.' But 'let us not be taken in by such sophistry. Better build by ourselves, better 'let the work go on slowly, than allow 'Sanballat and Tobiah to come and 'build by our side. I believe that all 'communion of that sort, all interchange of pulpits with unsound men, 'is to be deprecated, as doing nothing 'but harm to the cause of God. I believe that by so doing we endorse the 'sentiments of persons who have no 'real love of Christ's truth. We enable the High-church party to manufacture ecclesiastical capital out of the 'Evangelical clergy, and to make people 'believe that we are all one in heart, 'when, in reality, we differ in first 'principles. From such unity and cooperation we pray to be delivered."

Such are the chief features of the organisation of a powerful and active school in the Church of England. If ever that Church is to be again the Church of the nation, if ever it is to lead a grand attack on vice, and folly, and worldliness, it cannot be by the continuance among this large portion of her clergy of the spirit which seems to animate their collective action. In estimating it, we use no unfair tests; we appeal to no private scandal; we repeat no anecdotes; we quote the *dicta* only of the leaders of the party. Of individual intolerance we do not complain; it is a fault common to all ages and all parties. We shall not quote the *Record*; even though some of the leaders acknowledge it as their organ, by publishing their views in its columns, we shall yet not urge against their followers the rancour of which very many of them disapprove. When a minister of a central manufacturing town, who is usually courteous, and a favourable specimen of his school, says that if he knew any clergyman to hold the extreme High Church view of the doctrine of Confession he would not allow him to

enter his family—"he could not trust him,"—we have no wish to charge the saying upon all those whose champion he is. But, when in every step that is taken in common by clergymen of this party, in every union for purposes of philanthropy or spiritual communion there springs up at once a polemic spirit, often bitter and always uncompromising, it is a sign that the party in which such can be the case has done its work, is shorn of half its strength for other and holier purposes, and had better die.

But the Evangelical party is redeemed by the working of its parishes. It is to its credit that it is foremost in united schemes of charity: it is to its credit, to some extent, that foreign missions have so increased and spread. But that which saves it from wreck, which atones for its arbitrary social maxims, which partly conceals its obnoxious polemic organization, is the fact that the Evangelical clergy, as a body, are indefatigable in ministerial duties, and devoted, heart and soul, to the manifold labours of Christian love. The school, the savings-bank, the refuge, all the engines of parochial usefulness, find in them, for the most part, hearty supporters and friends. There is a positive literature of parish machinery. We have now before us a small work on the subject by the minister of a large parish in the south-west of London, which gives the details of the administration of such a system. The hardest workers are not generally the fiercest partisans; and it contains throughout not one word of religious sectarianism or hostile inuendo. Instead, there are practical suggestions and information on topics of which the following are some:—books for the sick, arrangement of pulpit, management of voice, district visitors, psalmody, almoners, Sunday and other schools, maternity fund, early communion, charity sermons, meetings, parish accounts, school books, rewards, confirmation classes, the cooking of rice, relief tickets, penny banks, soup in time of cholera, lending library, cottage lectures, open-air services, working men's seats in church, local collections, and books of memoranda. This parish, we are bound to say, is but a specimen of many; and we could quote, but that such work is not the nobler for the praise of men, similar tracts, supplying for parish circulation the annual narrative of progress in this kind of work. It is not necessary to dwell long on the subject; it is patent, and easily appreciated. But when the history of the Evangelical party is written, it will be told of them, that with narrow-mindedness and mistaken traditions, with little intellectual acquirements and ill-directed zeal against their brothers in the Church, they yet worked manfully in the pestilent and heathen by-ways of our cities, and preached the gospel to the poor.

It remains to say a few words on the intellectual attitude of the party. This is not the occasion to discuss points of doctrine, or examine questions of ecclesiastical polity. But it is impossible not to remark that the position which this body of clergymen, the appointed guides to thinking and reflecting fellow-men, have deliberately and almost unanimously adopted, is one of direct antagonism to intellectual progress and research. In this one point they have followed the tradition of the elders. Venn wrote, in 1780, "Our God never "prescribes a critical study of the "Hebrew text;" and since then it is hardly too much to say, that his followers have not led public opinion in any one point of mental advancement, or contributed one single work,—at all events more than one,—which has been generally accepted as a signal addition to the stores of theological speculation or criticism. Their most distinguished men are not men of conspicuous learning; their most highly prized writings seem even to slight the acquirements of science and scholarship. And this is the case not only in their practice, but in their theory. The spiritual element of our nature is so highly exalted, that the intellectual is looked upon with absolute suspicion. "The cultivation of the intellectual power's," says Or. Close (Sermons, 1842, p. 149), "can of itself "have no tendency towards moral or "spiritual good. . . . Time cannot alter "the deteriorating tendency of unassisted human intellect." Of all studies discordant with the Church of England, Mr. Clayton, a well-known evangelical preacher, writes (Sermons, p. 239): "Young persons should especially be "careful to turn away from all such "dangerous speculations." Mr. Ryle, even when speaking of the duty of reading and study, which he allows to be neglected, makes the singular exception, "I do not mean that we ought to read "things which do not throw light upon "the word of God" (Home Truths, vol. vi.), and in his preface to a commentary on St. Luke, shows his idea of the value of accurate criticism by the remark that "the 'various readings' of the New "Testament are of infinitesimally small "importance." The Rev. C. Bridges (Weston Address, p. 46), somewhat naively confesses, "with regard to the "snares for the intellect, if we seek to "meet the great reasoner on his own "ground, he is more than a match for "us;" and Canon Stowell, apparently with regard to a late edition of the New Testament, laments that "at this time "some of our learned and critical men "do us more injury than advantage."

Now it is well known that the last few years have been years of great advance in theological knowledge. Science, ethnology, the history of language, accurate scholarship, are doing much to assist the study of the Bible, and further the progress of religious thought. It is probable that much will be done by the pursuit of these studies to modify opinions and suggest new canons of criticism. "We have no wish that it should be otherwise. Religious thought was never intended to stagnate. Novelty is not, indeed, a mark of truth; but obstructiveness in matters of theory is a certain guide to error. And, therefore, towards new phases of sacred speculation the attitude of a lover of truth will be, not antagonistic virulence, but judicial impartiality. He will not be rash to adopt the guesses of a restless ambition; but he will not shut his eyes to reasonable and probable argument. He

will not deem the intellect the sovereign principle in man; but he will determine, in God's strength, to bring anything to the bar of reason. He will not read the apostolic precept as though it were "Disprove all things;" but he will no more be driven from intellectual duty by fear of consequences, than from moral. He will give all reverence to those who teach the soul: but, loyal to the ends to which man's nature points, he will render unto mind the things that are mind's. And so he will strive, without partiality or without hypocrisy, to enter the kingdom of God as a little child; and so act, if he may,

That mind and soul, according well.
May make one music.

Is it possible that Evangelical energy may ever adopt this attitude? It was the essence of Protestantism to attack prejudice: and they are the most zealous Protestants of the Church. The chief doctrine of the Reformation was the right of private judgment; and though many of the maxims of the Reformation have been lost, this has not quite died yet. Is it yet possible that a fuller knowledge of the tendencies of the age, and some mighty resurrection from the narrowness of organised partizanship may change the current of their sympathies, and make them, even now, champions, not of change, but of inquiry, and research, and development? It cannot be, while they believe the sentiment of Dr. Close, in his Lectures on the Evidences, that Revelation was not meant to gratify a "proud investigation." Investigation of every possible subject is the bounden duty of every educated man, as far as his time and talents allow; and that investigation may well be proud which is the result of powers bestowed by the Almighty for the study of His mysteries. If they refuse to acknowledge this duty; if they cling to the crystallized system of what was once a working and living spirit, forgetting nothing, learning nothing; if they give all the energies of their collective action to attack some difference of ecclesiastical creed, and all the weight of their social influence to create artificial division in what God, by forming human society, has pronounced united; then all their labours of parish charity, and schemes of worldwide philanthropy, will hardly save them from the sentence which awaits all that is transitory, because artificial; and those who know what once the party was will see, when they look upon it now, only a fresh instance of the way in which zeal is pernicious, when its purpose is an anachronism, and good men wasted, when the mind is narrowed to tradition, and the sympathies distorted to party.

Poetry, Prose, and Mr Patmore.

By Richard Garnett.

EVERY poet pleads, and every critic laments, the difficulties opposed by modern habits of thought, and the constitution of modern society, to the production of substantial works of poetic art—such, we mean, as affect an independent concrete existence, instead of merely serving to express the feelings of the writers as individuals. If, it is said, the author resorts for his subject to the antique or the ideal world, the degree of his success does but serve to measure the remoteness of his exile from contemporary interests and sympathies; if, on the other hand, he endeavours to reflect the life around him, he can no more escape alloying his strain with the transitory and accidental than the diver can avoid bringing up the oyster with the pearl. This is true; but it cannot be said that the unhappy divorce between the real and ideal is the especial disaster of our times. Few and brief have been the periods in human history when a vital belief in a mythology capable of supplying art with the most exalted themes has co-existed with the ability to apply it to poetic usages. The reason is evident—that such a degree of ability implies a degree of culture and intelligence in presence of which the most picturesque legends disappear like

*"A withered morn,
Smote by the fresh beam of the springing East."*

For two generations only was it possible for the Greeks to retain, along with the civilization which permitted their tragic poets to exemplify the perfection of artistic skill no less than of native power, the simple traditional belief which gave their dramas a root in the national life as well as the national sense of beauty. Dante's contemporaries readily explained the gloom of his aspect as the effect of his Stygian experiences; but the Cardinal of Este, two hundred and fifty years later, would probably have referred the Divine Comedy to the same category as the Orlando Furioso. In fact, the difficulty of accomplishing the task on which modern criticism rather vociferously insists, of finding imaginative expression for the interests, aspirations, and social peculiarities of our own age, is so far from being any special characteristic of the age in question that it would

be hard to point out any writers who have more unequivocally succumbed to it than the great Italian pair of the sixteenth century,—Ariosto and Tasso. The contemporaries of the Constable Bourbon can hardly have cared much about Orlando; and, in Tasso's day, the Holy Sepulchre, so far from being the goal of a crusade, would not even answer as a pretext for replenishing the Papal coffers. If, then, the universal witness of the human heart justified Mrs. Browning in her "Distrust" of

*"The poet who discerns
No character or glory in his times,
And trundles back his soul five hundred years,
Past moat and drawbridge, into a castle court,"*

the successive laureates of that lucky house of Este ought to have been poetically dead and buried long ago. The notoriety of the contrary fact suggests that the utilitarian theory of poetry may perhaps be less sound than specious. "We see (and, if further example be required, Spenser, Keats, Shelley, and Schiller are at hand) that it is quite possible for genius to disdain the ground of realities and yet exist—though, it may be but as a wild, wandering beauty, a

*"Strange bird of Paradise
That floats through Heaven and cannot light."*

The modern impatience of the *indirect* operation of the humanizing and harmonizing influences of art—the confusion of the poet's function with that of the philosopher, the legislator, the reformer—have only tended to make writers conceited and readers unjust

Still, however extravagant the form in which it may sometimes find expression, the desire to see poetry brought into a more intimate relation with the practical needs of the age is in itself laudable and legitimate. In proportion to our appreciation of the elevating and refining character of its influences must be our unwillingness to contemplate these as necessarily limited in their operation to a small literary class. It cannot be said that contemporary poets have, as a body, shown any indisposition "to grapple with the questions of the time." On the contrary, their mistake has rather consisted in the failure to discriminate between those vitally and eternally significant and the merely transient and accidental features of the age. We live in times exceedingly favourable to the development of the speculative faculty—a period in which it is hardly possible to reflect seriously on any important topic without encountering some problem in urgent need of solution. The answers which for so many centuries have more or less contented the inquiring mind of man are now found to have been merely provisional; and, while old questions are being reopened on all sides, the gigantic development of physical and political science has suggested an infinity of new ones. By virtue of its peculiar sensitiveness, the poetic is even more likely than the ordinary mind to conceive an intense interest in some of these problems; and it is the very law of its being to reproduce its impressions in its creations. Unfortunately, nothing but an instinctive sense of artistic fitness will enable it to distinguish the permanent from the accidental features of its fascinating environment. We might mention two contemporary poets who possess this delicate tact, but doubt if the list could be extended.

Some writers not merely by preference adopt a metrical form as the vehicle of thought, but are before all things *poets*. Their conception of a poet is not that of one writing to instruct, to refine, to expound a plan of life, to accomplish any end whatever capable of being expressed with logical precision in words; but whose aim, or rather call it instinct, is simply to compose poetry. If you ask what this poetry is, they cannot tell you; they are only sure that it is an actual entity, as real an existence as painting or music. As painting, they would say, is not outline and colour, so neither is poet's language and rhythm; these are simply the vesture of the spirit else invisible. As music is not an ingenious way of moving the passions, but a something which possesses this among other properties, so the power of poetry to exalt or admonish is indeed an inherent quality, but not the essence of poetry itself. A writer who has risen to this conception of his art will neither make perfection of form nor practical utility his main object, for his instinct assures him that the soul of poetry lies elsewhere. As the painter does not conceive the universe to be all colour, as the musician has eyes as well as ears, so he himself does not regard poetry as sunlight, steeping the universe in a flood of monotonous radiance, but as the intense electric beam, whose splendid concentration on some objects only serves to isolate them from the surrounding darkness. Consequently, he will be an eclectic, content with selecting from the mass of contemporary interests those themes alone which appear to him susceptible of poetic treatment; like a bee, he alights only upon flowers. Thus, though Mr. Tennyson is one of the most thoughtful of men, familiar with every branch of ethical

and abstract speculation, it is impossible to extract anything like a theory of life from his writings, simply because such a theory must necessarily take cognisance of a multitude of details which he has intuitively perceived to be unpoetical. The same might have been said even of so eminent a thinker as Goethe, had he never written in prose.

But, it may be asked, is the reader dependent on the fidelity of the writer's intuitions? Can he not determine for himself when he is or is not reading poetry? We might reply that he is himself frequently a participant in "the vision and the faculty divine," even though "the channels between thought and expression may have been obstructed." Perhaps, however, it may be possible to discover a less abrupt *Gradus ad Parnassum*. Painting, sculpture, music, are found to agree in the common aim of raising man above himself—of substituting a state of emotion for one of tranquillity. If no emotion be excited by the sight of a painting or a statue, or the hearing of a piece of music, then either the spectator or listener is naturally insensible to the influence of art, or has temporarily become so through satiety, pre-occupation, or infirmity, or else the merits of the work itself are merely of a technical character. Poetry, in the proper sense of the term, is attended by the same effect, and maybe discovered by the same criterion. The range of the poetic is indeed more extensive than that of the sister arts. Emotion may be aroused by an appeal to the affections, as in Moore's—

*"I know not, I ask not, if guilt's in that heart;
I but know that I love thee, whatever thou art;"*

—to the imagination, as in Shelley's description of the waning moon:—

*"Like a (lying lady, lean and pale,
Who totters forth, wrapt in a gauzy veil,
Out of her chamber, led by the insane
And feeble wanderings of her fading brain,
The moon arose up on the murky earth,
A white and shapeless mass;"*

or, finally, by the enunciation of some grand moral or philosophical truth, such as Wordsworth's—

*"Sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things"*

This latter sublime passage is to be rather apprehended intuitively than by a conscious effort of the understanding; and so in every case the appeal is addressed to feeling of some sort;

See Mr. Mill's masterly essay on Poetry and its Varieties ("Dissertations and Discussions," vol. i.).

and, therefore, poetry, in the highest sense, cannot undertake the construction of a theory of life or the universe, on which the logical faculty alone is competent to pronounce. Yet this is the very work which each successive generation requires and attempts to accomplish. The highest kind of poetry, then, cannot fulfil the wants and wishes of contemporaries; and it even requires self-discipline and watchfulness, and an ambition of achieving practical results, to prevent its wandering off altogether into the ideal regions which are after all most congenial to its nature. Mrs. Shelley has recorded the difficulty her husband experienced in composing political songs, political zealot as he was.

The cultivation of poetry for its own sake is, however, quite exceptional, even with poets. With most, when once they have travelled beyond the simple lyrical expression of their individual emotions, the main impulse to the production of poetry has obviously been to afford the world the benefit of their opinion on subjects which appear to them of importance. Thus, if we are to accept Milton's own account of his aims, his sublimest flights of imagination are merely accessories to the practical end of "justifying the ways of God to man." It is impossible to suppose that the architect of Pandemonium took no pleasure in his work for its own sake,

independent of the value he ascribed to it as a buttress of theology; but, with less imaginative writers, the artistic motive disappears in the didactic. In the "Course of Time," for example, the Calvinistic polemic is real and hearty; the imaginative form a reminiscence of Milton, as conventional as a red petticoat in a landscape. The same assertion, *mutatis mutandis*, may be made with reference to Cowper, Young, Crabbe, &c. Almost all Wordsworth's poems stand in direct and calculated relation to his theories of life and art. Even Mrs. Browning tells us that she intends "Aurora Leigh" as the exponent of her own. Now we think we may venture to assume as axioms—

1. That every system of thought is in some way the offspring of the age in which it makes its appearance. Thus Wordsworth's anti-conventionalism was at bottom merely another manifestation of the same spirit that was contemporaneously overthrowing the thrones of the continent. The Tractarian protest against the tendencies of the age was virtually as much the creature of the age as those tendencies themselves.

2. The poets who frame such systems are necessarily better exponents of the special characteristics of their times than those who restrict themselves to the essentially poetical; for this is the common property of all ages. But, the more completely they express these characteristic features, the more certainly do they reproduce the frivolous casual aspects of the age, as well as those of serious and permanent significance. Consequently, the problem, how to adapt the eternal spirit of poetry to contemporary interests and sympathies, does not admit of a satisfactory solution. A rigid idealist, professing to go round the world without transgressing the limits of pure poetry, is like one endeavouring to empty the sea with a bucket. A mere realist, trying to accomplish the poet's task with the satirist's tools, would hew an oak with rushes, weave a cable from sand. The same strictures apply to the purely didactic poet who is inevitably driven to adapt his instructions to the special requirements of his generation.

Mr. Patmore

Faithful for Ever. By Coventry Patmore. J. W. Parker and Son.

is an admirable example of the second of the poetical classes we have endeavoured to discriminate above—of those, namely, who write poetry not for its own sake, but for that of some definite aim ever present to their minds. Mr. Tennyson and Mr. Patmore have each treated of the mission of woman; but is it possible to imagine two more dissimilar works than the "Princess" and the "Angel in the House?" Mr. Patmore describes his task as self-imposed, requiring special training, steady purpose, and prolonged effort:—

*"The fairest realm in all the earth
Is counted still a heathen land;
So I, like Joshua, now go forth
To give it into Israel's hand.
I've girt myself with faith and prayer," &c.*

And he does indeed go at his work with a simple manly directness that would insure him our respect, even if his genius did not, as it must, command our admiration. Mr. Tennyson, too, professes to have a moral, of which he is continually losing sight, and which cannot be deduced from the preceding narrative. "Maud" has fifty times the moral significance of "The Princess," and for this very reason, that Mr. Tennyson has not gone out of his way in quest of anything, but, allowing free play to his artistic instincts, has evolved an ethical lesson as well. Mr. Patmore could not write with this *abandon*; he speaks by the intellect, though, it may be, often *to* the feelings. Fortunately these feelings, though temporarily entwined like ivy with much that is accidental and perishable, have still, like ivy, a root in the solid earth. If we wish to understand Mr. Patmore's merit in this respect, we can compare his poem with one partly conceived in a kindred spirit—Aurora Leigh. Each book is occupied with a social problem; but Mrs. Browning's is one to which the peculiar aspects of the age have imparted an adventitious importance, while Mr. Patmore's is invested with constant freshness by its vital relation to the needs of the human heart. The elements of decay in his work—its wood, hay, and stubble—appear to us to be not so much inherent in its structure as superinduced by his didactic spirit, his determination to exhaust the significance of his theme, instead of confining himself to its poetic aspects as Mr. Tennyson would have done. In a word, he seems to us to confuse the office of the poet with that of the moralist on one hand, and that of the novelist on the other.

This implies that Mr. Patmore is after all essentially a poet, and moreover that, when he temporarily ceases to be such, he does but substitute one kind of excellence for another. His ethics and his social delineations are as good in their way as the inspirations of his loftier mood—his precious metal has some alloy, but little dross. It requires, we are sensible, a much finer analysis than ours to discriminate with perfect accuracy between his poetry and his prose; and, unlike most treasure-seekers, we are in much greater danger of parting with the object of our quest than of retaining what we do not want. It is curious that this enthusiastic singer of domestic

life should himself be one of the last writers with whom we can feel thoroughly at home; but assuredly the most sensible impression we have derived from every reperusal of the "Angel in the House" has been one of astonishment at the amount of beauty which the last reading had left for us to discover. We may say of Mr. Patmore's book, as he says of his heroine, that we have found it "more to us"

*"Yesterday than the day before,
And more to-day than yesterday."*

Any opinion, therefore, that we may express respecting the poem under consideration must be taken as subject to revision; yet there are principles of criticism which we may venture to apply boldly. If we find, for example, any particular passage to be—leaving its metrical form out of account—exactly such as we should have expected to meet with in a novel, we can hardly consider it to be in its place where we find it; often, on the other hand, when the theme is apparently little calculated to arouse our sympathies, the poet's lyrical fervour indicates that its significance has been more truly revealed to him than to us. In the first book, more especially, the fountains of the great deep of feeling are broken up with tempest; the subsequent calm is indeed a falling-off, but we are in more danger of tedium than of shipwreck.

"Faithful for Ever" is not, as we have seen it described, an episode in "The Angel in the House;" it is rather a supplement, representing some of the aspects of the philosophy of love and marriage, excluded by the plan of the former work. In "The Angel in the House," the course of true love runs exceedingly smooth. Intended as introductory to a comprehensive treatment of the whole theory of married life, it necessarily excluded the idea of any but a fortunate catastrophe. To have conducted Vaughan's suit to an unprosperous termination would have been to have shut the door in the poet's own face; the "betrothal" was the necessary condition of the "espousals." It would, of course, have been possible to have subjected the hero to violent alternations of hope and fear, joy and bitterness, as painters of the final triumph of the righteous make over half their canvas to the demons. But Mr. Patmore appears to have felt, with the delicate tact we so often admire in him, that pathos misses its effect when joy is a foregone conclusion, and that it would be better to reserve it as the leading motive of a new work. In the present poem, accordingly, we are presented with a new protagonist in the person of Frederick Graham, Vaughan's moral and spiritual facsimile, and whose preferences and antipathies necessarily correspond to those of his counterpart. It follows that both are attracted by Honoria Churchill, and it falls to the rejected Graham to teach what the fortunate Vaughan could not know. The task which Mr. Patmore has thus prescribed to himself, of representing the demeanour of a mind of unusual nobility under a trial of which even his eloquence cannot exaggerate the bitterness, is one already attempted by Mr. Tennyson in *Love and Duty*. The laureate, however, only gives us the result; Mr. Patmore, a master of analysis rather than of generalisation, is more particularly occupied with the process. Every phase of feeling through which the lover has to struggle is seized at the culminating point, and reproduced with a pathos which nothing can exceed, because nothing can surpass its fidelity. It would be great injustice to Mr. Patmore not to allow him to speak here for himself. Laying a good foundation, Frederick thus describes the lady of his heart in the first canto:—

*"The noble girl! With whom she talks
She knights first with her smile; she walks,
Stands, dances, to such sweet effect
Alone she seems to go erect.
The brightest and the chastest brow
Rules o'er a cheek which seems to show
That love, as a mere vague suspense
Of apprehensive innocence,
Perturbs her heart; love without aim
Or object, like the holy flame
That in the Vestals' temple glowed
Without the image of a god."*

The gradual ascent of admiration into passion is portrayed with the most delicate accuracy. The transient and contradictory emotions of the lover's mood are arrested and recorded in the very act of passing into their opposites; the contending billows of his breast are shown by sudden flashes, as he himself picturesquely says of the waves of an actual storm—

"Standing about in stony heaps."

At one moment he exclaims—

*"Blest is her place! blissful is she!
And I, departing, seem to be
Like the strange waif that comes to run
A few days flaming near the sun,
And carries back through boundless night
Its lessening memory of light"*

But the next—

*"What! and, when some short months are o'er,
Be not much other than before?
Decline the high harmonious sphere
In which I'm held but while she's dear?
In unrespective peace forget
Those eyes for which mine own are wet
With that delicious fruitful dew
Which, check'd, will never flow anew?
For daily life's dull senseless mood
Slay the sharp nerves of gratitude
And sweet allegiance, which I owe
Whether she cares for me or no?
Nay, mother, I, forewarned, prefer
To want for all in wanting her.
For all? Love's best is not bereft
Ever from him to whom is left
The trust that God will not deceive
His creature, fashion'd to believe
The prophecies of pure desire.
Not loss, nor death, my love shall tire.
A mystery does my heart foretell;
Nor do I press the oracle
For explanations. Leave me alone,
And let in me love's will be done."*

What that will was is known to all readers of the "Angel in the House." The final overthrow of such hope as Graham had ventured to entertain, is expressed in perhaps the finest simile Mr. Patmore has yet made. His rival Vaughan enters while he is sitting with Honoria:—

*"And, as the image of the moon
Breaks up within some still lagoon
That feels the soft wind suddenly,
Or tide fresh flowing from the sea,
And turns to giddy flames that go
Over the water to and fro,
Thus, when he took her hand to-night,
Her lovely gravity of light
Was scattered into many smiles
And flattering weakness. Hope beguiles*

*No more my heart, dear mother; He
By jealous looks, o'erhonoured me!"*

We know not whether Mr. Patmore, who has finely said in "The Angel in the House" that

*"Love in tears too noble is
For pity, save of Love in smiles,"*

has since so far modified his opinions as to intentionally represent an unfortunate as the legitimate object of envy instead of compassion to a successful lover. We remember, indeed, Vaughan in one place expressing himself as if his being less "hapless" necessarily implied that he was less "great" than his rival; and assuredly the enthusiasm of possession falls short of the fervour with which Graham,

*"Nursing the image of unfelt caresses
Till dim imagination just possesses
The half-created shadow,"*

celebrates the object of his affection and despair. He dreams that—

*"Lo!
As moisture sweet my seeing blurs
To hear my name so linked with hers,
A mirror joins, by guilty chance,
Either's averted, watchful glance!
Or with me in the ball-room's blaze
Her brilliant mildness thrids the maze;
Our thoughts are lovely, and each word
Is music in the music heard,
And all things seem but parts to be
In one persistent harmony,
By which I'm made divinely bold;
The secret, which she knows, is told;
And, laughing with a lofty bliss
Of innocent accord, we kiss;
About her neck my pleasure weeps;
Against my lip the silk vein leaps.*

* * * * *

*Or else some wasteful malady
Devours her shape and dims her eye;
No charms are left, where all were rife,
Except her voice, which is her life,
Wherewith she, in her foolish fear,
Says trembling. 'Do you love me, dear?
And I reply, 'Ah, sweet, I vow
I never loved but half till now.'
She turns her face to the wall at this,
And says, 'Go, love, 'tis too much bliss.'
And then a sudden pulse is sent
About the sounding firmament*

*In smittings as of silver bars
The bright disorder of the stars
Is solved by music, far and near,
Through infinite distinctions clear
Their two-fold voice's deeper tone
Thunders the Name which all things own,
And each ecstatic treble dwells
On that whereof none other tells;
And we, sublimed to song and fire,
Take order in the wheeling quire,
Till from the throbbing sphere I start,
Waked by the beating of my heart."*

All his visions, however, are far from resembling this:—

*"When I lay me down at even
'Tis Hades lit with neighbouring Heaven.
There comes a smile acutely sweet
Out of the picturing dark; I meet
The ancient frankness of her gaze,
That simple, bold, and living blaze
Of great goodwill and innocence
And perfect joy proceeding thence,
Ah! made for Earth's delight, yet such
The mid-sea air's too gross to touch.
At thought of which, the soul in me
Is as the bird that bites a bee,
And darts abroad on frantic wing
Tasting the honey and the sting;
And, moaning where all round me sleep
Amidst the moaning of the deep,
I start at midnight from my bed,
And have no right to strike him dead."*

Nor any wish, before long. Vaughan and his bride visit Graham's ship, and the effect of his observation is to compel the latter to resign "the ultimate hope I rested on:"—

*"The hope that in the heavens high
At last it should appear that I
Loved most, and so, by claim divine,
Should have her, in the heavens, for mine,
According to such nuptial sort
As may subsist in the holy court,
Where, if there are all kinds of joys
To exhaust the multitude of choice
In many mansions, then there are
Loves personal and particular,
Conspicuous in the glorious sky
Of universal charity
As Hesper in the sunrise."*

Whence,

*"Standing beneath the sky's pure cope
Unburdened even by a hope,"*

he is able to feel—

*"That I have known her, that she moves
Somewhere all-graceful; that she loves,
And is beloved, and that she's so
Most happy; and to heaven will go,
Where I may meet with her (yet this
I count but adventitious bliss),
And that the full, celestial weal
Of all shall sensitively feel
The partnership and work of each,
And thus my love and labour reach
Her region, there the more to bless
Her last, consummate happiness,
Is guerdon up to the degree
Of that alone true loyalty
Which, sacrificing, is not nice
About the terms of sacrifice,
But offers all, with smiles that say,
'Twere nothing if 'twere not for aye!"*

O si sic omnia! In that case, indeed, "Faithful for Ever" would be no illustration of our doctrine that poetry parts with its essential characteristics in proportion as it undertakes to teach otherwise than indirectly, or concerns itself with the mutable superficialities of contemporary life. So far, however, though Frederick Graham is a very substantial personality—a thoroughly imaginable man—his expressions of feeling have been as purely lyrical and subjective as the lamentations of Clymene or Cænone. He has, as before remarked, had to learn the same lesson of self-renunciation as the anonymous hero of "Love and Duty," with this very important difference, that the latter has but succumbed to external circumstances as independent of the will of his beloved as of his own; he has yielded nothing to any rival; what he has acquired is after all more precious than what he has been compelled to forgo. Mr. Tennyson, therefore, is not asking too much when he would have us contemplate the "streaming eye" as finally dried, the "broken heart" as eventually bound up; we not merely acquiesce in the propriety, but have faith in the permanence, of the conclusion at which his hero arrives. The infinitely greater severity of Graham's trial perhaps justifies Mr. Patmore in considering that, had the mood of our last extract been represented as permanent, had the curtain fallen then and there upon his hero's folded arms of humility and upward gaze of ineffable aspiration, our torpid imaginations would have seen nothing but a stage-effect, and expected, could we pierce behind the scenes, to find Graham rather prostrate beneath, than

"Growing, like Atlas, stronger from his load."

At all events, he has not chosen to task our faith so heavily. In the second section of the next canto we find Honoria's lover—married! Yes, and to a very unattractive personage. Of course, he has a thousand good reasons for maintaining that he has committed no treason against love; that his bride is at worst but as one of Voltaire's *oignons, qui n'étaient pas des dieux tout-a-fait, mais qui leur ressembaient beaucoup*:—

*"As to the ether is the air
Is her good to Honoria's fair;
One place is full of both, yet each
Lies quite beyond the other's reach
And recognition. Star and star,*

Rays crossing, closer rivals are."

Mr. Patmore is now fully in his element, with a triple moral problem before him. He has to make his hero's paradox good, to show the effect on Jane (the unattractive wife) of being thus caught up into a sphere so much above her, and to determine the proper relation of Honoria to her married lover. This involves the necessity of a copious and minute delineation of manners and customs, since (to name but one aspect of the problem) it is impossible to depict Frederick and Jane's mutual relation and interaction without entering fully into the details of their domestic life. Behold us, then, alike from the didactic and the descriptive point of view, fairly committed to a course of what, *we say*, is substantially prose; not that the writing is not, for the most part, very clever, but this is not the question; not that we are not continually encountering passages of the most exquisite poetry, but these are not the rule. We are content to stake the whole theory of this paper on a single issue,—*"Is or is not the first book of 'Faithful for Ever' incomparably the best of the three?"* It would be a cheap triumph to produce some of the passages (excellent as these are in their way) in which Mr. Patmore furls the poet's wing on the essayist's perch; but these separate bricks could at best bear witness to the material, not to the style of the building.

In conclusion, it will be but just to produce the results at which Mr. Patmore appears to have arrived, embodied in two of the most charming passages of his poem. As regards the relation which Honoria ultimately assumes to Graham, contemplated from *her* point of view, we learn nothing; and, indeed, the problem suggests questions of such infinite delicacy that we cannot wonder at Mr. Patmore's reticence. As we are only concerned with her here in so far as she concerns Frederick, we could well have dispensed with numerous trivial, details relative to her husband and children, which vexatiously conflict with the unity of impression already disturbed by the change of *venue* in Book II. In fact, the way in which she is trotted out for the admiration of one personage after another is almost comical. That Frederick himself should never tire of praising her is as natural as that we should never tire of listening to passages like this:—

*"I kiss'd the kind, warm neck that slept,
And from her side, this morning, stepp'd
To bathe my brain from drowsy night
In the sharp air and golden light.
The dew, like frost, was on the pane.
The year begins, though fair, to wane.
There is a fragrance in its breath
Which is not of the flowers, but death,
And green above the ground appear
The lilies of another year.
I wandered forth, and took my path
Among the bloomless aftermath;
And heard the steadfast robin sing,
As if his own warm heart were spring,
And watch'd him feed where, on the yew,
Hung sugar'd drops of crimson dew;
And then return'd by walls of peach
And pear-trees bending to my reach,
And rose-beds with the roses gone,
To bright-laid breakfast. Mrs. Vaughan
Was there, none with her. I confess
I love her rather more than less!
But she alone was loved of old;
Now love is twain, nay, manifold;
For, somehow, he whose daily life
Adjusts itself to one true wife
Grows to a nuptial, near degree
With all that's fair and womanly.
Therefore, as more than friends, we meet*

*Without constraint, without regret;
The wedded yoke that each had donn'd
Seeming a sanction, not a bond."*

We have undertaken to question the propriety of Mr. Patmore's attempting the solution of moral problems in verse at all, not the logic of the solution itself. Yet we cannot refrain from remarking, that the conclusion expressed in the above most exquisite passage appears to us an unfair deduction from the pre-mises. On the other hand, the picture of Jane's development from original immaturity, rather than absolute defect, to perfect sweetness and ripeness of character, is as natural as it is captivating. We are indeed reminded at every stroke how much better it would have become the pages of a work like "The Mill on the Floss," where copiousness and minute precision of detail are rather to be cultivated than avoided. Had the writer attempted to rival Miss Evans's exactness, he might have filled two volumes with this single theme; as it is, he is at once too particular for poetry and too superficial for fiction. Yet, as the stalk is forgotten in the flower, we acknowledge a justification of much prose in the lovely poetry that comes to crown it at last.

*"Too soon, too soon, comes death to show
We love more deeply than we know!
The rain, that fell upon the height
Too gently to be called delight,
Within the dark vale reappears
As a wild cataract of tears;
And love in life should strive to see
Sometimes what love in death would be.
She's cold. Put to the coffin-lid.
What distance for another did,
That death has done for her!
* * * * **

*How great her smallest virtue seems,
How small her greatest fault! Ill dreams
Were those that foil'd with loftier grace
The homely kindness of her face.
'Twas here she sat and work'd, and there
She comb'd and kiss'd the children's hair;
Or, with one baby at her breast,
Another taught, or hush'd to rest.
Praise does the heart no more refuse
To the divinity of use.
Her humblest good is hence most high
In the heavens of fond memory;
And love says Amen to the word,
A prudent wife is from the Lord.
Her worst gown's kept ('tis now the best,
As that in which she oftenest dress'd),
For memory's sake more precious grown
Than she herself was for her own.
Poor wife! foolish it seemed to fly
To sobs instead of dignity,
When she was hurt. Now, more than all,
Heart-rending and angelical
That ignorance of what to do,
Bewilder'd still by wrong from you.
(For what man ever yet had grace
Not to abuse his power and place?)
No magic of her voice or smile*

*Rais'd in a trice a fairy isle;
But fondness for her underwent
An unregarded increment,
Like that which lifts through centuries
The coral reef within the seas,
Till lo! the land where was the wave.
Alas! 'tis everywhere her grave."*

To deny the character of poetry to tenderness and truth like this, would be to rob the Muses of their fairest province—to treat Parnassus as Catherine and her confederates treated Poland.

The Private of the Buffs.

By Sir F. H. Doyle.

"Some Seiks, and a private of the Buffs, having remained behind with the grog-carts, fell into the hands of the Chinese. On the next morning, they were brought before the authorities, and commanded to perform the *kotou*. The Seiks obeyed: but Moyse, the English soldier, declaring that he would not prostrate himself before any Chinaman alive, was immediately knocked upon the head, and his body thrown on a dung-hill."—*See China Correspondent of the "Times."*

*Lost night, among his fellow roughs,
He jested, quaffed, and swore;
A drunken private of the Buffs,
Who never looked before.*

*To-day, beneath the foeman's frown,
He stands in Elgin's place,
Ambassador from Britain's crown,
And type of all her race.*

Poor, reckless, rude, low-born, untaught,
Bewildered, and alone,
A heart, with English instinct fraught,
He yet can call his own.
Ay, tear his body limb from limb,
Bring cord, or axe or flame:
He only knows, that not through *him*
Shall England come to shame.

Far Kentish

The Buffs, or West Kent Regiment.
hop-fields round him seem'd,
Like dreams, to come and go;
Bright leagues of cherry blossom gleam'd,
One sheet of living snow;
The smoke, above his father's door,
In grey soft eddyings hung:
Must he then watch it rise no more,

Doom'd by himself, so young?

Yes, honour calls!—with strength like steel
He put the vision by.
Let dusky Indians whine and kneel;
An English lad must die.

And thus, with eyes that would not shrink,
With knee to man unbent,
Unfaltering on its dreadful brink,
To his red grave he went.

Vain, mightiest fleets, of iron framed;
Vain, those all-shattering guns;
Unless proud England keep, untamed,
The strong heart of her sons.
So, let his name through Europe ring—
A man of mean estate,
Who died, as firm as Sparta's king,
Because his soul was great

Horse-Breaking in the Nineteenth Century.

SINCE the day when to man was given dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, there is no record of any new attempts on his part to turn his sovereignty to use. Immemorially our beasts of burden have been of the same races as they are now, and equally unchanged have been our methods of subduing them to our service. In these last days comes to us, from the farthest prairies of the Western world, one who tells us that the error of our methods is the cause of the narrowness of our reign. He shows us that strength must always yield to skill, and that ferocity will always disappear before gentleness. He shows us that violence is but feebleness, and that kindness alone is irresistible. He shows us that intellect can create intelligence; and that animals willingly learn of man whatever man rightly addresses to their understanding. To all this we have listened with no deaf ears. Never has discoverer met with more rapid recognition than this unknown American farmer. His first exhibitions were witnessed and applauded by royalty; the highest in the land eagerly bought, as an expensive secret, the knowledge of his process; when by accident its principles became published, scarce a murmur was heard that more had been given than the exploded secret was worth. Now, amongst all classes, it is expounded with still unabated interest; the competitors whom success called up have dropped out of sight; Government has adopted the system for the Army; and the Humane Society has rewarded its discoverer with a medal. There must be something remarkable in the man that wins such a success; but there must be also something remarkable in the nation that grants it, and perhaps still more in the times that permit it.

In no land but ours, indeed, could such a result have followed. Elsewhere Mr. Rarey has amused, and been rewarded by praises, but here alone has he drawn the popular sympathy. We are, in truth, above all nations, a horseloving nation. To us, riding seems nature; with us, men, women, and children are alike infected with the passion. Those who cannot ride delight to watch those who do ride; our chief national amusements are connected with the use of horses; and the most dignified of our Houses of Parliament thinks a discussion of the weights that racehorses should carry no waste of its time. Nor let us in our gravity deem this turn of the national taste a thing wholly insignificant and immaterial. In the world's history it has happened too often to be wholly an accidental coincidence, that national supremacy has fallen to the nation which was distinguished by pre-eminence on horseback. Were those old fables of Centaurs and Amazons not based on a dim perception of

this truth, when they taught that the first horsemen were half divine, and the first horsewomen more than a match for men? Shall we recall the first great monarchy of the old world, established and maintained by the innumerable Persian cavalry, till it was broken up by a greater horseman than they, the invincible tamer of Bucephalus? Shall we tell how in the most palmy state of Rome the title "horseman" was one of high honour and esteem, alike in peace and war, and how the uninterrupted spread of Roman power was stemmed at one point only, where it encountered the never-conquered Parthians,—those fatal horsemen, fiery in advance, deadly in flight? Shall we recount the prowess of Arabs and Moors, by whose cavalry alone a new religion was carried to the ends of the earth, till the flower of mounted Christendom at Tours met and broke the overwhelming torrent? Need we speak of the days of chivalry, (the very name expressive of the glories of horsemanship,) when mastery lay ever with him who could bring into the field the greatest number of heavy-armed knights, before whose tremendous onset pikemen and archers went down as grass before the mower? Or passing by all other instances, need we now to be reminded that when, first since the time of Charlemagne, Europe fell under the yoke of a conqueror, it was before a nation of horsemen in the Cossack steppes, and a nation of horsemen in the plains of Spain, that his star first paled? And, when at length Cossack and English themselves met in combat, with whom did the final victory rest but with those whose heavy cavalry at Balaklava rode through the opposing squadrons as if they had been a line of paper, and whose light brigade, on that same day, dashed over the Russian batteries with a sweep as resistless as the surge of the tide-race over an outlying reef?

Shall it be objected that all this is of the past; that now we are a nation of riflemen, not of horsemen; that victory will rest for the future with the surest aim, and that long range and accurate sighting have made cavalry henceforth useless in the field? With all deference to ardent volunteers—with, if possible, even more deference to certain military authorities who have announced that opinion—it may be suggested that, as the introduction of gunpowder did not abolish cavalry, although it converted mailed knights into light armed hussars, it is possible that the improvement of the art of gunnery may only further modify, without destroying, the special use and purposes of mounted troops. That we shall not again have cavalry charging infantry from long distances, that we shall never again see cavalry walking about among the squares, seeking leisurely for an opening, as we saw them at Waterloo, may be very true, for the simple reason that with riflemen before them they would not live to reach the squares. But, on the other hand, neither shall we ever again see squares in such a situation, for the simple reason that, at three miles distance, a rifled and breech-loading thirty-two-pounder would mow lanes in them with its shot, and shatter them with its shell at the rate of half a dozen discharges per minute. For all this, we cannot do away with infantry, and just as little shall we be able to do without cavalry. Only the tactics of both must be altered to meet the new circumstances in which they will have to act. Our infantry must be kept more in shelter, and, when shelter is abandoned, it must advance in looser formation than hitherto. There may be moments when the men must be collected for a final charge, but the charge in line will often be superseded by the rapid dash of swarming skirmishers. So must it be with cavalry too. As of old, the charge will often decide the conflict; but, till the moment comes when cavalry can charge in a body, they must manœuvre more under cover, and in smaller and more open bodies than hitherto. But, if this is the case, why should we not go further? Why should we not have cavalry acting as skirmishers, in exactly the same way and in exactly the same circumstances as we employ infantry skirmishers?—only with this distinction, that they would trust to the speed of their horses' legs instead of their own.

The distinction is invaluable. The distance to which skirmishers can advance from the main body—that is, the distance at which an army can assume the offensive, or keep its antagonists at bay; the distance, too, at which it can acquire information of an enemy's force and movements—has for its limit the distance from which its skirmishers can safely run in, if attacked by an overwhelming force. Mount your skirmishers, and you at once more than double the precious limit. A position in advance can be felt and secured; a position in retreat can be held, at twice the distance from the main body, if your skirmishers are on horseback. To counterbalance this advantage, there are, however, disadvantages. A horse and man are much easier hit in open ground than a man only; and yet this, perhaps, would not in practice be found material, for the greater speed of a horse over open ground would restore equality in their chances. But then it is said that a horse cannot be concealed by the cover that will shelter a man, and that a mounted rifleman cannot get across an inclosed country as a rifleman on foot can. These are the two grand obstacles that deprive us of the benefit of mounted skirmishers. Now these two obstacles are capable of being removed by a judicious application of the instructions which for two years Mr. Rarey has been giving us.

For Mr. Rarey has not merely shown how vicious horses may be subdued, or unbroken horses made fit for work; he has shown how, very easily, very gently, and very completely, ordinary horses may be taught a great deal more than has commonly been taught them. he has shown how the feats which strike us as wonderful when seen in the circus, the acquisition of which accomplishments is the result of months of labour, and in some cases of a good deal of bad usage, may be taught the horse in a few minutes, hours, or days. In a few minutes

Mr. Rarey will teach a horse to follow him, to turn, to stop, to go on with him as closely as if he had been led, although all the time the horse's head is, and he knows it, loose. In an hour or two Mr. Rarey will teach the horse to stand immovably still, although his master leaves him, and to gallop up at his master's call. In a few lessons he will teach the horse to lie down at a given signal, say a tap on his fore-leg, and to remain lying till the signal is given to rise. All these things are no speculations; still less are they vain boastings. Any one who has been at Mr. Rarey's exhibitions has seen them accomplished; and those who have been often there have seen them done, or begun, with evident assurance of the same result, every time they have been present. We shall have occasion afterwards to discuss the nature of the means used; meanwhile, accepting the facts, let us consider their bearing on the subject of which we have been speaking.

And first, as to cover. The difference here between a mounted rifleman and a foot rifleman lies in the greater height and bulk of the horse. But make the horse lie down, and very little difference remains. What will shelter a man will in almost every case equally well shelter a horse lying on the ground. Moreover, if in any particular situation there is not cover for a horse, even when lying down, it is pretty certain that at a very short distance sufficient cover can be had. There will be found a rising ground, a clump of trees, a hedge, a bank, or a dry ditch, any of which will quite serve the purpose. Here let the riflemen dismount, cause their horses to lie down, and leave them, perhaps, in charge of one of their number. While the skirmishers steal on from point to point the horses remain close at hand, yet in safety. Suppose that the skirmishers drive the enemy back, and wish to make a further advance; or, suppose they are themselves threatened, and wish to retire with all possible speed—in either case a call brings each horse to his rider's side. What immensely rapid advances could thus be made; how closely might the light troops hang on an enemy's flanks; how daringly might they cover a retreat, when every distance of any length could be traversed at a gallop, and the means of rapid flight in case of surprise was thus ever within call! Suppose, now, that the country is enclosed, as this England of ours for the most part is, does that form any reason against its being traversed by light horsemen, or heavy horsemen either, if horse and man are English? Let hunting men answer that. Assuredly an enclosed country, impervious as a fortification to the cavalry of every other nation, would be no defence against the attack of English horse, were it not that the rifle, or the pistol, or the sword, would be rather awkward accoutrements in charging a bull-fence, and might chance to hurt the wearer more than the foe if the horse's knees just touched the top rail of timber. But here also Mr. Rarey can help us. Horses taught, as he shows us how to teach them, will follow their masters over a fence as handily as a dog. Coming up, then, to a rasper, our armed hunting man must for the moment forget that craning is an unknown word in his vocabulary. He must have the goodness to dismount, to push his way through the hedge, or to climb over the gate, (supposing he cannot unlock it, which I trust he would always have the sense first to try,) just as he would have to do were he a skirmisher on foot. When over, he calls his horse to him. Over, lightly as a bird, skims the horse. Up jumps our skirmisher, and in a moment is at the next fence, to pour his fire into the secure camp beyond, or the slow winding column in the hollow road below. Till, surprised and confused, the enemy discover the source of their danger, and throw out skirmishers on their part, in force sufficient to carry the hedges, or till they have time to bring up artillery, the game is in our hands. So soon as the tide seems likely to turn, our light Cavalry are off. By the time their protecting hedge is passed by the enemy they are through the next hedge, and half-a-dozen more are placed between them and pursuit ere this one is reached by the pursuers. Will any one say that men and horses trained thus, and used thus, might not half bait their foe to death ere the foe could reach an open battle-field? And when that is reached, would the thundering charge of the cavalry be less resistless because they had already seen the flash and smelt the smoke of distant battle, and man and horse had learned to rely on their individual skill, and to have confidence in their mutual prowess? Whoso says that, must say that the charge of bayonets will not be what it was, since a rifle sighted to 900 yards has been substituted for brown Bess without any sight at all.

I do verily believe that in all this a development of the science of war is opening to us such as the world has never yet seen; and such as will make that nation which first sees it mistress of the world, whether she cares to assert her sovereignty or not. We are getting past the age of men used as machines; we are getting into the age of machines used for men, in everything that senseless wood and iron can do as well as senseful men. So, instead of treating men as implements for discharging a certain number of balls in a given general direction, we now place in each soldier's hand a machine so accurate that one discharge from it is more than equal to a hundred from his old piece. But, in entrusting him with such a weapon, we demand from him a commensurate increase of thought in its use. Forced thus to depend on the intelligence of the men, to us, in good time, comes Mr. Rarey, to show how much we may cultivate the intelligence of the horse. He shows us that the value and use of the horse is not restricted to the purposes to which, in the days when men were machines, we put him; but that he will be of equal service and advantage now to the self-dependent and self-acting soldier. We have but to make this new system part of the regular instruction and daily drill of the troops, to see in six months our cavalry occupy a position such as no cavalry on earth can vie with. We are not yet the first riflemen in the world; perhaps we never may be; but we are the first horsemen, and the advantage of this superiority Mr.

Rarey's system preserves for us.

So much for the warlike uses of the new doctrine. But as, after all, war, much as it now fills our thoughts, is not the normal state of man, and as the horse is of even more service to us in peace than in war, it is a question of interest to what extent this development of his intelligence is likely to increase his utility for our ordinary purposes. Now here, in the matter of mere accomplishments, it may at once be granted that the practical gain will not be very great. But the great glory and pride of Mr. Rarey's system is this, that whatever be the work for which the horse may be intended, it will fit him for that work without cruelty and without the chance of making him vicious. Rightly used, it preserves in every horse the good temper and docility which are inherent in every horse; but which now, in constantly recurring cases, are, by blows and ill-usage of breakers, stablemen, and riders, exchanged for sullen stubbornness or malignant ferocity. Perhaps, indeed, it may hereafter be found to have a yet wider application. What so marvellously operates in the instance of the horse, may be found capable of reducing other animals, as yet counted untameable, to the willing servitude of man. For instance, in his own country, Mr. Rarey has driven a couple of elks in his carriage. What a pretty turn-out for a lady in the park would a four-in-hand of fallow deer make! But take a more important and more hopeful instance. In those prodigiously rich and almost boundless regions, which the travels of Anderson, Livingstone, and Burton have opened up to us in Central Africa, one of the greatest practical difficulties in the way of trade is the difficulty of finding the means of carriage for goods. The fatal fly, the tsetse, will there suffer no horse to exist. But over all these plains roam, untouched and secure from its attacks, herds of zebras—animals in power and activity scarcely inferior to the horse. Could we but tame the zebra! Mr. Rarey resolved to try if it could not be done. He procured one, made specially savage—as you will certainly make any animal of spirit savage—by long and close confinement. So wild was it, that when first approached by Mr. Rarey it sprang at an iron bar overhead, and held on with its teeth, while the whole weight of its body hung suspended in the air. Its strength and agility were immense, and every weapon of offence with which nature had endowed it was turned against its instructor. With mouth, and fore-feet, and heels it fought; and yet in three lessons it was led round the ring with a rider on its back; and there was evident truth in Mr. Rarey's assertion that, if he had time, he could in a month ride or drive it anywhere. Why not? Horses have fought as furiously, yet yielded as completely. And, if Mr. Rarey can subdue a vicious zebra as completely as a vicious horse, may we not hope that ordinary men may yet be able to subdue and render useful ordinary zebras?

Such are some of the practical results which, in a practical age and to a practical race, it is needful to indicate in order to win a respectful consideration for any novel system. Yet perhaps we may find that the indirect and the moral influences of the new system are, after all, the most important. Unquestionably they are suggestive of some new ideas on the subject of the relations between man and animals, and of man's responsibility in the exercise of his dominion over them.

For the essence of Mr. Rarey's system, is not merely manipulative dexterity; nor is there in the mere outward acts anything of absolute novelty. To hobble a horse so as to prevent his running away, to cast him on the ground by tying his feet together, so as to secure him while an operation is performed; are familiar processes. Nay, the very method of throwing a horse which Mr. Rarey employs, has been employed by many persons before him. Neither, I rejoice to think, is there anything new in the theory that gentleness is the best teacher, and kindness the sharpest spur. This part of Mr. Rarey's system is every day practised by thousands of horsemen and horsewomen in our own land. But the novelty in Mr. Rarey's system is the system as a whole. It lies in his application of the theory, announced by himself from the first as truly all that he claimed of "discovery," that the right way to subdue any animal of power greater than man's is to apply man's weaker force in such a way and by such means that the animal shall be compelled to believe it to be the greater, and to accompany that exhibition of superior strength with such gentleness that the animal shall recognise that its new master is a beneficent master, and shall for the future obey him for love as much as of necessity.

Now let me—not that I can say much that is new of the process, already so often described, but because having seen it performed on scores of horses by Mr. Rarey, and in some slight way practised it myself, I can say what its general principles and effect are, without reference to the modifications induced by the individual character of any particular animal—try to explain the method by which all this is brought about. With a wild prairie-bred colt the first point would be, of course, to catch him; and, even in this, Mr. Rarey's knowledge of horse nature finds an instructive theme. But in our country a colt is seldom unused to the approach and touch of man, and therefore we may proceed to the second stage—that in which the object is to teach him to submit to be led. The ordinary breaker does this by putting a halter on and pulling in front, while his helper uses the whip behind. The horse will fly from the unexpected pain; but wild terror slowly instructs. Mr. Rarey uses no whip, and does not commence with a halter. He cannot drag the horse forward, for the horse is stronger than he is; but, standing at the side, he can draw the head and neck gently towards him, for the muscles are weak there, and the horse has no inclination to resist. When he has yielded the head, the horse for his own comfort makes a side step. The victory is gained. The process is repeated, and the side step comes quicker, and gradually less to the

side and more to the front. At last the horse understands that when you draw his head you want his body to come with it—and as soon as he understands he acts. In a very little time he will follow you without drawing, merely because he likes your caresses. Now you may halter him when you like, only taking care first that he smells the straps and the rope, so as to assure himself that there is no harm in them, and that they are so put on as not to suggest to his mind the idea that they hurt him. A light bit will in the same way be quietly accepted next lesson.

If the horse is very gentle, he may, in a similar manner, be soon accustomed to feel your hand, your arm, the weight of your body on his back, and so be safely mounted. But there is some risk, if he is not very quiet, that during this process something may cause him to put out his strength against yours, and to make the discovery, almost fatal in a horse of spirit, that his strength is greater than yours. So, once for all, Mr. Rarey will convince him that the reverse is the fact. By gradual advances of the hand down the leg, he comes to the near fore foot, and persuades the horse to oblige him by lifting it. A soft strap forming a noose is placed round the pastern; the other end is buckled round the "arm," *i. e.* the leg above the knee. So the leg is suspended, and the horse finds himself—he does not exactly know how, but fancies it must be through some super-horse power in the creature at his side—obliged to stand on three legs. A step or two under this restraint convinces him that it is very awkward and uncomfortable, and that he would be very much obliged if his friend would break the spell. If in alarm he struggles for a moment, he quickly becomes quiet when he finds he is not hurt, only unaccountably paralyzed. Then a similar noose is placed round the pastern of the off foreleg, and the strap is passed through a surcingle—previously buckled round the horse's body—merely as an aid to the hand in holding the strap tight in the after operations. A push against the shoulder obliges the horse to move a step. As he lifts his leg the strap is drawn up, the leg doubled under him, and he conies down gently on both knees. A moment is absorbed in astonishment at this extraordinary circumstance, and then an effort is made to remedy the accident. But it can't be remedied; often as the horse may rear up he cannot get his feet loose, and still comes down again on his knees. After five, ten, or fifteen minutes' struggle (it never exceeds, and very rarely reaches, twenty minutes), he resigns himself to circumstances, and gently lies down. Perhaps after a rest he will have one more try; but at last he is fully satisfied that man is the stronger, and that it is useless to resist. Now you may handle him all over, sit upon him, take up all his legs, and make him familiar with the weight and touch of your body. All this time you never once hurt him. His proud spirit is taught that it must humble itself, but there is no physical pain. When he finally yields you caress him. And so when he rises, after his first lesson, a wiser and a better horse, he bears you no grudge. You are a superior being, who may in an instant blast his right leg, and make him powerless as a foal; but you are good as well as powerful. He will follow you now more readily than before; and now that he is standing, he will let you sit upon him as you did when he was on the ground. A few more lessons impress his mind indelibly. Never more will he resist; experience, the only teacher of horse and man, has taught him it is vain, and in his submission he finds his true happiness. That is, if you are good to him; if you are powerful and bad, you are—a devil, and as a devil you will make devils like yourself.

But even if thus made devils, Mr. Rarey's creed is, that no horse ever passes beyond the reach of softening mercy. By exactly the same means which have been explained in their application to young horses, Mr. Rarey has subdued and made gentle and playful the most savage brutes England could furnish. They are brought into his presence as it were handcuffed—led by a couple of grooms, one on each side, armed with bludgeons, and holding stout ropes some ten feet in length attached to the horse's head. In no other way can any ordinary mortal dare to approach these sons of Belial. Held thus captive, a yell, a scream, a lash with the hind-feet, a fierce pawing with the fore-feet at an imaginary enemy show every moment the demoniac spirit within. Mr. Rarey watches a quiet instant—with a light spring he is at the horse's shoulder, the grooms drop the long reins, and with their bludgeons vanish from the arena. Man and horse are alone to fight it out—the horse, in his furious passion, bending all his powers to beat down, trample on, mangle, kill his adversary; the man, resolute to reclaim, humanise, subdue into gentle affection the wild beast by his side. Standing close by the shoulder, he avoids the blows alike of hind and forefeet. The right arm is over the withers, and the hand holds the off-rein, so as to draw the horse's head to that side, and prevent his reaching his antagonist with his teeth. In this position the horse can but struggle to shake his opponent off. But the hold is too secure. Bound the ring goes the life and death waltz. At length the quieter moment arrives, when with his left hand Mr. Rarey slips the leather noose round the leg, drops it to its place, and draws it tight. Another dash, and at the next halt the left leg is caught up and securely buckled. Crippled now, the fury of the animal increases, but the struggles are shorter. Soon the other leg is caught up and all is safe. In ten minutes that horse must be on his ado—exhausted, but unhurt—yielding only to the resistless power of the calm, inevitable being at his side. When he is quiet he is caressed. The steps are removed; and, when his powers are restored to him, he rises too awestruck to attack again his fated subduer. A few more lessons daily, or twice a day, repeated, enforce on his memory what has been taught, and he may then be restored to society.

Such is the process in a public arena. But when he operates in private, Mr. Rarey prefers to approach the horse, or let the horse approach him, alone. Such is his confidence—and no man has a larger experience on which to base his confidence—in the native goodness of the horse, that he believes the most dangerous savage will not attack a man from whom he has received no wrong, who stands unarmed, and shows no fear or hostility. So, when he first saw Cruiser, he opened the door and stood alone before the animal—heavily muzzled, it is true, but loose and free to strike with his feet. With a scream, the horse sprang at his supposed enemy; but, seeing a stranger, motionless and unprepared for combat, he paused midway, and drew near quietly to examine the intruder. Let not Mr. Rarey's disciples, however, till they have had no less than his experience, and can work with his most wonderful nerve, temper, skill, and activity, so presume. An instant's wavering of heart, or the minutest failure in judgment, would fire the train. Yet we may remember, as confirmatory of Mr. Rarey's theory, that it is a known fact that many horses violent with men are tractable in a lady's hands; and that we have well-authenticated stories in which most savage animals have suffered infants to play among their legs, and have been seen carefully lifting each foot to avoid hurting the child.

I am anxious to press a little further the consideration that in all this process, rightly conducted, and if not lightly conducted it will not succeed,—there is absolutely no pain inflicted. The horse's spirit is forced to yield; and, till he recognises the necessity, he struggles violently. But his struggles are so managed that they produce no physical suffering whatever. The muscles of the legs, which are restrained by the straps—those muscles by which the horse tries to disengage and straighten his legs—are so weak, that the utmost force they can exert against the straps is insufficient to produce pain. Bandage your own ankle tightly to your thigh, and you will find that it does not hurt you, however hard you may try to get loose. So, when the second leg is taken up, and the horse brought on his knees, the position, however awkward and helpless, is not unnatural, painful, nor injurious. It is, in fact, that which the horse naturally takes for a moment every time he lies down, and it is that which the ox (not the horse, however) takes in rising up. I have seen quiet horses commence to graze when brought to this position in a pasture-field. To continue it for any length of time is of course fatiguing, and this is its advantage. A countryman, I believe, of Mr. Rarey, has ingeniously remarked that the leopard *can* change his spots, for when he is tired of one spot he can go to another. So the horse, when he is tired of the first stage towards lying down, and has satisfied his mind that he cannot at present get up, can change his position by advancing to the second stage of lying down. This is exactly what the intelligent animal does, and in so doing he finds not merely physical rest but moral happiness.

How far the conviction of human supremacy thus wrought on the horse's mind is permanent and ineffaceable, is a question which has been debated with an unnecessary degree of warmth. The fact is, that to Mr. Rarey the most vicious horses are ever after gentle; and equally gentle to all who treat them gently. But of course Nature is not changed; and the cruelty or folly that first excited resistance and then drove it to madness, will still produce again the same results. Is Mr. Rarey's system, then, imperfect, because it is not creative, but only educational? Or is the education imperfect, because with some natures its teachings may be overpowered by the sudden recoil of unprovoked suffering? I confess, in such a case, I blame neither the education nor the nature to which it is applied; I blame only the guilty harshness or indiscretion which tempts a hasty nature to revolt, and forbids all hope of amnesty on submission. I think I have heard too of little boys, whom a sense of unjust treatment has made dogged little rebels or violent little savages, but whose after life has shown that in them from the first had dwelt the spirit which is breathed into heroes only. Who was to blame for these wild childhood days—the child, or the child's ill-judging teachers? Perhaps they were not cruel—perhaps with another child the very same treatment would have been eminently successful. Perhaps they had only little cunning ways which a less honest child would not have noticed—perhaps they were guilty only of petty exasperations, which a duller child would not have felt. Is all this the child's fault? If, taken from such charge, and placed in just and tender hands, the fierce anger and despairing recklessness are softened into submission, is it a defect of that true education that it never can bend the spirit to bear wrong with callousness, and to see fraud with indifference? It certainly seems to me that Mr. Rarey's taming of a violent horse is as little impeachable, from the fact that bad treatment will make the horse again as violent as ever.

But all rebellions have a beginning, and all mental tendencies grow more fixed with indulgence. Mr. Rarey's teaching will have this great practical benefit, that it will cut away the occasion of many a rebellion. Few men could subdue a made savage with Mr. Rarey's dexterity—but nearly all men can, and I do hope will, come to follow his teaching in its application to spirited horses, whom an opposite course might render savage. For this never did anyone better deserve the thanks of the humane—I will add of the philanthropist. This lesson of the infinite power of kindness, taught with such new and striking illustration, will go home to thousands of hearts in which it never could else have gained recognition. As evil tendencies grow so do good. A man who is discriminatingly kind to his horse must have sympathies awakened with every living thing. It is good to be obliged even to simulate goodness. The human mind is fortunately too unelastic to avoid taking permanently something of the form which it externally puts on. Something, too, is gained on the side of goodness by simply

making thoughtless men think of it.

Yet with knowledge comes, as ever, responsibility. Hitherto we have looked at the great sad problem of the sufferings of animals as if such liability were to them an inevitable condition of existence. We have laid the flattering unction to our souls that what the horse or dog might suffer at our hands was in great part a necessary concomitant of his education to our service, and certainly was less than he might have had to suffer had he been left wild. The former position is now untenable, and even the second grows uncomfortably doubtful. To animals in a state of nature disease seldom comes; when it comes it is short—often shortened by the instinct which makes the companions of a sick or wounded beast fall upon and kill it. Their pain suffering, then, in the wild state, is neither more nor less than simply the final agonies of death. Their death is either placid from exhaustion, or violent, as by drowning, by the attack of carnivorous animals, or by that of their fellow-species. How much suffering is there in these modes of death? We fancy a great deal; but is it not that with ourselves "the sense of death is most in apprehension"? Of drowning we know, by the testimony of those who have recovered, that the sensation after the first momentary shock of immersion is actually one of intense pleasure. Of death by the attack of wild animals, we have a very singular testimony from the experience of Dr. Livingstone. He tells us that he was once seized by a lion, which sprang upon him, threw him down, breaking his arm, and then taking him in his mouth shook him as a terrier does a rat, or a cat a mouse. From this instant he declares that, while fully conscious of his situation, all sense of either pain or terror left him. May we not believe that this is the effect of the methods by which wild animals extinguish life, whether in one of their own species or in one on which they prey; and that the cries and struggles no more indicate true suffering than the convulsive efforts of a drowning man indicate sensation? Assuredly such a thought is not inconsistent with our ideas of God's mercy; and, if we admit it, we clear away some of the main difficulties which beset the question of animal suffering. But, if we thus can eliminate the suffering which arises from death, how little remains to be accounted for save that which flows, directly or indirectly, from man! And now Mr. Rarey teaches us how much of that residue we have inflicted needlessly, stifling conscience with the false pretext that God's gift to us is unavailing till, by our own cruelty, it has been adapted to our use.

B. K.

Travelling in Victoria.

By Henry Kingsley.

I HAVE not had the honour of seeing the State of New York; but I am told by those who have seen both, that its feverish energy is only surpassed in one place—Melbourne. The utter ignorance of home-dwellers about this place is extraordinary; they think it is a howling wilderness. I have seen people landing in 1857 with bowie-knives in their belts, and much astonished, instead of meeting bushrangers, at being put into a comfortably padded railway carriage, and whisked up, if it so pleased them, to a first-rate hotel. I have dined at the Wellington in Piccadilly, and I have dined at the Union in Bourke Street; and I prefer the latter. A man asked me the other day whether there were any theatres in Melbourne. I referred him to Miss Swanborough and Mr. G. V. Brooke. There is no account extant of the Melbourne of to-day; even Mr. Westgarth's admirable book is out of date. Let us have a glance at the every-day life of this *terra incognita*.

Day after day I and a friend of mine stayed in town, comforting one another with false excuses. Our business was well concluded, but still we lingered on, in spite of visions which occasionally arose before us of a face we knew, waiting for us, two hundred and fifty miles away on old Wimmera, and which face would probably exclaim with a look of triumph when it caught sight of us, "I knew you would stop for the race!"

For, the next day, Victoria and New South Wales were to meet in deadly conflict. Veno, the long-legged chestnut from Sydney, was to run the great intercolonial match with Alice Hawthorne, our plucky little grey. Both Houses were adjourned *nem. con.*, so that the collective legislative wisdom of the colony might have an opportunity of drinking its cobbles, and making its bets on the grand stand; and you may depend upon it, that, when your honourables adjourn, there is something worth seeing; and that was why we stayed in town.

And so there was something worth seeing. His Excellency himself was worth all the money, with his blue coat and white waistcoat, and his brown, shrewd, handsome face. It was worth while to see our bishop and the Roman Catholic prelate bowing and koo-tooing together, and pleasanter yet to hear the Wesleyan's wife tell Father G——, the jolly Irish priest, that she and her husband had come to see the "trial of speed," and "that it was quite like a race, really," and Father G——offering her absolution. Pleasant to look at were the crowded steamers, and the swarming heights around the course, and pleasantest of all was it to see the scarlet jacket (New South Wales) and the dark blue jacket (Victoria) lying side by side, all through the deadly three-mile struggle, till the poor little grey was just beat at the finish, and then to see every man who had won five shillings batter a guinea hat to pieces in the exuberance of his joy.

Now the reason I mentioned this was, firstly, to make some sort of excuse to my reader for what may

otherwise appear to have been inexcusable dawdling; and, secondly, because in consequence of this delay we were forced to do in two days what we should otherwise have taken four at.

Our horses were at a station not far from the great new digging of Mount Ararat, in the Portland Bay district. Mount Ararat was two hundred miles off; for the last sixty miles there was no road; and yet we coolly said to one another at breakfast-time next morning, "We shall get in tomorrow night."

I lingered over my breakfast as one lingers on the bank of the stream, on a cold day, before plunging in. I knew that in ten minutes more I should be no longer a man with a free will, but a bale of goods ticketed and numbered, temporarily the property of the Telegraph Company, tossed from boat to rail, from rail to coach, like a portmanteau, with this difference, that if a portmanteau is injured, you can make the company pay, but if a man is damaged, they consider themselves utterly irresponsible, and, in fact, the ill-used party.

We can see from our window right down the wharf; and our little steamer is getting up her steam under the tall dark warehouses. We must be off. Good bye! "Good bye," says Jack, who aint going, puffing at his last new Vienna meerschaum; "good bye, boys, and a happy journey."

So we racéd along past the Great Princes bridge (copied in dimensions from the middle arch of London bridge), and the Hobson's Bay railway station, along the broad wharfs, with all the Hinder Street warehouses towering on our right, and the clear river on our left. Now we were among the shipping; barques, schooners, and brigs of light draught which work up the river from the bay. Here comes our little steamer, the *Comet*, ready to start, with the captain on the bridge—"Only just in time. Good morning, captain. Portmanteau's aboard. All right, captain. Cut away."

Ha! A little rest after that run is rather pleasant. Let us look about us; plenty to be seen here. The river is about the size of the Thames at Oxford, but deep enough to allow ships of two hundred tons and upwards to lie along the wharfs. So here we see the coasting traders in plenty, regular Australians bred and born, in all their glory. That schooner yonder is unloading cedar from the dark jungles of the Clerance far away there in the north, while her next-door neighbour is busy disgorging nuts and apples from Launston in Van Diemen's Land (I humbly ask pardon—Tasmania); and the clipper barque, whose elegant bows tower over our heads, is a timber ship from New Zealand loaded with Kauri pine, and what not. There goes the seven o'clock train across the wooden viaduct! They say that Hobson's Bay railway is paying its eighteen per cent. Ha, here we are off at last!

Here we are off at last, panting clown the river. "Where to?" say you. Well, I'll tell you. We are going down the Yarra to catch the first train from Williamstown to Geelong; from Gee-long we go to Ballarat by coach, where we sleep; and tomorrow morning we mean to coach it on to Ararat, and then, picking up our horses, to get to our home on the Wimmera.

If our reader has never been in Australia, in Australia he will hardly understand what are the sensations of a man, long banished, when he first realizes to himself the fact, "I am going home." Home! No one ever says, "I am going to Europe, sir," or "I am going to England, sir." Men say, "I am thinking of taking a run home, Jim" (or Tom, as the case may be). Then you know Jim (or Tom) considers you as a sacrosanct person, and tires not in doing errands for you—will wade the mud of little La Trobe Street for you, and tells you all the time that, when so-and-so happens (when the kye come home, in fact), he means to run home too, and see the old folk.

We are steaming at half speed past the sweet-smelling slaughter-houses, with the captain on the bridge swearing at a lumbering Norwegian bark who has got across the river, and whose skipper replies to our captain's Queen's English in an unknown and barbarous tongue. The custom-house officer on board is known to us; so the captain makes a particular exception of his eyes, beyond that of the Norwegian skipper and his crew, gives them a thump with his larboard paddlebox which cants the bark's head up stream again, and on we go.

Plenty to see here, for those who do not choose to shut their eyes, as we steam down the narrow deep river between walls of tea scrub (a shrub somewhat resembling the tamarisk). Here are some fellows fishing and catching great bream; and now, above the high green wall, we begin to see the inland landscape of broad yellow plains intersected with belts of darksome forest, while beyond, distant but forty miles, is the great dividing range, which here approaches nearer to the sea and gets lower than in any other part of its two-thousand-mile course. Mount Macedon (three thousand feet), Mount Blackwood with its rich goldmines, and Pretty Sally's Hill (Apollo, what a name!), are the three principal eminences in sight of Melbourne. It is hard to believe that that wooded roll in the land is one hundred and fifty feet higher than majestic Cader Idris, but so it is.

Now the river grows apace into a broad estuary, and now suddenly rounding an angle we see busy Williams-town before us on the right bank—a group of zinc-roofed houses, a battery, two long dark stone jetties, and a tall white lighthouse. Now we open on the bay too; there are the convict hulks under the battery, with the two ships of war lying close beyond, and away to the left the crowded shipping.

There begins a buzz of conversation now; men ask which is the *Swiftsure* (a new clipper of Green's, just arrived in sixty-seven days). That's her next the *Red Jacket*. A black ship with a white beading. The Queen's ship, the *Electra*, is to sail this morning for England; there she goes—that gun is to weigh anchor, and lo! in an

instant her yards are blackened by two hundred men, and, rapidly as a trick in a pantomime, her masts become clothed with a cloud of canvas, and, as we touch the railway pier, the good old ship is full sail for England.

As I find that we are only a quarter of an hour behind the time of the train's starting, and as I see a guard violently gesticulating at us to run or we shall be too late, I, who have before travelled by this line, become aware that we have a good half hour to spare; and so we turn into the refreshment room to discuss a bottle of pale ale, and look through the morning's *Argus*. This being leisurely accomplished, we are sulkily taken into custody by the guard and locked up in a comfortable first-class carriage.

There is a gentleman at the farther end with his arm full of papers. This turns out to be his Honour Justice Blank, going on the Dash circuit—a very great person; and, after a few frigid commonplaces, we turn round and look out on to the platform.

There is a group of respectably dressed men, neat, clean, and shaved, standing together; they are diggers, who have been to town for a day or two, and are now going back to resume work. Near them are two men, who are intending to be diggers, and who have evidently not been many weeks in the country. They are dressed in the traditional old style of the digger in the pictures, the like of which was never seen, and I hope never will be, except among exceeding green new chums. They have got on new red shirts, and new wide-awakes, new moleskins, and new thigh-boots, and huge beards. One of them, too, carries a bowie-knife in a leather belt—a piece of snobbishness he will soon get laughed out of at the mines. Ah, well, we won't laugh at these two poor bears, with their sorrows before; they will be mightily changed in a year's time, or I am mistaken!

There is a group much more pleasant to contemplate. Two lanky, brown-faced, good-looking youths—the eldest about eighteen, and evidently brothers—are standing side by side, alike in face, figure, and dress; one is an inch longer than the other, but it is impossible to tell them apart. They are not bad specimens of Australian youth before the flood (of gold); and, as being characteristic, I will take notice of them in lieu of giving you statistics about the returns per share of the railway; about which the less that is said the better. They are dressed in breeches and boots, in brilliant-patterned flannel shirts of the same pattern, in white coats of expensive material, with loosely-tied blue handkerchiefs round their necks, and cabbage-tree hats on their heads. Each one has in his hand a stock-whip, some fourteen feet long, and there, lies at the feet of each a saddle and bridle. They stand side by side silent. They have that patient, stolid look, which arises from an utter absence of care, and from, let us say, not too much education. Look at the contrast they make to that lawyer, fuming up and down the platform, audibly cross-examining imaginary witnesses as to when the dawdling, jolter-headed idiots, are going to start this lumbering train of theirs. Would all the gold in Ballarat induce him to stand as quiet and unheeding as those two lads have done for half an hour? He could not do it. But our two brothers, *they* are in no hurry, bless you. They ain't hungry or thirsty, or too hot or too cold, or tired with standing; they have plenty of money, and an easy round of duties, easily performed. They would as soon be there as elsewhere. They have never—oh, my pale friends, who are going into the schools next term to try for a first—they have never tasted of the tree of knowledge. Think and say, would you change with them?

These two brown-faced lads are known to us; so we beckon them to come on our carriage. After a quick flash of recognition from the four blue eyes, guard is beckoned up to open the door. The saddles are taken up, and the two brothers prepare to enter. Guard objects that the saddles must go in the luggage-van. Guard's suggestion is received with lofty scorn. Elder brother demands of guard whether he (guar!) thinks him such a fool as to shy a thirteen-guinea saddle into the luggage-van, and have everybody else's luggage piled atop of it. Younger brother suggests that they shall go in the luggage-van themselves, and take care of their saddlery. Guard submits that the saddles will annoy the other passenger. His honour, the judge, without raising his eyes from the foolscap sheet he is reading at the other end of the carriage, says, in a throaty voice, as if he was summing up, that if the young gentlemen don't bring their saddles in he shall leave the carriage. So the valuable property is stowed away somehow, and we are once more locked up.

All this waiting about is altered now. Then there was but one line of rails, and an accident every day; now the trains run, I understand, with wonderful punctuality. At this time we waited nearly an hour altogether; but, being men of contented disposition, did not get very much bored. The lawyer aforementioned was enough to amuse one for a time. This leading counsel and M.L.C. grew more impatient as the time went on, and at last, having drawn the station-master out of his private office as a terrier draws a badger, he so bullied and aggravated that peaceable man that he retired into his house in high wrath, sending this Parthian arrow at the lawyer: "If I thought there were half-a-dozen such aggravating chaps as you in the train, I'd start her immediately, and have you all smashed to punk ashes against the goods before you'd gone ten miles."

A train comes sliding in alongside of us, and then off we go. Past the battery and the lighthouse, away on to the breezy plains, with the sea off our left.

*"The plain is grassy, wild and bare,
Wide and wild, and open to the air."*

On every side a wide stretch of grey grass, with here and there a belt of dark timber, seen miles off, making capes and islands in the sea of herbage. A piece of country quite unlike anything one can see in England. Here and there is a lonely station, apparently built for the accommodation of the one public-house which stands about one hundred yards off, the only house in sight. Here two farmers get out (one of whom has lost his luggage), and two get in (one of "whom is drunk, through having waited too long at the public-house for the train). Here also the station-master holds a conversation with the guard on the most personal and private matters, every word of which is perfectly audible to the whole train, and highly interesting. And then on we go again.

A pretty blue peaked mountain right before us; the mountain grows bigger and bigger, and at length, racing along under its hanging woods and granite crags, we find that the long-drawn bay on our left is narrowing up, and that the end of our journey is near. Then we see a great town (thirty thousand inhabitants) built of wood, painted white, of red brick and grey stone, with one or two spires, and a great iron clock-tower. Then the train stops; we have come thirty miles, and we are in Geelong.

There was no time then to notice what we had been enabled to notice on former occasions—that the Geelong terminus was a handsome and commodious building, in a suburb of the second city in Victoria, in the port of Great Ballarat; no time for that now. There stands before the gateway of the station a coach like a cricket-drag, with an awning of black leather, and curtains of the same. It holds about ten people, is drawn by four splendid horses, and is driven by a very large, very fresh-coloured, and very handsome Yankee, who is now standing up on his box, and roaring in a voice half sulky, half frantic, "Now then here, now then, all aboard for Ballarat. All aboard for Ballarat." We tumble on board as fast as we can, and find that our driver is inclined to attribute the lateness of the train to a morbid wish on the part of his passengers to make themselves disagreeable to their driver. This very much embittered the relations between the ten passengers on the one hand, and the driver on the other. The latter, indeed, was the most conceited and sulky I ever met among his very sulky and conceited class.

At length all was ready, the horses were standing immoveable, the driver settled himself firmly, and said—"Ho!"

With one mad bound the four horses sprang forward together, one of the leaders fairly standing on his hind legs. Three more fierce plunges, and the coach was fairly under weigh, and the four bays were cantering through the shabby suburbs of the town.

One remarks principally that the houses are of one storey, of wood and iron, and that the population don't comb their hair, and keep many goats, who have no visible means of subsistence. Now the streets get handsomer, and the shops exhibit more plate glass; now passing through a handsome street, with some fine stone houses, and seeing glimpses of the bright blue sea down lanes, we pull up suddenly in a handsome enough market square, with a singularly pretty clock-tower in the centre. There is a pause for a moment at the post-office; and then, before we have time to think of where we are, we are up the street, up the hill, on to the breezy down, with a long black road stretching indefinitely before us.

There is a noble view beneath us now. As we look back, a circular bay, intensely blue, with a shore of white sand; a white town, pretty enough at this distance; two piers with shipping, and a peaked mountain rising from the sea on the left—as like, I suspect, to Naples and Vesuvius as two peas. The myrtle-like shrubs which fringe the shore, and the trim white villas peeping out from among them, carry out the idea amazingly, until the eye catches a tall red chimney-stack or two, and watches a little cloud of steam flying above the line miles away, and then we know that we are not, indeed, looking at a scene of Italian laziness, but on a good, honest, thriving, busy English town.

Now the whole scene has dipped down below the hill, and we are looking inland over some wooded hills, with a noble, vast stretch of corn-land, dairy-farm, and vineyards on the left. The road goes straight as a line, apparently without a break; and we think it looks level enough until we come to a grand precipitous ravine, about five hundred feet deep, and at the bottom a little river, fringed with green trees, and a pretty village, with a public-house or two, and a blacksmith's shop.

We travelled fast, and were soon up the hill, through the wood, and away-over the plains again—long weary yellow stretches of grass, bounded by dull she-oak woods, with one shabby inn by the roadside, visible for miles—the external prospect being so dull that we turned to look at our fellow passengers. There were six in our compartment; let us see what they were like. A tolerably cosmopolitan collection, upon my word. My *vis-à-vis* was a Chinaman, with a round, smooth, beardless face, displaying no trace of human emotion or

intelligence—not unlike a cocoa-nut from which the hair has been removed. He was dressed in the height of European dandyism, save that he wore over all a tunic of sky-blue watered silk. He goggled his eyes, and looked at nothing. He did not look out of the window, or at me, or at the bottom of the carriage—he looked nowhere. He had just come back from some villanous expedition in town, and I have no doubt had a cool hundred or two stowed about him for travelling expenses. Next to him sat a big-chested, black-haired, handsome man, whom we knew. He was a French baker on a large scale; and his mission seemed to be to make himself agreeable—which he did, setting us all talking to one another, save the surly driver and the Chinaman. He tried his hand on coachman too; but, only getting an oath for his pains, he desisted, with a shrug; after which, he and his neighbour the Irishman kept us alive for a mile or two by various antics, while a Scotchman looked on approvingly, and took snuff, and a German smoked and dozed.

Such were our companions. As for the scenery we were passing through, or the road we were travelling on, the less that is said of either the better. It is hard for an Englishman to imagine a forest which is in every respect dreary and hideous; yet such is the case with the stunted belt of honeysuckle forest which generally makes its appearance between the sea and the mountains, which must be crossed before one gets into the beautiful glades and valleys among the quartz ranges. Travellers are very apt to condemn Australian woods wholesale, by their first impressions of them from the dreary she-oaks and honeysuckles near the coast—forgetting that afterwards, they saw a little farther in the interior forests more majestic, ay, and more beautiful in their way, though thin in foliage, than it will be easy to find in more than a few places in England. But whoever says that a honeysuckle forest is beautiful deserves to live in one for the rest of his life. It consists of mile beyond mile of miserable clay-land, far too rotten and uneven to walk over with comfort. Its only herbage is sparse worthless tussock-grass; its only timber very like unhappy old apple-trees after a gale of wind.

And the road through this aforesaid honeysuckle forest? Well, it is a remarkable provision of nature that the road (unless macadamised) is so unutterably bad that it quite takes off your attention from the scenery around you—one continual bump, thump, crash; crash, thump, bump. Every instant you are lifted off the seat four inches, and let down again (no cushions, mind you), as if you were playing at see-saw, and the other boy had slid off just when you were at your highest. Your head is shaken till you fear fracture of the base of the skull. The creak, jump, jolt of the vehicle begins to form itself into a tune from its monotony (say the Bay of Biscay or Old Robin Grey), until some more agonising crash than usual makes you wickedly hope for an upset, that you may get a quiet walk in peace for a mile or two.

No such luck; the driver goes headlong forward, with whip, and voice—a man of one idea—to do it as quickly as possible. "Jerry, Jerry, jo; snap (from the whip). Jerry, hi. Snap, snap. Blank, blank, your blank, blank." This last to his horses. I cannot render it hero. Then snap, snap again. A dead fix, and we dream foolishly of getting out and walking. N###áoi. He is only gathering his horses together for a rush. Then the original Ho! and we are all right again, going along at full gallop.

The horrible discomfort of our present mode of transit would render it totally impossible for any one who had not been this road before to make any observations, whether general or particular, on the immense amount and variety of traffic which we are meeting and overtaking. We, however, who have in times heretofore, jogged leisurely along the road on horseback—we, I say, can give some sort of idea of what this hideous phantasmagoria of men, horses, drays, women, and children, which, to us, in our headlong course, appear to be tumbling head over heels and making faces at us, would appear to some happier traveller who has not bartered comfort, safety, and money for mere speed.

In one place a string of empty drays passes us going towards the town, each drawn by two horses, very similar in breed and make to inferior English hunters (for your heavy dray-horse, your Barclay and Perkins, would soon bog himself in these heavy roads). Then, again, we overtake a long caravan of loaded horse-drays toiling wearily up country with loads of all conceivable sorts of merchandise; and immediately afterwards, a caravan of bullock-drays, each drawn by eight oxen apiece, going the same way with ourselves, yet empty. How is this? say you, why thus. These bullock-drays belong to the settlers, and have been carrying down wool for shipment and are returning. As I speak, we meet a wool-dray, piled to a dangerous height with the wool-bales, and threatening each instant to topple over, which threat it religiously fulfils about every fifty miles.

Now we overtake a long file of Chinamen, just landed, all in their native dress, dusky-looking blue smocks, loose drawers of the same, and hats like Indian pagodas. They are carrying their worldly goods over their shoulders, on bamboos, as in the willow-pattern plate; and as they pass, to my astonishment, my goggle-eyed Chinese *vis-à-vis* wakes up, puts his head out of where the window should be, and makes a noise like a door with rusty hinges, but ten times as loud. He is replied to by the head man of the travelling Chinamen in a sound as though one were playing a hurdy-gurdy under the bed-clothes. Our Chinaman draws his head back, and looks round upon his fellow-travellers with the air of one who has said something rather clever, he believes; and before I have time to ask him, angrily, what the deuce he means by making that noise before a gentleman, I

see something which puts Chinamen out of my head altogether.

A dray is upset by the roadside, evidently the dray of a newly-arrived emigrant, and all the poor little household gods are scattered about in the dirt. Poor old granny is sitting by the roadside, looking scared and wringing her hands, while the young mother is engaged half in watching her husband among the struggling horses, and half in trying to soothe the baby by her breast. She has had a sad cut, poor soul, I can see by her crumpled bonnet; and she looks pale and wild, but brave withal. A girl about fourteen is nursing and quieting a child of six, while a boy of ten helps his father. There is the bonnet-box, crushed flat by the hair trunk. Alas! for the poor Sunday bonnet inside, brought with such proud care so many miles, the last memento of happy summer church-goings in England. Poor bonnet! becoming poetical only in thy destruction! There, too, the box with the few poor books has burst open, and "The Iarmer of Englewood Forest" and "Fatherless Fanny" are in the mud with their old friend and companion, the fiddle. God speed you, my poor friends; be brave and careful, and the worst will soon be over. A twelvemonth hence you shall be sitting by the fireside laughing at all these mishaps and annoyances, bitter as they, are now.

If this purgatory of jolting continues much longer, a crisis must supervene—death, probably, or insanity. Two or three thousand years ago, as near as I can compute, there was a short cessation of it—a dream, as of being taken into an inn and having a dinner, and seeing the Chinaman eat with his knife and his fingers, dismissing his fork from office without pension; but since then things have been worse than over; and now a change is coming over me. I must be going mad. That Chinaman's head is no more fixed on his shoulders than King Charles the First's. He has got a joint in his neck like those nodding *papier maché* mandarins we used to have at home. How I should like to knock his head off, only I am so sleepy. Ah! that is it; before I have time to think about it, I am asleep.

I woke whenever we changed horses at a country township, and saw the same sight everywhere,—two or three largo wooden hotels, with a few travellers loitering about in the verandahs, unwilling to shoulder their heavy bundles and proceed. A drunken man dragged out and lying prone by the door, with his patient dog waiting till he should, arouse himself and come home. The blacksmith's shop, with its lot of gossiping idlers. The store, or village shop, with the proprietor at his door, with his hands in his pockets; half-a-dozen houses around, little wooden farmhouses like toys, standing just inside the three-railed fence, which inclosed the 80, 160, or 640 acre lots belonging to them; and around and beyond all the forest, now composed of Eucalypti (box and stringy bark here), and infinitely more eautiful than the miserable Banksia forest on which we poured the vials of ur wrath.

But at a place called Burat-bridge, I woke up for good; for in that place the plank road begins, and from that place the troubles of the traveller into Ballarat end. The road is of wooden planks, laid crosswise, and the coach runs as on a railway. This is an American invention. Let me do the Americans full justice. In spite of the bad and "wooden nutmeg" quality of nine-tenths of their importations, they have taught the Victorians one invaluable lesson—how to travel with speed over rough bush roads. Their double-ended Collins' picks, too, are more useful and handy than any imported from home.

We dash on through the darkening glades of a beautiful forest, the topmost boughs overhead growing more and more golden under the slanting rays of the sinking sun. As the tallest feathery bough begins to lose the light, and the magpie, most glorious of song-birds, croons out his vespers, I lean out of the coach to feast my eyes on a sight which, though so often seen, has never palled upon me—one of the most beautiful mountains in the world, Mount Buninyong. It is the extreme southern lip of a great volcanic crater, which runs up suddenly near a thousand feet above the road, covered from the dark base to where the topmost trees stand, feathering up against the crimson west, with some of the largest timber in the world Northwards, and towards Ballarat, the lava has burst down the rim of the cup on all sides, pouring in bands from forty to sixty feet thick over the gold-beds, to the everlasting confusion of miners; but at the south end it stands up Still as abrupt and lofty as it did when all the fertile country was a fiery desert—when the internal fires were vitrifying every seam in the slate-rock, and sublimating its vapour into gold.

Buninyong. Three large hotels, and a blacksmith's shop. A stoppage. A drunken man, who is anxious to fight any man in the coach for half-a-crown. The return gold escort from Geelong; ten troopers, in scarlet shirts, white breeches, and helmets; two carts, driven tandem, and an officer in a blue cloak, all of her majesty's 12th regiment; fifty or sixty clogs, who sit perfectly quiet till we start, and then come at us pell-mell, and gnaw our wheels in their wrath; then darkness again, and the forest.

Forest, and a smooth turnpike road. Sleep and dreams. Dreams of the forest getting scanter as we go; of long-drawn gullies running up into the hills, with all the bottom of them turned up in heaps of yellow clay, as though one were laying on the gas in the New forest. Of tents; sometimes one alone, sometimes twenty together, with men and women standing outside, looking at the coach. Of a stoppage at a store, supposed to be the post-office, where was a drunken man who disparaged us, and, like Shimei, went on his way, cursing. Of another bit of forest. Of more tents, and then of waking up and looking over a magnificent amphitheatre among

the hills, with ten thousand lights on hill and bottom, and a hundred busy steam-engines fuming and grinding away in the darkness. Of a long street of canvas stores and tents; of a better street of stone and wood; of handsome shops, and then of pulling up opposite a handsome hotel Ballarat.

We had an excellent supper in a handsome room, and, smoking our pipes after it, were joined by a gentleman in yellow clay-stained moleskin trousers, a blue shirt, and a white cap. This gentleman had not been invited to join our little party, but he did so with the greatest condescension. We soon found that he was a gentleman with a grievance, and that his grievance was Bath's-hole.

I give you my word of honour, that, although he bored us with Bath's hole, and his relations therewith, for an hour and a half, I have not the slightest idea what his grievance was. His strong point was this, that although Bath (the excellent landlord of the hotel in which we were staying) had hit gold, it wasn't the gravel-pits. We, knowing something about the matter, were unfortunately of opinion that it was the gravel-pits, and no other lead so the discussion was indefinitely prolonged, until we went out to look at the hole itself, just in front of the hotel—an erection like a bankrupt windmill, with a steam-engine inside, standing over a shaft of three hundred feet deep; and then we went to bed.

But not to sleep—oh dear, no! I was in bed at a quarter before eleven. At eleven, two dogs had a difference of opinion under my window; they walked up and down, growling, till, as near as I can guess, a quarter past eleven; when they departed without fighting, at which I was sorry. At half-past eleven (I merely give you approximation as to time; I did not look at my watch), a drunken man fell into the gutter, and, on being helped out by another man, pitched into him savagely. They fought three rounds, and *exeunt*. At twelve, the bar was cleared, and a gentleman, of the name of Bob, was found to be unequal to the occasion, and lay down in the mud, pulling a wheelbarrow over him, under the impression that it was the bed-clothes. Bob's mates fell out as to a score at the blacksmith's for sharpening gads. Fight, and grand *tableau—exeunt*. At half-past twelve, a drunken Irishwoman was conducted home by two policemen; on reaching my window, she declined to proceed on any terms whatever, and committed a series of savage assaults on the constabulary. At one, a gentleman from over the way came out of his house, and, without notice or apparent reason, discharged a six-barrelled revolver; which reminded another neighbour that he might as well let off a two-barrelled fowling-piece; which caused a third neighbour to come out and swear at the other two like a trooper.

And so the night wore on. We got to sleep somewhere in the small hours, and then were awakened by the "night-shift" from that abominable "Bath's hole" aforementioned, who arrived at the surface of the earth at four A.M. in a preternatural state of liveliness, and murdered sleep. A difference of opinion seemed to exist as to whether a gentleman of the name of Arry was, or was not, an etcetera fool. It was decided against Arry, by acclamation, and they went to bed.

In the grey light of the morning a vindictive waiter brought me my boots, and announced, in a tone of savage, implacable ferocity, that the coach would be ready in half an hour. So I again found myself opposite my old friend the Chinaman, plunging headlong through one of the worst roads in the world, north-west for Mount Ararat.

Mount Ararat, I must tell you here, at the risk of boring you, was the place at which all men in that year (1857) who cared to win gold were congregated. Eight "leads" of gold were being worked, and the population was close on 60,000.

There was breakfast in an hotel beside a broad desolate-looking lake, with a lofty volcanic down—a "bald hill," as they call them here—rolling up on the right; then "Fiery Creek," an immense deserted diggings among romantic gullies at the foot of a mountain; then we began to pass some very beautiful scenery indeed—flat plains, interspersed with belts of timber, and two fine isolated mountains, four thousand feet or so in height, rising abruptly on the left, the nearest of which rejoiced in the hideous name of "Tuckerimbid" (Mount Cole), and the farthest one in the exceedingly pretty one of Laningeryn. This latter mountain had two sharp peaks like Snowdon; but, like all other high mountains in Australia (except the Alps), was wooded with dense timber from base to summit—a circumstance which considerably mars the beauty of mountain scenery in those parts.

What I am going to tell you now is nothing more than the truth, whatever you may be inclined to think. We were going down a steep hill towards a creek, when the Chinaman, who sat opposite, suddenly, without notice or provocation, levelled his head, and brought it full against what Mr. Sayers would call my bread-basket with such astonishing force that I had no breath left to cry for assistance. I made a wild clutch at his pigtail, with the intention of holding on by that while I punched his head. That intention was never fulfilled; for, ere my hand reached his head, the whole *orbis terrarum*, the entire cosmos, utterly disappeared, and was replaced by a summer sky with floating clouds. The end of all things had come, and I was floating through space alone with a lunatic Chinaman.

But we did not float long. We came back to earth again with a crash enough to break every bone in our bodies, one would think; and I am happy to say that the Chinaman fell under me. Uprising, we saw that the coach had been upset, and rolled completely over. Our friend the French baker was wiping the blood from a

terrible cut in the forehead; the Yankee driver lay on his back, as I thought dead; and two of the party were cautiously approaching the four mad struggling horses.

In time the traces were cut; in time the driver came to himself, and swore profane oaths; in time the Frenchman got his head plastered, and was merry over our mishap, and, in time, we got to Ararat.

A great dusty main street of canvas stores, hotels, bagatelle-rooms, and bowling-alleys, outside of which on each side were vast mounds of snow-white pipe-clay, each one of which was surmounted by a windlass attended by two men. Due west, well in sight, rose Mount William, the highest mountain in Portland bay, rising 4,500 feet above the table-land, 6,000 feet above the sea. The main street in which we stop was primeval forest two months ago; and we may remark that the country round lies between the bald volcanic plains and the great ranges, consisting of a poor scrubby heath (more brilliant with flowers in spring than a duke's garden), over which was a sparse forest of stunted gum-trees.

Our coach journey is over, and we are put down at our hotel. Then we wander forth among the "holes" and converse with the miners, while supper is getting ready. A hole is pointed out to us as being remarkable. The men who are working it expect to raise about sixty load, and are certain of washing out eleven ounces to the load, which will give them somewhere about 600*l.* a man for three weeks' work. We go and look at the hole. It is a pyramid of white pipe-clay, about twenty feet high, with a windlass atop, and two handsome young Norfolk men working at it. We hear that their shaft is ninety feet deep, and several other particulars. But what takes our attention more than anything is this. At the foot of the great mound of pipe-clay, in the very centre of this roaring mass of advancing civilization, there sit three native black fellows. Naked save for a dirty Government blanket, pinned over their shoulders with a wooden skewer, there they sit, stupid and stunned. On the very place where a short year ago they had been hunting their wallaby and brush kangaroo, the billiard balls are clicking and the fiddles are playing. A rush of sixty thousand Europeans has come into their quiet forest, after that curious yellow metal, of whose existence they had never known; and they sit there stunned and puzzled. The eldest among them can remember the happy old times, when kangaroos were plenty and white men had not been heard of; the youngest can remember the quiet rule of the squatters, when all their work consisted in supplying the settler's table with game. And now! Their time is come, and they know it; there is no place left for them in the land. These white men have brought drink with them, and that will make them forget their troubles for a time. Let them cringe and whine, and prostitute their wives for it, and then die for it; that is all left for them. Alas! poor black fellows, I have left a little bit of my heart among you, and that is the truth.

Five hundred black fellows in full corroborry would have had a sedative tendency compared to what I had to suffer in the way of aggravating noises after I got to bed that night. Our hotel was built of calico; so, as you may suppose, one gathered a tolerable idea of what was going on around one. I got into bed with great confidence at eleven, and then discovered that I was within three statute feet of a bowling-alley. I listened for one hour to the "trundle, trundle, clink, clink," of that exciting game; and then the proprietor of the place put the candle out, and cleared the alley, and I composed myself to sleep.

Then I became painfully conscious that there was a bagatelle-board in my immediate neighbourhood, and that two men were playing on it, and, what was worse, that a dozen or so of other men were looking on, and discussing every stroke. A gentleman of the name of "Nipper," obviously disguised in liquor, was betting on one of the players, called "Sam." I was rather glad when Nipper and Sam fell out, and Sam hit Nipper over the head with the cue; but I was not glad when they came out with the intention of fighting, and wrangled for near upon three-quarters of an hour against my bed.

Then a drunken man came, and fell down on the other side of the calico, within two feet of me, and, being under the impression that he was lost in the bush, began singing out, "Coo'ee," as loud as he could. I suggested to him that he shouldn't make such a noise against a man's tent, whereat he cursed me, demanding what I meant by putting my tent in his way, and, receiving no answer, said that I was always at it.

And on the morrow we were on horseback once more, and, leaving all the dust and turmoil behind, were holding our way across the breezy plains towards the peaceful sunny stations of the west.

Musing.

PLAY on, dear love; I do not care
For any music like thine own:
And let it be that simple air
You touch so often when alone:
Not that,—nor that; nor can I tell

Even how its dropping cadence goes;
But last night, when the gloaming fell,
It seemed the voice of its repose.

Just after dinner, you remember,
I went up to my room; and—while
The cold grey twilight of September
Stretched through the limes, like Minster aisle
With lustrous oriel in the west,
And purple clouds in amber laid,
Where sainted spirits seemed to rest
With flaming glories round their head—

Then sat I, well resolved to know,
Caput and locus, every page in't,
One of the fathers, ranked in row,
The grenadiers of my book-regiment.
But, just as if I had uncoiled
His mummy from its rags and rust,
When to his inner heart I toiled,
'Twas but to be choked with saintly dust.

Then, brooding grim, I wondered:—"How
"Far down among the distant ages,
"Hath this fool's babble floated now
"With the high wisdom of the sages?
"He sat, indeed, at early morn
"Beside the fountains of the light;
"But, blanker than a babe new-born,
"He looked on day, and made it night.

"There's Sappho, little but a name,
"And Pindar, but a fragment hoary;
"And Phidias fills a niche in fame
"With formless shadow of his glory.
"Yet this big dullard, leaden-eyed,
"Hath paper, type, and gilding got;
"And drops, the mud-barge, down the tide.
"Where the immortal galleys float.

"Strange doom! high wisdom wrecked arid lost,
"Or just a splinter drifts ashore,
"Through dark and stormy ages tossed,
"To make us grieve there is no more.
"And such as this great fellow, he

"Gets handed down safe to this day,—
"The heir-loom of stupidity,
"To make us grieve another way.

"'Tis well, perhaps; for indolence,
"O'ershadowed by the ancient great,
"Had sunk in hopeless reverence,
"To worship, not to emulate—
"But that among their matchless wise
"They had their matchless fools as well,
"And equal immortalities
"To wit and folly both befell.

"And yet the oaf had curious brains
"For cobwebs in the nooks of thought,—
"A spider-gift for subtle trains
"Of useless reason, soon forgot;
"And many a feeble soul, I know,
"All bloodless in his meshes lies;
"So to the spider let him go—
"God made them both for catching flies."

Thus musing, in a stormful mood
I flung him to his dusty nook,
And left the moth her proper food,
And cobwebs to a kindred book.
Just then it was, dear love, I heard,
Slow-swimming through the air, a rhyme
That soothed me, like a pious word,
Remembered at a needful time.

Small skill have I in harmonies,
Recording, with their measured roll,
The master-spirit's mysteries,
The maze and motion of his soul.
But now and then mine ear will catch,
And keep rehearsing dreamily,
A plaintive thought,—a little snatch
From the Eternal melody.

So with the harmonics of truth,
I may not soar with those that hymn,
In beauty of immortal youth,
Among the clear-eyed seraphim;
I can but stand without the doors,

And sometimes catch a passing strain
Like that the mellow blackbird pours
In twilight-woods, fresh after rain—

A passing strain of plaintive thought
In natural music softly stealing,
The pathos of a common lot,
Or homely incident, or feeling;
Nor deep, nor broad, nor soaring high,
Nor surging with the passion-strife;
But rippling clear and quietly
Along the common path of life.

And that is all: there was a time
Of windy vanities, when I
Deemed that among the harps sublime
My psalm might blend its melody.
I'm wiser now—I can but sit
In lowly bower of joy or grief,
With thee, dear love, to share in it,
And pipe to give our hearts relief.

It vexed me when this wisdom came,
At first, and, wrestling with my fate,
I strove awhile to fan the flame,
And, spite of nature, to be great.
Yet, what is better than to know
What God has given thee strength to be?
To live a true life here below
Is more than dreaming gloriously.

Then play that plaintive air to me
You touch so often when alone,
That moves in its simplicity,
With natural grace in every tone.
I'm weary of all mocking birds,
I'm weary, too, of straining throats;
And sweetly dropt its natural words
In natural fall of plaintive notes.

Orwell.

Extracts from the Journal of an Englishwoman at Naples.

THE writer of the letters in the form of a journal, from which the following extracts are, with her permission, made, has been for some years resident with her husband at Naples. She witnessed the entrance of Garibaldi; her graphic description of which has been already before the public. The date of the earliest letter from which the extracts are made is Oct. 16th, the latest, Oct. 27th. The subjects of the extracts are—1 and 2.

Scenes in Hospital. 3. Garibaldi: his Character and Influence. 4. A Visit to St. Elmo.

The writer, having found great difficulty in dealing with the peculation, want of cleanliness, lying, and indolence of the hospital officials, has determined, in conjunction with her relatives and other residents, to provide some temporary accommodation for convalescents, who have in many cases left the hospitals as soon as ever their wounds were healed, but long before their strength warranted their joining the camp. Devotion to Garibaldi would inspire them with eagerness to present themselves at Caserta; but their enfeebled frames gave way. Many fainted in the streets, and others languished about at cafes, and in such shelter as they could obtain, unable to procure nourishing food, wine, and other necessary comforts, much less books or amusements suited to their weak health. It is hoped that the means for carrying out this benevolent design will not be wanting. It is believed that the extracts will tell their own story sufficiently, without further preface. G. B.

Extract 1.—Scenes in Hospital.

Oct. 8.—My sister has had a ward given up to her entirely in the Sant' Apostoli Hospital. We spent Sunday in it.

I am much impressed with the courage of the men in bearing pain; I think the courage required in battle is a trifle compared with it. S——only spoke to some; the others showed their native courtesy in scarcely giving her a sign of recognition as she passed, lest they should seem to put themselves forward, although their faces beamed with pleasure. There is a boy who had had a large ball, which went slantwise through both shoulders and back. He showed me the ball—thimble-shaped, as large as a small wine-glass, but solid. He is obliged to sit curled up forwards night and day. Another whom I was struck with was a young Lombard gentleman, serving in the ranks, very beautiful, like the St. Michael of the Louvre, with reddish hair flowing back in wavy curls from the smooth white forehead. He is mortally wounded, I fear. His fine chestnut eyes are glassy and vacant. There are many who are suffering great agonies, evidenced by the livid lips, the clenched hands, and the drawn features. Those poor faces haunt me in my sleep. One poor man was having a severe wound in the stomach dressed. It was the first time I had heard the deep hoarse scream of a man in great agony. It went through and through me. It was evident that he tried to repress it, but could not. Yet they are wonderfully cheerful, and are ready for smiles and jokes; and, if they suffer and die, is it not for "la Patria," and for "our general?" Oh! that word "Patria," it is like a trumpet call to new life for each of them! "What an elevating influence is the love of country! Even the Neapolitans are stirred by it. Yet there is a great difference between their characters and those of the northerns. In hospital they come around you begging, or claw the air with ten hooked fingers from their distant beds, to hasten your coming to listen to them, so little dignity they have; whereas the others ask you in the most beautiful Italian, which is like a chime of sweet bells, to allow them to pay for the letters you have brought them from the post. Yet I am full of hope for the Neapolitans, seeing that, after years of degrading oppression, one month of liberty has already called out stray and far-apart signs of nobleness.

Money has been given most liberally, but it gets shamefully thrown away, through the incorrigible thieving propensities of the Neapolitan officials. Baskets full of provisions come in at one door and go out at the other, and are re-sold; and the money goes into the pockets of the hospital staff. The same with donations of linen. The meat for their broth is passed through hot water, which is given to the soldiers; the meat itself being taken home by the cooks to feed their families to the fourth and fifth generation. One day we went at an unusual hour, and found their broth just as if you had washed dinner-plates in lukewarm water, and then sprinkled a little grease on the top: the poor men were leaving it. S——took a basin of it to the kitchen, called the governor, and showed it him before the cook. he just stood in the favourite attitude of Neapolitans, repeating, "Mais que voulez-vous? mais que ferai-je?" "Look after things; scold the cook," she replied. Still he only shrugged his shoulders, spread his hands, made ill-used eyelids, and left *her* to scold the cook. Everybody is afraid of everybody. Oh! for a little uncalculating manliness!

She one day went up to some of the higher floors not under our care, and found a long gallery full of blankets, sheets, shirts and shoes, and a man in it who, with many bows, protested he was there to give out all that was wanted. She then went to a higher sala, and found it in a horrible state. The wall opposite to the long row of beds was lined with thin old mattresses laid on the cold stone floor; and on them were rows of men tossing and wasted with fever, with woollen covers—not a sheet or a pillow among them. She gave one of them a glass of lemonade, and observed when he put out his arm that he had no shirt; he told her that, when their own red shirts were taken to be washed they never got them back again, and got no substitute. She went back to the linen-room, and, behold, the door was locked, and the key was said to be in the possession of the princess——, who had gone to Sorrento! She then told the head Sister of Charity that she would stand by the man until they brought him a shirt; and presently they did so. Another man in that room had only a few days to live, and was trying to pass the time, while his strength lasted, by reading a little dirty novel. S——gave him a new Testament, and his whole face brightened up. She showed him what parts to read, and told him it was about Jesus Christ, who suffered for us, and that it would comfort him in his sufferings: he said, "Ah, yes; it may help

me in dying," and immediately began to devour it. Rejoice with me over this part of our newly-found freedom! If one had done such a thing six months ago, the king, the ministry, the College of Jesuits, and the Council of Cardinals would all have known of it in half an hour, and we should never have seen the inside of a hospital again, even if we had escaped prison.

Extract 2.—Scenes in Hospital.

Sunday.—When my sister was distributing her roast-beef to-day in her hospital, there was a cry outside that Garibaldi was coming. People rushed with brooms and swept the floors; and the governor sidled up and hoped she had found the broth better the last few days. Presently Garibaldi entered. A swarm of doctors and attendants immediately surrounded him, praising themselves and craving his notice. She could not hear what he said, but observed that he did not fail to speak to each of the fifty-two men in her sala. She waited at the upper end, beside the handsome likeness of St. Michael, whom I mentioned before. She felt it provoking that, when Garibaldi came up, the governor presented her to him with such a torrent of fulsome flattery that simple dignified Garibaldi could not possibly vie with it, and seemed at a loss what to say, but thanked her most heartily for the care of his men. Then she took the liberty to say that she wished she could do a great deal more—that she would like to see that they had proper food, &c. Then the governor burst out with a declaration that she was the mistress of the whole hospital, and that he lay at her feet, and that everybody, cooks and all, lay at her feet, and that she had only to order to be obeyed, &c., &c. She turned her back on him, and spoke to Garibaldi about the patience and courage of the men; and he went to the St. Michael and bent down and kissed him on both cheeks, and told those around how brave he had been; and the big tears rolled down his face on to that of the dying man. He made him an officer there. All the men, when they heard him coming, began to sit up in their beds and clap their hands, and shout "Papa nostro, papa nostro!" They long to be allowed coffee in the morning instead of their grease and water; so my sister said to one of them, "Now could you not ask the general to order that you have coffee?" The young man answered, "Oh, lady, how could I trouble him with that, when he has so much to see to, and when his very presence gives us new life?" I was glad my sister had this pleasure, for she works with all her heart and soul; and it was a better way of meeting Garibaldi than that of some ladies who sought an interview with him later at the Hotel d'Angleterre, and asked him for a kiss a-piece, and that each might cut off a lock of his hair. General Türr was with him, and looked somewhat out of patience, standing guard over Garibaldi with a comb, and raking down his head after each operation.

On Monday, we went to inquire about the fever cases—about three hundred. They are in the charge of the Princess—and the "ladies of the commission," who have the spending of the money subscribed. The ladies do not visit every day, and sometimes do odd things. There was a poor man, who had not a day to live, his lungs having been pierced. Some of them came running up, exclaiming, "Oh, how ill he looks! Here, dear man—here are some bonbons!" emptying a lot of almond sugar-plums into his bed, which he regarded with a kind of patient amusement, but, of course, could not touch. The salas up there are not so good. They have a window at each end, and are nearly dark in the midst, and look cheerless; along behind them run rows of small rooms, with windows close up to a dead wall—six men crowded into each of these little holes! This was a barrack turned into a hospital; and the horrid arrangements, which satisfied the dirtiest of all animals (Neapolitan soldiers), still exist. The first of the row of rooms is the public place for the whole floor; but do not imagine that it has any kind of arrangement whatever—any pipes or drains. It has an immense doorway, without any door to shut; at the opposite end of it, a large window, which blows the draught of it all along the rooms, which have their open doorways all in a line with it. Accustomed as I am to the horrors of the streets of Naples, I never imagined anything like this. It seemed as if it would knock you down when you entered the sala; and it was only with a great effort of self-command that one could remain there. When I awoke in the night, after being there, my throat was sore from the effects of it; what must it be to those poor creatures, wasted with fever, with burning hollow cheeks and glazed eyes, lying without beds—only a thin mattress between them and the stone flags—with their heads up to the very door of this sink of putrefaction, some for thirty days, some for forty? How the human frame can withstand such a thing seems a miracle. We asked a doctor how he had the conscience to undertake to cure people in such a room? He replied, that it was very much against him—"*Mais que voulez-vous?*" with the usual rise of shoulders and eyebrows.

There are some of the worst cases in these rooms. One young man squints till you scarcely see his eyes, and is so deaf, that the old man who attends him is obliged to scream into his ears, and gets a word or two of answer in a hoarse, unnatural voice—all the effect of the fever. He did not squint, nor was he deaf, when brought in. S asked him if he should not like his friends to be written to; and, with great difficulty, he recalled and articulated his mother's name and address,—at which the others were astonished, as he had been raving for several days, he opened his mouth greedily to swallow the grapes which we gave him, with an expression like that of a famished beast. It was very sad to see. There was a pretty boy, with a complexion almost blue white, who thought he was better, and had got up in his flannel coat; but he swayed about, and then sank down again. His head was so

weak that he could not remember where he lived, except "quattro Piano," neither the street nor the town. At last he remembered it was Turin. Another very pretty blue-eyed, yellow-haired boy of thirteen, from Lucca, wasted with low fever, begged S—to write to his mother that he was getting better, and hoped to come home soon. His delicate white face was covered over with great cold drops of perspiration. I wiped it with my fine cambric handkerchief, and gave it to him. He tucked it so affectionately into his neck, and added, very anxiously, "Don't ask father or mother to send me money; they are poor, and I would not be an embarrassment to them." One young fellow of eighteen was so completely paralysed with rheumatism as not to be able to put his hand to his mouth. Near him was one with a finely cut face, but, without doubt, the most dreadful thing we had seen; it looked like the face of a corpse many days dead—the blue lip stretched tight over the glittering teeth—the nostrils dilated, but quite stiff—the eyes wide open, but so turned up into the head, that nothing was seen but shining white, contrasting terribly with the dark, deadly clay-colour of the skin—and a deep hollow under each cheekbone, in which a walnut might have lain. I could hardly suppress a moan of horror and pity when his attendant shouted into his ear, and poked and shook him—which he did rather roughly. He turned down his eyes with an effort—great, brilliant, brown eyes they were—but I think they saw nothing; and immediately they turned up again, till the brown disappeared, without winking or closing. He had been taken prisoner by the Royalists on the 1st, and rescued again the same evening. They did not know if he had been beaten on the head with their muskets, or had been shown the fire he was to be roasted at. He had received a shock to his nerves. I asked what he got as nourishment; they said, a few spoonsful of lemonade squeezed between his teeth. A rather stupid young doctor came by, and I asked him if it would not be good to give him something nourishing, and if I might bring him some beef tea? He said, "Yes, certainly; it would be very good for him." Now, I wonder, if the strengthening food was good, why he had got nothing but spoonsful of lemonade for three weeks.

We next went to the Hospital Pelligrino, to ask if a young man was still alive, who was very ill from mortification of the arm up to the shoulder. He had begged to have his mother sent for from Florence, and S——had just been able to write to her by the same day's boat; otherwise a week would have been lost. She said it was touching to see him when she had written the letter—how he threw his head from side to side, crying, "Subito, Subito! Madre!" in a kind of despairing, entreating voice. We found him with a nice, gentle-mannered, elderly man by his side, who was his father, just arrived, having set off the same day that he got the letter. In the next bed lay a man with blood flowing from his breast, and face livid, and working in great agony: he was a Neapolitan, just brought in, who had been stabbed in a quarrel over cards and money. The knife had touched his heart, and he had not half an hour to live: two women stood wailing over him. All quarrels and stabbing here are about money; it is the one thing that rouses the Neapolitans to energy and passion. Is it not well that, in fault of a still higher object, they should learn even to worship a character like Garibaldi's? This shocked me more than all else I had seen: the power to look on pain and death seemed suddenly to desert me, when the holy cause was no longer there to sanctify them.

Tuesday.—We went at our usual hour. Madame B——accompanied me to the fever labyrinth; I went straight to the bed of the poor fellow who had fallen into the hands of the enemy, with strong beef tea for him. Alas! the bed was empty! I could have cried; I had so much longed to cherish him back to consciousness; it seemed hard for the light to go out from a nameless unknown cause, and not even to know who he was. He was not very young; perhaps his wife and children are waiting for him. He died in great agony at seven that morning; he seemed to be struggling hard to utter some word, but could not.

I had brought a quantity of the strongest chloride of lime from the English Pharmacy, and bought some common plates; and I set it all about the worst rooms, and gave a lump of camphor in muslin to each bed. None of them knew what chloride was: I begged them not to eat it, and to ask the doctor to let it remain until I came again.

Thursday.—I went with Dr. and Mrs. Strange to the hospital of San Sebastian, of the Jesuits, to see the English there. It is under the direction of Madame Mario, formerly Miss Jessie White. The English are in four little airy rooms very high up, with cheerful windows, whence they can look over the housetops to the green hill-side. They are attended by a Scotch doctor named McKenzie, who took his degree in Germany, and by a nice little Irish Sister of Mercy—such a blooming pretty little thing—who was very much delighted to find I had been at the convent of St. Stephen's Green, whence she was sent out to come here. Most of the men are Scotch, and very enthusiastic. Some of the ladies tell them that they were fools to come out. I have it very much at heart that they should be a credit to us; in fighting of course they will—but I wish that they should be well-behaved in every way; and I don't think it will encourage discipline and good behaviour to teach them contempt for the service they had entered. I therefore said all I could, to show them what a noble cause it is, and how proper for the English to help the Italians to secure what God has given them. I wish you could have seen how the faces of those young Scots brightened up at my few words. I think they had become, at the discouragement of some of the English ladies, a little ashamed of what they had done; but now they came out quite eagerly with what they had "thought"—that they *must* come out and lend a helping hand. I was very much

pleased with the style of men they are; not at all the "ne'er-do-well" adventurers that some here pretend. Most are of the well-educated Presbyterian middle class, who use grand words when they talk. One was a watchmaker, another a "traveller to a house;" one an Edinburgh man, another a tall fair Cumberland man. There were two well-mannered Londoners—one a clerk in a merchant's office, and a Sunday-school teacher.

Friday.—We had a long day in the hospitals—the first part with our own fifty-two patients. The only one of them who was worse was the nice young fellow who had the great wine glass shaped hall through his shoulders. He had been going on well; but, dear silly fellow, he lost his head with joy on Sunday to see Garibaldi, and jumped out of bed—he who was never allowed to change his position—and the wounds broke out bleeding. He has gone back, and the doctor thought very badly of him. Later we went to the Jesuits to see the English again. I gave to each of the rooms a packet of tea and sugar, and to each a spoon to keep, as they never have any; but the present at which their faces brightened the most was a great lump of brown soap for each little room; they exclaimed, "Now, *won't* we have a wash" The first since they came to Naples! I gave them plenty of books.

I must not forget to tell you of my triumph over the smells before leaving the *Apostoli*. After finishing with our own sala we went up to the fever wards. I ran along to find out how the smells were, and, behold, the rooms were not worse than ordinary fever rooms. I went to see if the cause was removed; but that was the same. S——had asked one of the men if anything had been done. He answered, "No; only three days ago a lady came and put white stuff in plates about the floors (where it still was), and since then we have not been tormented." He then broke out into an eloquent description of their former sufferings. I had no idea that chloride was so powerful to counteract an existing evil, and could have danced for joy. There are still two more floors higher up where we have never been. It dawns upon me that my true mission is to hunt up bad smells and try to cure them!

Extract 3.—Garibaldi: his Character and Influence.

The one fault Garibaldi has is in being too guileless and pure-minded for this world. He cannot disbelieve people's good professions until their dishonesty is brought home to him by disastrous proof. There must be a want in his intellect, through which he has not yet learned this lesson; though it only adds to the perfection of his heart, for which all love him so much. A week ago he had a sad disappointment about a wholesale robbery which had been committed by a number of his Calabrian volunteers. He had just been told of it, and had dismissed them from his service, and was breaking his honourable sensitive heart over it in his own little room, where a friend of his who told us the story went to inform him that the ministry here had put aside his measures and were about to substitute others. He told him rather timidly, thinking how it would vex him, to whom they owed everything, to have his authority set at nought: but he was already so cut to the heart about his men having been thieves, that he threw himself into his friend's arms, and said, "Let all be done *for the good of Italy*; do not give a thought to me."

Most certainly he is *not* a diplomatist; if he were he would not be Garibaldi. I daresay there may be five or ten diplomatists in the world, but there is only one Garibaldi. It is just his undiplomatic character which makes him the real hero, but which also unfortunately makes him have no sympathy with, but rather a repulsion against, the secret scheming, and long-laid half-avowed trains of Cavour. It is a pity they are not friends; but the nature of the two men precludes the possibility Cavour, with his worldly wisdom, regards Garibaldi as a fool, convenient to be used as a tool at fitting times. Garibaldi wants everything to be done openly, from an avowed principle, and for an avowed end; and he believes that the right will be protected by heaven. The one is the ideal of all that worldly wisdom and talent can effect; the other the ideal of all that is morally exalted, all that makes the beauty and soul of chivalry: and they *cannot* walk together, any more than stars and gas-lamps—the latter being much more practically useful for showing people through the bogs and puddles of man's world; the former more powerful to raise men's hearts and thoughts to a higher tone.

I wish you could hear thoughtful men hero speak of what the conception of such a character has even already done for the degraded Neapolitans. They are a people quick of apprehension and appreciation. Try to realise the disadvantages they have had. They were never taught about Christ; and to many of them the idea of right for right's sake, and of all that is true, noble, and devoted, has dawned upon them first through Garibaldi, and already worked a kind of regeneration in their feeling? and opinions. Do not think me irreverent—I do not give this more than its true weight; I only mean that such an example and influence as his, acting upon the inner character of the units which make up the vast population of the country, appears to those who are here and observe it, not a substitute for the Christian faith, but a treasure of greater worth than any shining statesman's qualities. "We believe that it will make the people more worthy to profit by what statesmanship may secure to them now; so that each will do his work. This part of Garibaldi's work, however, is not so widely understood as his generalship. Even the fighting could not have been successful without him. If Victor Emmanuel had invaded, he would have probably found much more opposition here. It is Garibaldi who represents the moral

feeling, and embodies the longings which have stirred all hearts; and this gave him the power to carry all before him.

Extract 4.—Visit to St. Elmo.

Saturday, 27th.—We went to St. Elmo. You know from pictures that the fortress is built on a rock, three sides of which shelve steeply down; the fourth merges into the hill behind, still standing somewhat higher than the hill.

From the ramparts you see the whole of Naples like a map spread out. The huge walls of the fortress, growing straight out of the rock, look imposing enough; but none of us had an idea, till we were there, that they form only the fourth étage as it were of a four-storied building. We were taken about the great square which they enclose, with its barrack buildings, its mounds of shells, its great guns and big mortars. When we had seen the top part, which covers an immense space, they asked us if we would like to see the covered batteries. They opened a large gate in the middle of the enclosed square, and with a lantern we began to descend a wide paved road, almost as steep as a staircase. When we reached the lower level we found ourselves among immense tunnels, very wide and lofty, which follow, at a varying distance of from ten to thirty feet from the outside, the shape of the great rock on which the upper building stands. Wherever the tunnel approached near enough to the outside, the intervening mass was pierced with a great round hole, at which stood a cannon (they *now* have all got their noses turned inwards); and from the heavy mysterious gloom of these huge caverns you caught sight of the most exquisite little vignette views framed in black rock, sometimes fringed with maiden-hair fern—little pictures perfectly painted. The effect was wonderful, from the concentration of light caused by looking through a tube, perhaps fifteen feet long, with black darkness on our side. At one time it was the Red Palace with its arcades; at another a museum or church; then a bright bit of sea with men-of-war riding at anchor. The maiden's-hair was not growing at all; for some had been newly chiselled out, to enable the guns to be better pointed down into the street. There were, perhaps, thirty in all. Then they showed us the big ovens quite at hand to red-heat the balls that they might set fire to any building they struck, and balls standing near, waiting to be heated. Some of the guns swept the drawbridge and causeway by which one ascends from the outer wall; and there are all the necessaries for a body of troops to live down there, even if the outworks were taken—mills for grinding corn, bread-ovens, sleeping huts, &c. This place is perfectly bomb proof. They talked of destroying St. Elmo; but none of us could understand how they could destroy this place, except by blasting away the entire hill.

Here and there were trap-doors which led down to a lower étage just like the upper one: that makes three floors; and now come the dungeons.

These have no communication with the batteries. To reach them we went a long way down the sloping covered road which leads to the Castle from the drawbridge. I think the door we went in by was on a level with the mouths of those wicked gun-holes. After entering it we went still further down steps and sloping passages cut roughly in the rock, until we came to a large circular dome-shaped cavern, the light of which was very dim. At one side of this cave hall, there was a funnel-shaped opening, beginning wide and growing narrower, until it reached the face of the rock and open air, where it was heavily barred. I think it looked towards the sea and islands of the west, but we could not see anything distinctly. All around this hall were little huts of mason-work, detached one from the other, that there might be less chance of communication. They had heavy doors faced with iron, if I remember rightly, and in each door a little window with a heavy shutter and bolts; and it was only through this window that the cell could borrow a little light from the large cave which was already so dim, and from which not a speck of green or of sky could be seen. I imagine, from the shape of the bars in the little window, that the door was never opened even to give food. The windows had an opening into which you could have slid a soup plate, which will give you an idea of their size; and the people there confidently assert that the shutters were closed by day. Inside each hut was a bed made of two boards, fixed in the corner, a little sloping, to save a pillow; in one the bed was of stone, with a pillow cut in stone. They have been cleaned out and white-washed, but the stench is still overpowering; imagine what it was when inhabited by people who were never let out, who had no mattresses, and had to wear their clothes night and day! And, if so much cheating goes on about the food in the hospitals, which are open to every visitor, how may we imagine these people were fed!

There was one cell still worse than the others. A little winding staircase led up to it. Even with the door wide open you could not see the person at your elbow. Of course I had heard and read all about the prisons, as you will read this; but, standing there, it came upon me as it had never done before, as a new sense, what it would be to have that door shut upon one. Even when it was open, the darkness seemed to weigh like a year of midnight on my chest, and to crush the breath out. I don't think I should have courage to try to keep alive there; I should lie down on that plank bed and never move any more. A man was kept sixteen years in that hole! In that moment the last spark of pity I had felt for the Bourbons died out of me, and I could have clapped my

hands for joy to think that it was over. In other countries a single abuse may arise; like that on which Charles Reade has founded his novel *Never too late to mend*; but this was the *system*, upheld by the Government, and known in all its details to Bomba at least, and made use of not against criminals, but against noble-minded men—against many even stupidly innocent, who had not an idea of being patriots, but in whose dusty book-shelves might have been found some book with a forbidden name or word in its pages, which had probably never been opened by its present owner. There is a good reason for never finding a library in the house of a Neapolitan.

But these are not the worst prisons. They are dry: there are others by the sea which drip night and day; and a gentleman who was with us had been informed by one of the released prisoners of a torture invented by his jailor—to dash on him, through an opening at the top, cold water at any time, night or day. He could not avoid it in any part of his cell, and never went to sleep without expecting it. It became a haunting terror to him, and he had to remain shivering in his wet clothes until they dried upon him. It was a way of extorting money from the friends of a prisoner, to torture him unless bribed not to do so. There were names and dates inscribed on the rock—one of a Spanish nobleman 200 years ago. Some told of very long imprisonments: it seemed as if the very rocks were impregnated with sighs and tears, and groans, and as if they weighed and crushed one's heart with misery.

But there is more to tell, very horrible and mysterious. In the middle of this large cave there was a great round hole, with a low parapet wall enclosing it; and, looking down into it, we saw another hall cut in the rock, like that in which we stood—larger because of not being filled with the cells, and very deep—lighted by a slanting shaft to the opening of the upper one. They told us that this was the place in which they used to put a number of prisoners, whom they wanted to get rid of, together, and shoot them from above. There was an iron gate in the side of the upper hall which led down by a staircase cut in the rock to the under one—a wide staircase, the ends of the steps sharp, but in the middle worn into one continuous slope. Even if the story of the shooting is an exaggeration, it must have taken *thousands* of feet to wear the steps like this; and certainly those feet had not carried people there for their own pleasure. There is *another* gate at the bottom, and more cells opening upon the stairs. It is true that all around the sides of this cave, about the height of a man's head and chest, the walls are marked with round holes, which Captain said he could not imagine having been made by anything but a bullet. Supposing that this was used not for political prisoners, but in cases of military revolt, yet what a system to put men into a wild beast's hole and shoot them down, instead of having an open execution after fair trial! The best colour one can put upon it is horrible.

I took the children: it will not be my fault if they do not grow up haters of tyranny and dark dealing. I did not allow them, however, to go into the cells, lest they should be poisoned; but sent them up into the blessed light of day. When we came up again upon the huge ramparts, and saw the celestial looking sunset over the peaks of Ischia, and the rosy clouds mirrored in the bay, it made my heart ache the more for those who had spent years without being able to tell the winter from the summer, scarcely the day from the night. I hope many of them have it made up to them now in glories which the eye of man hath not seen, nor his ear heard.

Garibaldi's Retirement.

NOT that three armies thou didst overthrow,
Not that three cities oped their gates to thee,
I praise thee, Chief; not for this royalty,
Decked with new crowns, that utterly lay low;
For nothing of all thou didst forsake to go
And tend thy vines amid the Etrurian Sea;
Not even that thou didst *this*—though History
Retread two thousand selfish years to show
Another Cincinnatus! Rather for this—
The having lived such life that even this deed
Of stress heroic natural seems as is
Calm night, when glorious day it doth succeed,
And we, forewarned by surest auguries,
The amazing act with no amazement read.

The Australian Free Religious Press
Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 1. February 7, 1870.

Notes.

Watch-Night Services are all very well in their way; but it is really a pity that ministers who undertake to improve these occasions should, like Dean Cowper in his midnight sermon preached in Sydney Cathedral on the 31st December, 1869, so invariably treat their hearers to a mere string of the dreariest platitudes on the shortness of human life. No doubt, the flight of time is to us mortals a verity, as indisputable as it is solemn; but there surely must be some better and more impressive way of putting it before the minds and consciences of man than the Dean's method of repeating, over and over again,—in fact, some twenty times in as many minutes,—the Apostle Peter's quite inappropriate declaration about the end of all things being at hand. Why inappropriate? Simply for the reason that this statement, as the Dean knows, or ought to know, is but one of many which might be selected from the New Testament, expressive of the early Christian belief that the world, in fulfilment of its destiny, was actually about to withdraw from the solar system and return to nothingness. A strange delusion, long since dispelled. If there is anything clear in the teachings of science, or any weight to be attached to an overwhelming balance of probabilities, the dissolution of our globe, instead of being "at hand," is thousands—perhaps millions—of centuries off. One part of the service there was, however, which decidedly, but quite unexpectedly, impressed us: for when the expiring year had but two or three minutes to live, the preacher's exhortation was, at his request, succeeded by a deep silence, broken only by a chorus of watch-tickings, which, to our profane imagination, seemed to say: "Is it not a fact, O ye people, that the oldest of you will, in a few years, be under the turf? By the souls of you then, be up and doing! Renounce your evil courses. Ennoble your lives. Be true, just, manly, generous. Be not over anxious about the future, but make the most of the time you have." Now we think that the Dean, seizing on this or a similar text, might and should have made it clear to us that

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths; In feelings, not in figures on a dial;"

and that

"He most lives Who thinks most—feels the noblest—acts the best."

As it was, the preacher quite lost his opportunity. Quite? Stop a bit. To do him justice, he was once or twice, though but momentarily, on the right tack, as, for instance, when, he said that people ought to pay their debts before giving picnics, or incurring unnecessary expenses of any kind. Not a bad suggestion, it strikes us. Suppose we all adopt it as an earnest of our intention to turn over, with the new year, a new leaf.

WE neither laugh at prayer as a superstitious absurdity, nor demur to it as a proposal on the part of ignorant and short-sighted beings to thwart the fixed and unimprovable purposes of the Almighty. Our conviction, on the other hand, is, that prayer, when rightly understood and practised, is defensible both on moral and philosophical grounds. It does seem to us, however, that Goethe's remark about the probability of people who set up piety as an end—instead of regarding it as a means to an end—becoming hypocrites, has some sort of bearing on the noisy flourish of trumpets with which certain reverend gentlemen in Sydney and its neighbourhood announced their intention to spend the opening week of the year in asking God for a long list of specified helps. We have the highest authority—that of Jesus himself—for believing that the secrecy of prayer is favorable to its efficiency. "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and shut the door." But how can this injunction be squared with an ostentatious, half-column newspaper announcement, calling the attention of the Public to the fact that certain ministers will, at certain times and places, be found praying? It pains us to believe that such proceedings are, on the contrary, but too closely allied to the ways of those Pharisees and others, who, in the time of Christ, loved to parade their worthless piety before men, and thought, among other fatal blunders, that they should be "heard for their much speaking." Exactly so. For their much speaking: just as if the Deity were to be importuned, by public prayer meetings, at the rate of four or five a day, into an approval of sundry pet schemes of ecclesiastical enterprise, and a disapproval of forms of religious thought—"false doctrines"—that the Church chooses to consider heretical! That the published programme was characterised by a certain priestly adroitness, we admit. Masterly was that part of it, for instance, which invited "business men and others" to attend a daily prayer-meeting at the Temperance Hall, "for one hour only," and that the business man's dinner hour,—"one o'clock, p.m.,"—just by way of testing—what a "happy thought" of the clerical mind!—the strength of the business man's spirituality in subduing his carnal appetites! We wonder how many of our business men, hot from the bustle of George Street, were in attendance? But for the conceit, the affectation, the Pharisaic self-righteousness, the insolent familiarity with the Divine nature and ways, which usually give tone to a public prayer-meeting, especially when conducted by ministers, we might have gone to see. Can any of our readers

inform us on the point.?

THE Reverend Principal of Newington College—to judge from the remarks he made at the laying of the foundation stone of the new Wesleyan Church at Ryde, Parramatta River—is evidently a little uneasy in his mind as to the future of Methodism. The Establishment, he said, had threatened to re-absorb—"swallow up"—her truant offspring. Mr. Fletcher, however, assuring himself, is convinced that the Church of England is gastrically unequal to the feat. "And if she were," he adds, with a vigorous, but scarcely elegant thrust of rhetoric, "she would be as restless and uncomfortable after it as the whale which swallowed up Jonah, and would certainly find no rest until Methodism were vomited out." We are not so sure of that. Surely a Church with a stomach capable of assimilating such opposite theological systems as those of Dean Close and the Rev. Charles Voysey, and all that comes between them, ought to find no difficulty in digesting so tame and consanguineous a morsel as the sect to which Mr. Fletcher belongs. It may come to that: who knows? But whether it does or not, the religious tendencies of the age afford the clearest indications that a re-reformed Christianity is already in existence, and daily waxing in power and influence, which will, in the fulness of time, swallow up all the existing Christian sects; and that too, without experiencing any of the uncomfortable sensations felt by the whale—does Mr. Fletcher really believe this absurd fiction?—after swallowing Jonah. Sound reforms, however, have, like good stomachs, a discriminative as well as an assimilative faculty,—the one, indeed, involving the other,—so that established systems of doctrine are not allowed to pass away without bequeathing to newer and truer systems their imperishable ingredients. How pitiful, thrice pitiful, in face of this great law, are the short-lived isms and *ologies* we so perversely think of as immortal!

ON another matter—that of the pressing necessity for a sweeping legislative interference with the traffic in alcoholic drinks as at present carried on—our concurrence with Mr. Fletcher is both cordial and complete. His address on this subject, delivered in the Temperance Hall, in December last, and since printed in the newspapers, is an admirable summary, temperately as well as tersely written, of all that need be said, and perhaps can be said, on behalf of the proposed enactment of a Permissive Law, prohibiting the common sale of intoxicating liquors in any city or district where two-thirds of the inhabitants may record their votes in favour of its adoption. A loud cry has been raised—chiefly by those, we suspect, who have vested interests in the liquor traffic—against the proposed measure as an unwarranted interference with, and infringement of, personal liberty; but John Stuart Mill, our great master on such subjects, is unassailably right when he affirms, that "Whenever there is a definite damage, or a definite risk of damage, either to an individual or to the public, the case is taken out of the province of liberty, and placed in that of morality or law." True, too, is Mr. Fletcher's remark that "the bitterest enemy of this measure would relax his opposition, if the plausible demon of intemperance had lured away a child or a friend to that abyss, fringed it may be with many flowers of poesy, attractive it may be with much perverted sweetness of music and of good fellowship, that, deep and dark abyss of drunkenness into which so many fall, and from which too few return at all, or return injured and degraded in life." In a word, the principle—we do not pledge ourselves to details—of the Permissive Bill has our approval, and will at all times receive our earnest support.

In the name of social decency, of morality, and of religion itself, we protest, earnestly protest, against the pious, or rather impious, farce recently enacted, under the management of the Rev. Messrs. Carson, Jenkyn and Hartley, and the Rockhampton gaol officials, at the execution of the murderer Archibald. Is it right that a man, under sentence of death for the commission of a foul crime, should be allowed to walk to the scaffold with a bunch of flowers in his hand and place them in his coffin? Or that he should be drilled by his spiritual advisers into a programme of pious utterances which, under the circumstances, were simply blasphemous? "Thanks be to God I am climbing to Heaven." "I meet my death as a Christian." "I wish you a merry Christmas and a happy new year. I am going to spend mine with the Saviour in joy." Then the Rev. Mr. Carson's prayer: "Into thy merciful hands, O God, we commend the soul of *thy servant*, now about to be severed from the body. Receive him, we beseech thee O God, into the arms of thy mercy. Let not his faith waver, nor his hope fail. Let him die in peace, rest in hope, and rise in glory." Now, observe. We do not say—far from it—that a condemned criminal should not, as one placed in a very awful and trying position, be treated with consideration, nay, with all tenderness. We do not say he should not be accessible to such religious and other influences as may tend to discipline his mind and conscience for the dread ordeal through which he is about to pass, so that friends may take comfort from, and he himself find hope in, his death. But we do say that the practice of surrendering a poor condemned criminal into the hands of a set of priestly inquisitors, empowered to experiment with his soul to any extent they please, is a species of moral vivisection in itself revoltingly unjustifiable, and fraught with results—these Rockhampton proceedings, for example—which call for an indignant protest from all right-minded persons. In the spectacle of a criminal who shows a genuine sorrow for his misdeeds, and, while bowing to the decrees of our human justice, is prepared to face the Supreme Justice in the consciousness that it can do nothing wrong, there will always be something touching, and even dignified. But for the spectacle of the murderer of Mr. Halligan, stalking to the gallows, bunch of flowers in hand, prating of his saintship, and

regularly primed for the occasion by his priestly attendants, who speak of him as a "Servant of the Lord, about to enter Glory,"—there can be no other description than that of a burlesque of justice and an outrage on the sanctities of religion. We go further, and say, that to send a poor wretch, like Archibald, into the next world, under the impression that "grace," reliance on the merits of Christ, and the rest of it, have released him from the ineffaceable and eternal consequences of his crimes, is to subject him to the cruelest of delusions. As a man leaves this world, so will he begin the next. But for any priest to undertake so to remould and theologically infiltrate a man, as to transform him, in the course of a few days, from a systematic villain into an exemplary servant of the Lord,—is to pledge himself to an absurdly unaccomplishable task. Ministers of religion should look, and look at once, to this matter. It is, we think, a serious one.

WHO is Daniel P. M. Hulbert? We are curious to know. We have read, or tried to read, his literary exertions in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, on subjects ranging from the primeval chaos to the recent Papal Syllabus, and have come to the conclusion—shared, as it is, by the doughtiest bookworms of our acquaintance—that more unintelligible and oldwomanish utterances than Daniel P. M. Hulbert's have seldom if ever found their way into print. It is, however, a relief to know that readers of the *Herald* are no longer to be bored with this gentleman's wearisome rigmarole. The leading journal, suddenly waking up, has got rid of its enterprising correspondent by politely handing him over to "our friend, the editor of the *Australian Churchman*." What a mercy 'tis that the *Herald's* editorial eye now and then loses its film.

IF it be an offence against morals and manners to slander one's neighbour and refuse to make honourable reparation when called upon to do so, then is Mr. William Macleay, to say the least of it, a very ungenerous man. His reported public allusions to Mr. Davies as a political loafer who obtained his living on doubtful terms, should, at the request of that gentleman, have been promptly disclaimed or apologised for. But Mr. Macleay has a code of ethics of his own. To the feelings or the reputation of others, he is besottedly indifferent. What his imperial lips have once spoken, that he never retracts. There is at least one gentleman—how many more we cannot say—in Sydney, of the highest standing as a scholar and a citizen, who, in the remembrance of certain unhandsome, and to this day unrecalled, aspersions cast upon his character, in the legislative chamber, by Mr. Macleay, can sympathise with Mr. Davies. Such conduct is, in our opinion,—can there be two opinions on the point?—quite indefensible; and we counsel Mr. Macleay, kindly but strongly counsel him, as he values his good name, to abstain from it for the future.

We observe that the *Australian Churchman* has been lecturing Unitarians on their "superfluity of naughtiness" in theological matters. To be a Unitarian, according to the *Churchman*, is to be of those who have renounced "the essential and fundamental truths of the Christian religion, the final atonement for sin on Calvary, and the incarnation of the Son of God." Another characteristic of these troublesome heretics, the *Churchman* goes on to say, is that they deliberately twist and mutilate the Scriptures in order to squeeze out of them "a Christianity without a Christ, a Revelation without anything supernatural, and a Salvation without an atonement." These feeble explosions scarcely merit notice; we shall at any rate reserve our metal until threatened by a decidedly stronger broadside. It is to be regretted that Christians should be so prone to *assume* the truth of what they wish to be true, and then resent and anathematise the fairest proposal to test the stability of their theological erections as savouring of the unpardonable sin. This is precisely the *Churchman's* method. But if the editor of that journal will but descend from his lofty platform, and, instead of piteously whining over those who, on religious matters, cannot see as he sees, try what can be said on behalf of the so-called essential and fundamental truths of Christianity in the way of fair argument, we may be able to show him, before we are many numbers old, that their foundation is anything but the solid and immovable rock of truth. In these days of fearless research among the theological lumber of past times, and when the religion of Jesus is in such a fair way of being disassociated from the superstitions which have so long encrusted it, it is simply absurd to talk of such tottering dogmas as Atonement by vicarious suffering, and Incarnation by the supernatural birth of the son of Joseph and Mary, as essential and fundamental truths which a man must either accept or be unchristianized. Unitarians revere Jesus; not, certainly, as a God, but as the man who of all others has most fully proved, and most heroically lived out, the divine elements of our humanity. Their Christianity, then; is not a "Christianity without a Christ," but a Christianity without the errors and superstitions which will soon belong to what Mr. Buckle terms "the draff and offal of a bygone age."

THAT a man of Dr. Badham's social standing and literary attainments should, under the influence of a singularly unbridled temper, so sadly forget and degrade himself in the eyes of the public, is indeed to be deplored. Dr. Badham's estimate of the value of Greek and Latin studies—eminent as he undoubtedly is in this department of learning—would, under ordinary circumstances, have received the most respectful attention. As it is, his surly and disrespectful treatment of those who are entitled to give an opinion on such subjects, to say nothing of his over-bearing contempt for the "yapping crowd" of mortals who help to pay his salary, at once excludes him from the lists. It seems probable then, that the professor will for the future be allowed to flourish his Partingtonian mop—for Dr. Badham must be aware, that in his extravagant estimate of classical learning, he

stands almost alone among his literary compeers—unchallenged and unnoticed. We fear, too, that his doctrine of the fine disciplinary effect of such learning on the various faculties of human nature, will hardly make converts in face of the fact that the "foremost classic of Europe" is the most violent tempered man in the Australian colonies.

EARNESTNESS, especially religious earnestness, is always praiseworthy; and it is for this very reason that we wish to have a friendly word of expostulation with so earnest a man as Dr. Turner, the London Missionary Society's principal representative for some years past in the island of Samoa. The speech this gentleman delivered in the Pitt-street Congregational Church was in itself a testimony to his zeal and enthusiasm in the Missionary cause; it was, however, very seriously marred by certain statements to which we desire to call the attention both of Dr. Turner and the Public. In the first place, then, he quite fails to understand the attitude of "politicians," "men of science," "time-serving editors," and others, towards associations that have been organised for carrying Christianity into uncivilised countries, and whose "incoherent revilings" on this subject are clearly traceable, Dr. Turner thinks, to the fact that the "carnal mind is enmity against God." This latter point we shall not trouble ourselves to discuss. We wish him, however, to understand that the opposition he complains of is directed not to the Missionary cause itself, but to the style in which it is carried on. That savages must, under any circumstances, be greatly improved and elevated by being brought into contact with refined and educated Europeans is, of course, beyond cavil. But the fact is, that the ordinary Missionary sadly diminishes the civilising and humanising influence he might exert by unduly fixing his attention on the affairs of the next world to the manifest depreciation and neglect of the purely secular affairs of this. His avowed aim is not to fit his converts for earth by teaching them the useful arts and ennobling refinements of civilised life, but to prepare them for heaven by indoctrinating their minds with the dogmas that he considers necessary to salvation. So low, indeed, is the type of Christianity which the Missionary generally carries with him to his work, that the alleged Christianising of an uncivilised country often amounts to the mere uprooting of one superstition by the planting of another. Hence an enormous waste of means and power; nor do we hesitate to say that one-tenth of the annual income of the London Missionary Society would, in the hands of an enterprising corporation of honest and honorable men, but without any particular pretensions to piety, accomplish far finer results in ten years than the Society, with all its resources, is likely to accomplish in a hundred. Dr. Turner himself is fully aware of this purely secular aspect of the Missionary cause, only that he subordinates it to another aspect which he considers "infinitely higher." What this infinitely higher aspect is, may be gathered from his remark, that "there are now in heaven some 50,000 Polynesians who, if we could ask them, would tell us they were led to a knowledge of Christ by the London Missionary Society." Some fifty thousand! What a host! But would Dr. Turner care to complete his statement by affirming that the untold millions of Polynesians who never heard of Christ or of the London Missionary Society are not in heaven? Is he so ignorant of the religion of the Master he professes to serve, and whose one message to his fellow-men was that of the Universal Fatherhood of God, as to declare, with a cold-blooded theological effrontery which almost makes us shiver, that these poor savages are, by no fault of their own, at this moment writhing in the flames of an everlasting hell? If so, we can only say that his God is not ours, even as we fearlessly assert that any sort of atheism is to be preferred to a theism so truly horrible. But Dr. Turner is also very deep in the ways and counsels of the Almighty. He has, it seems, not the slightest doubt that the great tidal wave which a year or two since devastated the coast of Peru, destroying some 20,000 people and unhousing 40,000 more, was a Divine judgment on that country, directly and judicially administered, for its participation in the Polynesian slave traffic. And Queensland, according to this Prophet of the Lord, will, for the same crime, be the next to experience "the frown of the Almighty," in the shape, we presume, of another tidal wave or some equally terrible convulsion of nature. We, for ourselves, predict that men who deal in human flesh, or engage in any other kind of unjustifiable traffic, are tolerably safe to experience in the end the strong arm of our secular justice. But what can be said for the justice—to say nothing of the fatherly loving-kindness—of a God who, for the sins of a few guilty persons, would deliberately destroy, or reduce to a misery worse than death, thousands upon thousands of innocent women and children! Our Prophet's explanation is that God—*his* God—is a "God of Vengeance." Oh fie! fie! Dr. Turner. We are ashamed of you. We are quite sure that Jesus, were he among us to-day would be more than shocked at such a doctrine; and is it not lamentable to think that men professing to be animated by his spirit should attribute vindictiveness and other low human passions to the Great Being whom Jesus speaks of as causing his rain to fall on the evil as on the good, and as loving and blessing his children even when immersed in their follies and their sins. What an elevating theology for people whose professional business it is to *enlighten* the heathen!

A BABY SHOW is, in our opinion, an essentially immoral exhibition, and we shall abstain, therefore, from joking on the subject. Indeed, we must own to our surprise that the parents of as many as seventy children should have been betrayed by a bait of "five guineas and a silver tea service" into so gross a sacrifice of the finer feelings of their nature. It is hardly creditable to us as a community that a proceeding of this kind should

have been allowed to pass off without a word of remonstrance from the Public Press.

The Old and the New.

INDISPUTABLE as is the fact that all organised bodies, whether belonging to the animal or to the vegetable kingdom, are destined to perish and pass away, we yet know, as a matter of the commonest observation, that the resulting disintegration of their physical structure, is sometimes indefinitely postponed. A tree, for example, on succumbing to the whirlwind or the axe, will, under favouring circumstances of climate, retain for many, indeed for untold, years its original toughness of fibre; and even appear, by the production of a twig here or an excrescence there, to reassert the life of which, by the prostration of its stem, it was permanently dispossessed. We say permanently, seeing that these irregular and, as it were, post-mortem displays of the vital principle, always take place within certain limits, as they are always traceable to local and, to some extent, fortuitous agencies. Of the upward and downward movement of the sap in which, formerly, the life of the tree consisted, there is a total and permanent stoppage. The prostrate trunk has ceased to grow. It is no longer a living organism, and the dissolution of its integrant parts, by the chemic and mechanic forces of nature, is, in face of the defiant durability of the woody texture, a mere question of time.

Now on turning from these and kindred phenomena of external nature to the moral and mental activities of man, we find an analogous set of facts awaiting our recognition. Our systems of belief, for example—is it not a fact that their disruption by the investigating spirit is generally followed by periods of slow decay, during which they exert a more or less vigorous but gradually relaxing hold on the popular mind? Is it not a fact that the old Paganism which Christianity eventually supplanted was, for at least three centuries after the Prophet of Nazareth delivered his message, the dominant faith of the Roman Empire? History, indeed, bears uniform testimony to this sturdy and lingering resistance to truth on the part of exploded systems of doctrine. Cursorily glancing at the great moral and intellectual reforms of which history is the record, we readily accept the dictum that truth prevails over error; but to the careful student of history no fact is more patent than that truth may, in contesting with error, fight a losing battle for centuries. The time, however, must sooner or later come, when the issue of such a contest no longer remains doubtful, truth becoming more and more triumphant, while the opposing error, loosening its hold on the minds of men, gradually sinks into decrepitude and death.

Applying these observations to the purpose we have in view, it can hardly be doubted, we think, that the Popular Christian Theology of our time, when measured by its agreement, or rather disagreement, with the highest and devoutest thought of the age, is, analogously, in much the same condition as an old tree which, though sapless and decaying, is still equal, for an indefinite period, to certain displays of life. It can still plant churches by the hundred, and find worshippers of one sort and another to fill them. For the furtherance of its ends, it can inspire its votaries with a zeal, a vigour, and an enthusiasm, in themselves all too commendable, save, indeed, that by being diverted into worthier channels they might be used for the accomplishment of higher results. It can start associations, organise domestic and foreign missions, deluge society with its literature, and raise vast sums of money for the prosecution of any and every enterprise that it chooses to honour with its smile. But these laudable activities of the religious spirit need not, and should not, blind us to the fact that the theological system with which they are associated is slowly but surely receding before the advance of a faith which, while embodying infinitely higher conceptions of Man, of Nature, of the Universe, of Providence, and of God, will, in accordance with the law which provides for the conservation of the true and good amid the perpetual decay of the false and the worthless, assuredly incorporate the many imperishable excellencies of its predecessor, and use them, perhaps with greater efficiency than ever, for the progressive welfare of mankind. To the priest, whether Catholic or Protestant, who thinks himself the guardian of a supernaturally-communicated, and therefore unimprovable, scheme of doctrine; to the churchman who, under priestly misguidance, identifies his narrow creed with all that man can know or is entitled to know; to the weak or lazy-minded who, not daring to trust what is highest and best in their souls, must have some external and established authority to lean upon; to all, in short, who, by their arrogance, conceit, ignorance, indolence, or fear, have fairly involved themselves in the reproach of loving Christianity more than Truth,—there is, of course, nothing very comforting in the prospect of the probable or even possible dispersion of their favourite and, to them, indispensable dogmas. But what does their uneasiness prove? It proves that they either cannot or will not mark a distinction which, when duly recognised, is amazingly influential in the way of liberating the mind from its religious doubts and misgivings. We mean the distinction between the few deep trusts and aspirations of the human soul which constitute Religion, and the complicated web of metaphysical speculations on divine things which forms Theology; the former being inherently characteristic of human nature, and therefore fated to survive the last investigations of thought, while for man's speculations concerning God, varying as they do from age to age, and dealing as they do with an absolutely indefinable Essence, it is

impossible to set up any fixed standard. What would be more hopeless than the attempt to identify the God of Moses, washing his feet in Abraham's tent preparatory to a bread-and-meat supper, or visibly and tangibly encountering the great Lawgiver himself, and trying on one occasion to take the life of Moses at a wayside inn (Exodus iv. 24.) with the God of Jesus, sublimely defined by him as the all-pervading but invisible Spirit of the Universe, who is to be worshipped not merely in this temple, or on that mountain, but wherever the awe-touched soul of man soars up in adoration of the Infinite Holiness? How far removed again is the little wooden fetich, over which the savage mutters his incantations, from the dread ineffable Presence which awes the soul of the Astronomer, scanning the astral spaces with his gigantic tube, into a reverence that cannot be spoken! Yet under all these conceptions there appears the common and seemingly irrepressible conviction of the existence of a Power, an Essence, a Will, a Personality, pervading and controlling the universe, and to which, or to whom, our humanity is bound by indissoluble ties of reverential love, and irrefragable obligations to devout service. Such is the religious spirit when fairly disentangled from the adventitious, and but too often false and damaging, accretions of the theological spirit. These accretions have no guaranteed permanency. A master soul, like that of Jesus or Luther, may at any time appear and sweep them away. They are not the unchanging and eternal substance of religion, but the mere temporary husk which the sword of the Reformer, "dividing asunder even to the joints and the marrow," eventually strips off. Christians forget this; and, for the peace and enlargement of their minds, have yet to recognise the truth of Emerson's profound remark, that "God builds his temple in the heart on the ruins of Churches and Religions."

Such, then, is the law, constant and indefeasible, which provides, by the gradual demolition or modification of the prevailing beliefs of successive periods, for a continuous growth of new and truer systems of doctrine at the expense of those which have had their day and ceased to be; just as the saplings of a forest subsist and thrive on the rotting trunks of their ancestors, and will themselves, in turn, grow old and die, while new plants spring up and take their place. Such, in other words, is the law by which the human mind, thirsting for truth and impatient of the social and political restrictions that would pin it down to the old traditional beliefs "periodically grows too large," as Mr. Huxley aptly observes, "for its theoretical coverings, and bursts them asunder to appear in new habiliments, as the feeding and growing grub, at intervals, casts its skin, and assumes another, itself but temporary." But, then, the sudden blaze of light—if we may venture to expand Mr. Huxley's metaphor—thus thrown upon the human mind can be borne by none but those whose trained mental vision, and disinterested love of truth for its own sake, have prepared for the new epiphany. To such brave and discerning spirits, the unveiling of new truth ever comes as a veritable revelation, as well as a reassurance of man's march, onward and onward, even to the shining, however distant, of truth's perfect day. But to the multitude, a new truth, especially a new religious truth, is always an affront, and some-times a nuisance, as in the persons of Socrates and Jesus, to be summarily put out of the way. It shocks their prejudices. It touches their vanity, and puts a strain upon their self-denial. It overhauls their time-honoured prepossessions, and disturbs their lazy dreams. Its light, puzzling or overpowering their feeble vision, is, in a word, too much for them. So, disowning their leaders, they refuse to quit the old familiar skin, where they remain, decorously rehearsing their shibboleths and as-it-was-in-the-beginnings, until the growing luminosity of its walls necessitates an adjustment of their inner and sluggish to the outer and progressive world of thought. It is to these periodical emancipations of the human mind from the bondage of superannuated incrustations of belief that we are indebted for all the great reforms, whether in art, science, philosophy or religion, which have made history famous and the world what it is. The Christianity of Christ—and observe that we draw a distinction between the religion of the Founder of Christianity and that now professed by the mass of his followers—was itself the product of one of them. The great religious resolution of the sixteenth century—triumphantly vindicating, as it did, the rights of the human mind and conscience against the insolent assumptions of the powerful Ecclesiastic-ism which had for a thousand years impeded and debased the civilisation of Western Europe—was the upshot of another. So the world moves on; is actually moving on; as may be inferred from the fact that, *in our own day, another skin is being cast*, involving no loss a result than the total severance of spiritual from dogmatic Christianity and the relegation of the hitter to the limbo of used-up and inoperative beliefs. We do not expect acquiescence in this statement from the mass of professed Christians: still less do we expect it from their accredited religious guides. But their verdict—the verdict of the priesthood—in the matter, as being that of a class of men who are notorious for their adherence to doctrines that are merely venerable or established, at the cost of all open-eyed reverence for truth, irrespective of doctrines in any shape or form, is weightless, or nearly so, when confronted by the well-nigh unanimous decision of able and independent thinkers in all walks of learning that Christianity, as now generally taught and received, *is without a future*. For the future of Christianity, regarded as a masterly enthronement of the living spirit on the ruins of the mere letter of religion; as a noble assertion of the absolute freedom of the human mind and conscience in all matters pertaining to religion; and as a scathing exposure of the utter worthlessness of professional piety when divorced from practical morality and purity of heart, we, for our part, are in nowise apprehensive; but for the future of the Christianity which systematically and provokingly

overlooks this abiding essence of the religion of Jesus, and propounds a scheme of faith which cannot do without its infallible Bible and the supernatural revelation of which it is the presumed exclusive depository; its repulsive Devil, and the more repulsive Hell where that next-to-almighty fiend is to reign for ever as the prince and tormentor of reprobate souls; its superhuman Christ, and the monstrous, not to say immoral, fiction of vicarious suffering for sin of which he was the divinely-ordained victim; its imperfect God, and his occasional suspension or modification of the laws of nature, as ascertained by science, for the infliction of his otherwise unimpossible punishments or the unfolding of his otherwise incommunicable truth;—for the future of such a Christianity, except, indeed, as a lingering superstition in the minds of the ignorant, we unhesitatingly assert that the religious tendencies of our time afford no guarantees whatever. The truth is, that the progress of thought in removing this dogmatic Christianity from the court of mere ecclesiastical authority to that of reason and conscience, has, by the open verdict of the profoundest and devoutest thinkers, putting aside the *secret* verdict of thinkers equally profound but not equally honest, irrevocably sealed its fate. There are men of the highest standing who undisguisedly impugn it as an intruder on the domain of philosophy and science; others there are who deferentially shelve it as a once influential but now obsolete ethics and doctrine; but the fact is at any rate notorious, that among men of culture and information, taken as a class, there is a deep-rooted conviction that the Popular Christianity of our day, already detached in their estimation from the moral and intellectual forces which *really* move and mould society, can only regain its place among them by submitting to excisions which involve not so much a modification as a reconstruction of its theological scheme. In making these statements, we are fully aware that millions of earnest and intelligent Christians still accept and reverence the false and moribund dogmas to which we have just alluded as the essentials of their faith. We quite understand the strength and cohesiveness which belong to Popular Christianity as a system of doctrine hallowed by age, enriched by the grandest historical memories, ennobled by a glorious ancestry comprising some of the best and bravest spirits that have ever worn flesh, and still guarded by a jealous and powerful priesthood ready, at the least scent of heresy, to do fierce battle for it, just as if the cause—nay, the very existence—of religion and morality were staked on the issue. But knowing this, we are at least as well assured, that neither popular prejudice, backed by all the hierarchies in the world, nor the "refined mental conservatism which, like arsenic, preserves form, but is inimical to life and progress," is any match, in the long run, for that pushing and irrepressible spirit of free inquiry in the soul of man, which, constantly urging him forward in the quest of truth, is eventually fatal to the strongest and most popular forms of error. Entrench itself, then, as it may, in the blinding conceits, the strong passions, the sacred yearnings of human nature, it seems clear that the time must, sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, come, when the now dominant but visibly declining creed of Christendom will be as emphatically disowned by the leavened multitude as it is at present by the leavening few. On no point, perhaps, are the religious signs of the times more explicit than on this.

The foregoing observations will indicate, we hope, with sufficient clearness, the purpose which our little Paper, the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS is, in a humble way, intended to serve. We wish it to be understood that our standpoint is distinctly and, indeed, emphatically religious. Our philosophy, such as it is, refuses to part company with those elements of human nature—wonder, hope, trust, resignation, reverence—which find their root in the conviction that the glorious Universe is but the ever-unfolding autobiography of an infinitely wise and good Being who, while transcending our utmost thought of his perfections, mysteriously reveals himself to our consciousness as the Author of all that we have and are, and to whom therefore, our devoutest allegiance is irreversibly due. In pledging ourselves, however, to the defence of this central and essential truth of all religions against the encroachments of Atheistic and other anti-religious forms of belief, we none the less declare that our main purpose is to assist in liberating Christianity itself from the false and pernicious dogmas which, without the slightest warrant from the pure religion of Jesus, are still taught and accepted in his name. Our standpoint, therefore, is not only religious, but Christian too; for we agree with Renan's observation, that Jesus "founded the pure worship, of all ages, of all lands, even that to which mankind, after having run through all the cycles of error, will return as the immortal expression of its faith and hope."

To die for Truth is to die, not for your country, but for the world. Truth may, like the Venus de Medicis, descend to posterity in many fragments, but it will be re-united into a goddess. And thy temple, eternal Truth, which is now half-under ground, will be dug out of the graves of thy martyrs, raised out of the earth, and stand a precious monument, with the firmness of an adamantine pillar.—*Jean Paul*.

The Education of the People and the Religious Difficulty.

(Abridged from the *Theological Review*, with slight additions.)

THROUGHOUT the civilised world there would at length seem to be a decided awakening of the public mind on the question of Education; and we have, as one result of that awakening, the New South Wales Public Schools Act. But this measure, with all its excellencies, is confessedly a compromise; and, until Mr. Parkes or some other fearless and far-seeing statesman shall come forward, and seizing the so-called "religious difficulty" by the horns, secure for the colony a system of government education, purely secular in its spirit and provisions, a compromise, and a very embarrassing compromise, the present Public Schools Act is likely to remain. Surely our schools for the people might and should be carried on without resorting, under the hollow pretence of preserving their religious character, to books of "Scripture Lessons"—a mutilated Bible—which, however acceptable to Protestants, are in some respects unquestionably antagonistic to the faith of Roman Catholics, and still more so to the religious sentiments of those whose minds have renounced the errors and superstitions of both parties. Catholics object—rightly so, we think—to the Scripture Lessons as being prevailingly Protestant in tone, and as tending, therefore, to disturb and corrupt the religious training which, in their estimation, all Catholic children ought to receive. For ourselves, we object to them on the ground that, in reproducing the most objectionable features of the Bible, they assume the truth of theological notions respecting God and his government of the universe with which the highest science and philosophy of the day are openly at issue. Holding, indeed, as we do, that the Bible contains much that is positively unfit for public reading to children, and much also that must ever be a dead letter to them, it does seem to us that to regard this reading of the Bible as making all the difference between a secular and a religious school, is both a superstition and an absurdity;—a superstition because it makes religion to consist in a mere form, and an absurdity because no real effect for good is produced; and it is a piece of tyranny to which not even a *poor* man should be exposed, that he should be compelled to subject his child to share in a superstition and an absurdity, or pay the penalty by keeping his child in ignorance at home—that his child should not have the piece of bread, unless he takes with it the regulation pill.

The proposition, then, we wish to affirm, is, that dogmatic or doctrinal teaching should have no place whatever in a just and healthy system of public education. And for this we give three reasons:—1, that at the early age when children should be at school, they are not able to understand the Bible read at random, or to comprehend the language, much less the sense, of the dogmas which are usually taught as the sum and substance of religion; 2, that the first business of life is to prepare children to live well here; 3, that it is in nowise the duty of the State, or of the schoolmaster assisted by the State, to provide for the spread of dogmatic peculiarities.

The first of these three reasons is, or ought to be, obvious enough; for it is plainly absurd to attempt to make children comprehend the dogmas that puzzle and muddle the heads of great divines. The thing called religious teaching, as defined and regulated by the government, is the reading of a piece of the Bible, the bare reading of any portion of which is supposed to work somehow like a charm. Sometimes the chapter may be glaringly inappropriate, often quite unintelligible, and occasionally positively unfit to be read aloud to children, but this matters not: the charm will work whatever the words may be. And what is the result of it all? Simply this, that not one child in ten has any real knowledge of the Bible they almost get to hate, or of the dogmas they never try to love. It is a mercy, perhaps, that the children do *not* remember more of what they sometimes hear; but what a shocking waste of time and power it is, to bring in this needless obstruction to a true education and to the true work of a school. We need not wonder at the reports we hear as to the answers the examiners get from puzzled children on these matters. As, for instance, the following version of "the Belief," written by a lad in a national school :

"I belive in God the all mighty maker of Heaven and in Jesus Christ the only son of God who was conseved by the holy Gost born of the vurgan Marry soffed under panshed plited was Squest fied ded and boded he descended into heel the third day he rose again from the ded he descended into Heaven and setted hat the right hand of God the father all might maker of Heaven and earth the see and all that in them is and rested upon the Seventh day and Howard it."

Or this, written by a boy described as "intelligent," in answer to the question, What did your godfathers and godmothers then for you?

"They did promis and voal three things in my name, first that I should pernounce of the devel and all his walks, pumps, and valities of this wicked wold, and all the sinful larsts of the flesh," &c.

Now these scholars had been learning and repeating the Catechism for four or five years, and this was the result. The whole thing, repeated by rote, parrot-like, had simply muddled their brains. And even as regards the perpetual and indiscriminate use of the Bible itself, who does not know that children are often made to hate it? And what wonder, when, as is sometimes the case, it is made an instrument of torture, a chapter being considered a fine or penalty, to learn which is the punishment meted out for an offence. The Bible, in the hands of a good mother or a thoughtful father, is a priceless aid in the education of chil- dren, but what it is in the

hands of a "hide-bound pedant," or even of the ordinary good routine schoolmaster, let results declare. What have little children to do, at present, with Leviticus, and the wars of the Jews, and the kings of Israel and Judah? Would it not be better,—would there not be more religion in it,—if they were put to learn something about themselves, their fellow-creatures, their duty or their country? For this *is* the great work of the day-school,—to fit children for the work of this life, and not to waste their time and strength, and muddle their heads, by any premature and utterly useless attempts to teach them scraps of divinity. It is little time they can give, and but little strength they have to spare, and every moment of the one and every particle of the other are needed for the proper work of the school.

If the teacher strove to make his scholars ashamed of lying and swearing and cheating and selfishness, this, we are told, would be mere "godless morality;" but if he got up and read about pigeons, and he-goats, and the blood of bulls, and heifers, and Gog and Magog, and Mesopotamia, *that*, forsooth, would be religion. Our own opinion is, that there would be a great deal more religion in teaching the child something about itself; and that the really religious teaching would be, not the bit of magical reading, but the spoken word of life.

The second reason is, that the first great business of life is to prepare children to *live* well. Whatever world there is to come, or whatever world we shall come to, after this, it is pretty clear that God meant us to *begin* with this. He has placed us *here*; and our duty to God, our duty to ourselves, and our duty to others, require that we should make it our first business to live well here. There is of course a great truth in the saying that we ought to be prepared for another world; but surely the best way of preparing for another world is to be faithful in this; therefore we would say as little as possible to children about death and the judgment, and heaven and hell. Read the books that are sometimes written for children—full of everything that is unnatural and diseased. Or listen to the absurd, or sometimes, horrible little sermons preached to children in our schools. Hear how they are called upon to prepare for death almost before the poor little things have begun to live, and to be in agonies about pardon before they have begun to sin. It is this that perpetuates the errors and superstitions of the past; it is this that makes it such uphill work to teach the people to think healthily and freely on matters *really* pertaining to religion. Now, children need very little of this kind of thing. What they need is, to be shown as speedily as possible what they are, where they are, whence they are, and what they have to do. This is our programme of a true day-school education; all else is waste of power and waste of time; an impertinence, an injustice, an intrusion. Teach them *what* they are; tell them, therefore, something about the laws of health, of which they are at present disgracefully ignorant; something about the body, its perils and possibilities; the mind, the conscience, and the heart. Teach them *where* they are; tell them, therefore, something about the world they live in, and the country they call their own; train them, therefore, to think it as religious a thing to be told of the kings of England as of the kings of Israel and Judah; and let the names of Milton and Cromwell and Shakespeare be as devoutly mentioned as the names of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob; so shall we make the Lord God something more than a local Deity, and so shall we practically declare that He is not far from any one of us. Teach them also what they have to do; tell them, therefore, something of the ordinary duties of life; something of the laws of trade, of which they are taught next to nothing now; something of the duties of masters and servants, the nature of politics, the conditions of citizenship, and the duties of the rulers and the ruled. We say these are the things that ought to make up the business of every-day school teaching, and that must make up the work of every publicly-supported school. The priest, with his sacramental or theological tackle, must be kept outside; the Bible itself, as a drudge book, or task book, or magical reading book, must cease to be enforced; and nothing must be allowed to uselessly exhaust any portion of the time or the little strength that can by the children be given to this first great business of life—the learning how to *live*. "Make them," as Mr. Buskin has said of children, "men first, and religious men afterwards; but a knave's religion is always the rottenest thing about him."

The last reason is, that it is in nowise the duty of the State, or of the schoolmaster assisted by the State, to provide for the spread of dogmatic peculiarities. It may not yet be self-evident, but it will be, and must be clear before long, that a system of *national* education, established and regulated by the State, or otherwise supported by public money, must ultimately be a system of Secular education. For a time, as a matter of policy or necessity, schools of the old kind may be received, and the Bible regulation may be enforced or allowed; but in the end it will be seen that it is not only illogical but unjust to admit into public schools anything that interferes with the primary and only work of a school—the education of children for secular affairs. How shall the State do this? "I answer," said the Hon. Auberon Herbert, at the Meeting of the National Education League, held in Birmingham, in October last, "by giving to every child a clear conception of the fact of his existence as a member of society, and of the birth with him of obligations which limit his actions towards others; by leading him to understand what law is; to understand the necessity that where men and women live together they should live under law, and the spirit and intentions of the law which a civilised community imposes on itself. It must show him that the happiness of society, its power of progression, its power of enjoying higher pleasures, impose on its members many obligations—obligations of truthful speech, of upright dealing, of respect for

feelings as well as rights—obligations which cannot be neglected without somewhere inflicting injury upon that society which he is learning to place higher than his own individual existence. Under such teaching the social bond will pass from the region of phrases and become to our children as they grow up a distinct and living reality."

And now what is the great principle which underlies all that we have here advanced? For there *is* a principle at stake here, little as it may at present be seen! It is not a paltry controversy about details; it is not a squabble about methods. These ripples may disturb the surface, but there is a deep current beneath. Our cause is the cause of the complete emancipation of the human mind from the bondage of old-world superstitions of priest and creed. We are on the eve of one more struggle between the old order and the new. The old order received full utterance a year or two ago, when the Pope, before all the world, cursed those who denied that the right and duty of educating the children resided with the Church and the priest; and it finds a lingering utterance in the so-called "religious difficulty" here. But it is not a "religious difficulty;" it is a Pope's difficulty, a priest's difficulty, a chapel difficulty, a church difficulty; and it is not doubtful what the end of *that* will be.

The great question at stake, then, goes deeper down than this bare question of education. For we are not only entering upon a new phase of the question of *education*, we are also entering upon a new phase of the question of religion; and these are bound up the one with the other. What was once called religion (an affair of creed-making and creed-believing, of forms, and sacraments, and priests, and rituals), is all gliding away; while the real religion, the religion of natural piety—the religion of being good and of doing good—the religion of love to God and love to man, is coming forth to the resurrection, let us hope, of everlasting life. And this is what lies at the heart of this movement. "The chief priests and rulers" may not see it—or they may not be willing to own it; and only a voice as of one crying in the wilderness may proclaim it; but there is the deep current that is carrying this mighty movement on, and though the men of the old order may not know it, they *feel* it; and we may safely predict a struggle ere the old order can be changed to the new. But the change will come; and the priest with his saving charm, and the preacher with his saving creed, will give place in our schools—aye, and in our churches—to the teacher with his declarations concerning those great laws of life, for want of the knowledge of which the people all around us perish. Then, indeed, in the truest sense, religion will be taught in our schools; not as a form, or as the magical reading of magical words, but as a reality for all life; for the schoolmaster will himself be truest priest amongst his scholars; and he will teach them truth, obedience, unselfishness, charity, purity, and love to the dear God that loves us, and love to one another for the great Father's sake. And in that day *he* will be accounted best to have taught religion, not who has done any regulation work of mechanical routine, but who has filled young minds with bright thoughts, and filled their young hearts with noble ardours, and given them a desire to live for pure and generous ends. Then will men know what religion really *is*; and they will find God, not in thunder-clouds of terror, or seated on a "great white throne," but in the beautiful laws and beneficent order of this lower world, in all the duties of our common way, where He ever breathes the whisper of His will. And with the simple teaching of the religion of human nature, *all* will be satisfied because none will be aggrieved; for all will be grateful that their children are taught their practical duty here to God and Man.

We plead, then, for a national system of Secular education. We are for listening to no cry that asks to consider the cost of it; heartily agreeing with those who say, "We have heard enough of the cost of education, tell us something now of the cost of ignorance." Every penny we spend in this direction will be so much money put into the bank of Nature, and will bring in a large return—"All its gains," says Ruskin, "are at *compound interest*." There are those, indeed, who doubt and fear; who tell us we are dreamers, and that, do what we will, we shall not alter human nature or uplift or improve it. But this we count a kind of social infidelity—the only infidelity that does real harm, for it degrades our nature, and clips the wings of hope, and flings dust in the eyes of the explorer, and threatens to break the heart of the prophet who speaks of better days to come.

Come, then, we would say to all religious teachers, let us cry truce here, and, at the door of the school-house, let us forget that we have a creed; and, whether we train these children into little church or chapel people or not, let us, at all events, make them decent, disciplined, educated, womanly women and manly men. And it may be that the good God will not think so badly of us after all, if for the present, we cease to contend about Heaven, and only seek to make His children fit for earth.

The Living God.

FOR my own part, I venerate not less than others the birth-hour of Christianity, and the creative origin of worlds. But I do not believe that God lived then and there alone; or that if we could be transplanted to those times, we should find any such difference as would melt down the coldness of our hearts, or leave us more without excuse than we are now. There is no chronology in the evidence, any more than in the presence of the

Deity. Since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning—or rather the unbeginning—of creation. The universe, open to the eye to-day, looks as it did a thousand years ago; and the morning hymn of Milton does but tell the beauty with which our own familiar sun dressed the earliest fields and gardens of the world. We see what all our fathers saw. And if we cannot find God in your house and mine, upon the road-side or the margin of the sea; in the bursting seed or opening flower; in the day-duty and the night-musing; in the genial laugh and the sacred grief; in the procession of life ever entering afresh, and solemnly passing by and dropping off; I do not think we should discern him any more on the grass of Eden, or beneath the moonlight of Gethsemane. Depend upon it, it is not the want of greater miracles, but of the soul to perceive such as are allowed us still, that makes us push all the sanctities into the far spaces we cannot reach. The devout feel that wherever God's hand is, *there* is miracle : and it is simply an indeavour which imagines that only where miracle is, can there be the real hand of God. The customs of heaven ought surely to be more sacred in our eyes than its anomalies; the dear old ways, of which the Most High is never tired, than the strange things which he does not love well enough ever to repeat. And he who will but discern beneath the sun, as he rises any morning, the supporting finger of the Almighty, may recover the sweet and reverend surprise with which Adam gazed on the first dawn in Paradise. It is no outward change, no shifting in time or place; but only the loving meditation of the pure in heart, that can re-awaken the Eternal from the sleep within our souls; that can render him a reality again, and re-assert for him once more his ancient name of "The Living God."—*James Martineau*.

Free Discussion.

OUR merely social intolerance kills no one, roots out no opinions, but induces men to disguise them, or to abstain from any active effort for their diffusion. * * * And thus is kept up a state of things very satisfactory to some minds, because, without the unpleasant process of fining or imprisoning anybody, it maintains all prevailing opinions outwardly undisturbed, while it does not absolutely interdict the exercise of reason by dissentients afflicted with the malady of thought. A convenient plan for having peace in the intellectual world, and keeping all things going therein very much as they do already. But the price paid for this sort of intellectual pacification, is the sacrifice of the entire moral courage of the human mind. A state of things in which a large portion of the most active and inquiring intellects find it advisable to keep the general principles and grounds of their convictions within their own breasts, and attempt, in what they address to the public, to fit as much as they can of their own conclusions to premises which they have internally renounced, cannot send forth the open, fearless characters, and logical, consistent intellects * * * * who once adorned the thinking world. The sort of men who can be looked for under it, are either mere conformers to common-place, or time-servers for truth, whose arguments on all great subjects are meant for their hearers, and are not those which have convinced themselves. Those who avoid this alternative, do so by narrowing their thoughts and interests to things which can be spoken of without venturing within the region of principles, that is, to small practical matters, which would come right of themselves, if but the minds of mankind were strengthened and enlarged, and which will never be made effectually right until then : while that which would strengthen and enlarge men's minds, free and daring speculation on the highest subjects, is abandoned. * * * * * Who can compute what the world loses in the multitude of promising intellects combined with timid characters, who dare not follow out any bold, vigorous, independent train of thought, lest it should land them in something which would admit of being considered irreligious or immoral? Among them we may occasionally see some man of deep conscientiousness, and subtle and refined understanding, who spends a life in sophisticating with an intellect which he cannot silence, and exhausts the resources of ingenuity in attempting to reconcile the promptings of his conscience and reason with orthodoxy, which yet he does not, perhaps, to the end succeed in doing. No one can be a great thinker who does not recognise, that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead. Truth gains more even by the errors of one who, with due study and preparation, thinks for himself, than by the true opinions of those who only hold them because they do not suffer themselves to think. * * * * * This is not the way in which truth ought to be held by a rational being. This is not knowing the truth. Truth, thus held, is but one superstition the more, accidentally clinging to the words which enunciate a truth.—*J. S. Mill*.

Bibliolatry.

IN examining the sacred writings, (for which there is claimed a supernatural exemption from all the imperfections that distinguish other religious writings,) we find, in the Old Testament, the most foolish fables

of a dark age superstitiously recorded, occasionally, even, false morals inculcated, and the lowest motives to virtuous action suggested. * * * * * witchcraft and magic spoken of in the same terms as by our forefathers in England three centuries ago. We find, as has been often observed, a code of barbarous and ferocious laws, of which God is assumed to be the direct author, and the unrelenting administrator. In the New Testament records (waiving all *critical* objections to their authenticity and genuineness) we find errors *in fact*, errors in reasoning, doubtful meanings, and unintelligible allusions to forgotten events—the same Jewish fables—devils going bodily into swine and conversing in human language—miracles, in spite of the orthodox explanations and glosses, precisely similar to those of the middle ages—we find recording the belief of these "inspired persons" in the approaching end of the world, which was not accomplished. * * * * * We find, every evidence of human infirmity, both in the writers and in the record, that can possibly be conceived, and yet we are to believe, on their authority, facts the most repulsive to common sense,—that the order of nature was changed, and the law of gravitation suspended in the valleys of Palestine, and that God himself specially inspired them with false philosophy, vicious logic and bad grammar. This is, certainly, the popular notion of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the great mass of the Christian world are at this moment, instead of worshipping God, worshipping the *Bible*—putting the assumed record of God's will before the "inward witness" of his spirit! But can such a belief as this long survive in an age of intellectual inquiry? A juster and more rational idea of God's dealings with us is fast spreading through the Christian world. The sublime philosophy of the Gospel teaches us that the Spirit of God is poured upon all flesh. The "inspired" followers of Christ, being blessed with Eastern imaginations, could easily discover the Divine Messenger in the form (or more strictly speaking, descending after the manner) of a dove, or as "cloven tongues of fire;" but modern wisdom teaches us to look for it in a less palpable form. The human soul has sympathy and comprehension for the God dwelling within us, but the spiritual idea is degraded and lost by association with a material substance. When the bosom swells with virtuous emotion, or the eyes fill with tears of tenderness, we feel the presence of a higher nature, and need no other revelation of the present God. Even in the mixed and motley crowd of a theatre, gathered together for the mere indulgence of the senses, the heroic sentiment, the tender word, the simple trait of fidelity or of honesty, will often touch some chord of sympathy lying deep in the common heart, producing a virtuous harmony far more sincere, more profound, and more universal, than is elicited by the most gorgeous display of a religious ceremonial, or the highest exhibition of pulpit eloquence. If we look, in our best moments, into the deep of our hearts, we find, amidst much confusion, the indestructible elements of the Divine nature. And what is the origin of this everlasting instinct? Is it an old revelation handed down to us by religious systems, (for all religious systems have actually embodied it) from age to age from the earliest time? Is morality a tradition, the source of which is hidden from us in the mist of time, or is it the natural growth of the human heart, a part of the nature a holy God has imparted to his creatures? The last is by far the most rational hypothesis. The instinct of conscience is absolutely universal—the man is yet to be born who has never blushed—in the lowest depths of human degradation "the still small voice" is sometimes heard.—*Foxton*.

Open Vision.

THERE runs a story that one Passover Sabbath-day, when Jesus was a boy of twelve, he stood with his mother at the door of their little cottage in Nazareth—his father newly dead, and his brothers and sisters playing their noisy games. And he said, "O mother, would that I had lived in the times when there was open vision, and the Lord visited the earth, as in the days of Adam, Abraham, and Moses. These are sad times, mother, which we have fallen in."

Mary laid the baby, sleeping, from her arms, and took a sprig of hyssop out of the narrow wall, and said, "Lo, God is here! and, my boy, not less than on Jacob's ladder do angels herein go up and down. It is spring time now, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land, and the blossom of this grape-vine is fragrant with God. The date-tree, the white rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valley, root in Him. He is in your little garden out there, not less than in grand Eden, with Adam and Eve. Look how the setting sun has sketched out all the hills. What a purple glory flames in the west, and is reflected in the east, where the full moon tells us it is Passover-day."

"Nay, mother," said the thoughtful boy, "but He has left the soul of Israel for their sins. So Rabbi Jonas told us in the synagogue to-day. Oh, that I had lived with Elias or Amos, when the Spirit fell on men. I had also been filled with Him."

And Mary took up her wakened baby, who began to cry, and stilling it to her bosom, she said, "The sins of Israel, my son, are like Rebecca's cry. God is more mother to the children of Israel than I to her. Do you think He will forsake the world? This little baby is as new as Adam; and God is as near to you as He was to Abraham, Moses, Elias, or Amos. He never withdraws from the soul of men, but the day-spring from on high

comes continually to the soul of each. Open the window, and the sun of righteousness comes in."

And Jesus paused, the story tells, and sat there, and while his mother laid the little ones away in their poor and several cribs, he watched the purple fade out from the sky, and the great moon pouring out its white fire, with a star or two to keep her company in heaven. And when the moon was overhead, there came two young lovers, newly wed, and as Jesus caught the joy of their talk to one another, and smelt the fragrant of the blooming grape, there came a rush of devotion in his young heart, and he said, "My Father worketh hitherto; I also will work"—and laid him down to his dreams and slept, preparatory to the work which fills the world.—*Theodore Parker*.

Earth our Home.

DIVINE things are not put away into foreign realms of being and future reaches of time, attainable by no path of toil, no spring of effort, only by miraculous transport; but are met with every day, shining through the substance of life, and hid amid its hours * * * * * We do believe that the great change for which the secret religiousness of this age pines, and which it is sorely straitened till it can accomplish, is, the deliberate adoption into "heavenly places" of this world, its faculties and affairs, just as God has made them, and man's unfaithfulness has not yet spoiled them * * * * * Men are tired of straining their thought along the diameter of the universe to seek for a holy of holies in whatever is opposite to their life. They find a worship possible, even irresistible at home; and on the roadside a place as fit to kneel as on the pavement of the Milky Way. The old antagonism between the world that now is, and any other that has been or is to come, has been modified for them, or has even entirely ceased. The earth is no place of diabolic exile, which the "prince of the power of the air" ever fans and darkens with his wings * * * * * It is not only the home of each man's personal affections, but the native country of his very soul; where first he found in what a life he lives and to what heaven he tends; where he has met the touch of spirits higher than his own, and of Him that is highest of all. It is the abode of every ennobling relation, the scene of every worthy toil, the altar of his vows, the observatory of his knowledge, the temple of his worship * * * * * He is set here to live, not as an alien, passing in disguise through an enemy's camp, where no allegiance is due and no worthy love is possible, but as a citizen fixed on a historic soil, pledged by honourable memories to nurse yet higher hopes. *Here* is the spot, *now* is the time, for the most devoted service of God. No strains of heaven will wake him into prayer, if the common music of humanity stirs him not.—*Westminster Review*.

True and False Views of Prayer.

THE scepticism of scientific men when called upon to join in national prayer for changes in the economy of nature is notorious. Those who devise such prayers admit that the age of miracles is past, and in the same breath they petition for the performance of miracles. They ask for fair weather and for rain, but they do not ask that water may flow up-hill; while the man of science clearly sees that the granting of one petition would be just as much an infringement of the law of conservation as the granting of the other. Holding this law to be permanent, he prays for neither. But this does not close his eyes to the fact, that while prayer is thus impotent in external nature, it may re-act with beneficent power upon the human mind. That prayer produces its effect, benign or otherwise, is not only as indubitable as the law of conservation itself, but it will probably be found to illustrate that law in its ultimate expansions. And if our spiritual authorities could only devise a form in which the heart might express itself without putting the intellect to shame, they might utilise a power which they now waste, and make prayer, instead of a butt to the scorner, the potent inner supplement of a noble outward life.—*Professor Tyndall*.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religions Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Our next issue will contain an examination of the Bishop of Melbourne's lecture on Science and the Bible.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.
Vol. I., No. 2. March 7, 1870.

Notes.

If it could be shown that the morality and intelligence of a people might be rightly estimated by noticing the language and demeanour of its parliamentary representatives, the Colony of New South Wales would, assuredly, not rank high in the scale of civilisation. It must be remembered, however, that the vile and coarse proceedings which have, on various occasions, taken place within the walls of the Legislative Assembly, must have had, and will continue to have, the effect of preventing most men of cultivated minds and habits, besides many, having even a moderate amount of self-respect, from seeking the position of legislators, and that a large share in the business of legislation is thus necessarily left in the hands of a number of fussy schemers, who, adopting politics as a trade, and looking upon principle as a joke, mainly occupy themselves in promoting such measures as may seem to them most likely to forward the interests of themselves and their friends, without any consideration as to the benefit or injury that may consequently result to the general body of the people. The universal tone of condemnation which has always been used in commenting on the degrading exhibitions referred to, shows that the colonists, generally, are not responsible for them, but that it is in the defective material to which the electors are limited for the choice of their representatives, that the origin of the evil lies. Until the tone of our social morality be improved, and the false and contemptible manœuvring of certain political adventurers comes to be characterised by some less lenient, and more appropriate epithet than that of "slippery," we shall fail in securing a more dignified or less unscrupulous body of representatives than that which we at present possess. The freedom of speech which is accorded to, and enjoyed by, members of Parliament, is necessarily very great, and when rightly employed may fairly be looked upon as the basis of all wise legislation, especially when, in the assertion of great and important truths and principles, it stands in opposition to the efforts of those who, from selfish motives, trade upon and endeavour to foster measures of a false and corrupt character. That this freedom has been grossly abused cannot be denied, and there is much reason to apprehend, even in the present constitution of the Assembly, that the session will not close without some outburst of personal recrimination and abuse. It is commonly supposed that, when matters have attained a certain climax, improvement may be looked for; but it is not by the silent acquiescence of those right-minded members of the house, who continually regret and deplore the scenes of which they are the witnesses, but fail to act in opposition to the promoters of them, that any good can be effected. Reform, in this direction, can only be carried out by the determined and individual effort of every member, who, having a sense of his personal responsibility, dares to advocate the application, in the legislature, of those fundamental principles of religion and morality, respecting which all good men are agreed, and by which they profess, as Christians, to be guided in the intercourse of every-day life.

TURNING into a Sydney theatre the other night, our attention was speedily fixed by Herr Bandmann's scholarly and artistic delineation of that high—perhaps the highest—achievement of dramatic genius, "Hamlet." A burst of applause followed his really impressive rendering of the fine soliloquy in which the young Dane measures the "dread of something after death" against the "whips and scorns of time," and the actor was evidently in high favour with his audience until that part of the play where the king's question, "Where is Polonius?" is met by Hamlet with the answer, "In heaven: send thither to see; if your messenger find him not there, seek him in the other place yourself." The applause, however, which greeted Herr Bandmann at this point of the performance was unmistakeably accompanied by expressions of disapproval. What was it all about? What did the hissings mean? They evidently meant that the actor had committed himself by his vivid portraiture of a dogma which, in spite of its inherent repulsiveness, is taught daily in our schools, repeated nightly by our children in their prayers, and by every good Christian as often as he rehearses the Articles of his "Belief:" of a dogma, in a word, which, recoil from it as we may in our higher moods of thought, is still but too deeply rooted in the popular creed. We composedly follow Dante, or Milton, into the very jaws of the Christian Tartarus. We place John Bunyan in the hands of children when we wish to amuse them, and dose their imaginations with Dr. Watts in the hope of scaring them into docility and good behaviour. Yet the modest allusion of a stage-player to the Hell of orthodox Christianity as that "other place" to which all wicked people are supposed to go, may act, it seems, as a shock to our sense of propriety. Well, well; when *shall* we have done with the farce of swallowing theological camels while straining at theological gnats?

MR. David Buchanan, when confronted by priestly impudence or intrigue, is a hitter of undoubted power. His blows, on such occasions, are always from the shoulder, but his style of getting home is, we think, defective. It lacks thoroughness and impartiality. In dealing with so palpable a Hydra as Priestism, nothing, or

next to nothing, comes of hammering away at a single head. The reformer who addresses himself to the task of reaching the vitals of this monster, must be armed with something more than a mere sectarian rabies. He must share the conviction that as religion is a sacredly personal relationship between man and his Maker, so the priest, appear in what garb he may, is a profane and mischievous intruder between the soul of man and the highest of its freedoms, privileges, and spontaneities. But of Mr. Buchanan, we must say that his intense Protestantism blinds him to the fact that the priestism of the Church of England and its dissenting offshoots is, in its way, just as insolent and intriguing as that of the Church against which his prophetic ire so frequently and well-nigh exclusively unburdens itself. Aye, and more so, perhaps. For the priestism of the Church of Rome is generally marked by an unblushing arrogance and a vulgar straightforwardness of purpose which are innocent and even amiable when compared with the low cant, the long-visaged hypocrisies, and that "air of exclusive sanctity, as of men already beatified," which, it pains us to say, are but too characteristic of the Protestant priest. We speak thus strongly, as we have just now in our mind's eye certain of this order in Sydney—and where are they not?—who, respecting neither the privacy of the home circle nor the sacredness of personal conviction, are capable of an obtrusive meddlesomeness in the affairs of other people, which ought not and, but for the popular awe of a man in sacerdotal robes, assuredly would not be tolerated for a moment. We are not going to mention names. We merely state a fact which is constantly coming under our notice. For his vigilant and uncompromising scrutiny of the intrigues and machinations of the Roman hierarchy in this corner of the world we like Mr. Buchanan much; but we should like him more did he but stoutly apply his axe to the root of priestcraft instead of hacking at its main ecclesiastical branch.

THE Rev. S. Ella—who recently entertained the members of the St. George's Mutual Improvement Association with an account of his missionary sojourn in the Loyalty Islands—has, we find, a short and easy method of summing up what he calls "the theory and practice of Christian Missions : " *i.e.*, by quoting at us the text—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." But what if Jesus never uttered this command? It were too much, perhaps, to expect Mr. Ella to know that the twelve concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, from which he obtains his quotation, are now generally regarded by biblical critics as an unwarrantable addition to the original narrative. It may be as well, therefore, to inform him that our two oldest Mss., namely, the Vatican and the Sinaitic, dating back to about the middle of the fourth century, conclude the second Gospel at the eighth instead of the twentieth verso of the finishing chapter; making it next to certain that the extra verses were added, probably for some dogmatic or ecclesiastical purpose, by a later and unauthorised hand. But waiving this point, we object to Mr. Ella's short and easy method on the ground, firstly, that the gospel of the modern Christian Missionary—witness the degrading sectarian squabbles with which, on Mr. Ella's own testimony, the natives of the Loyalty Islands have for some years past been edified at the hands of their Christian instructors—is anything but consistent, either in spirit or in doctrine, with the amiable and enlightened philosophy of Jesus; and on the ground, secondly, that we are scarcely justified in transferring our philanthropic energies to remote and dubious fields of labour while there is so much to be done in the way of improving the manners and morals of people at home. A crowd of instances might be adduced in support of this restriction, but we shall confine ourselves to one. At the conclusion of the London Missionary Society's Branch Meeting recently held at Newtown, and at which the Revs. Dr. Turner, S. Ella and J. P. Sunderland were present, three reverend gentlemen sought refuge in an omnibus from the pelting rain, making up an inside complement of three bonnets and five hats. A little way down the road, two ladies appeared begging for seats and—two of the hats mounting aloft—were instantly accommodated. The vehicle was again stopped in answer to the call of a third lady, who on persuasively asking for admission received a curt "No" from one of the three clerici, who further allowed her, although thinly clad and carrying a music book, to scramble, as best she could, into a seat on the roof. Now we submit that this incident, for the occurrence of which we can personally vouch, is in itself sufficient to prove that people may have very high notions as to their "call" to "go forth and preach the gospel to every creature," and yet be strangely remiss in the observance of the thousand little decencies and courtesies of social life, in the absence of which a Christianity, of the merely dogmatic or professional sort, is not worth a pin.

ON Sunday, Feb. 13, the Sydney Volunteers assembled in the inner Domain ostensibly for a "Church Parade," but really, as it turned out, for a much more bellicose purpose. They were under the command of General the Rev. G. F. Macarthur who superintended the devotions of the Protestant division, and of General the Rev. Father M'Carthy who administered to the spiritual necessities of the Catholic veterans. Manœuvred by these eminent religio-military strategists—one trained in the "church militant here below," and the other in a church where tactics are by no means despised—the Volunteers were quite equal to the inspiring occasion. Their martial ardour was aroused and found vent in "Tommy Dodd" and other war-songs of the same type; while warriors of a more peaceable turn deliberately disembowelled their tobacco-pouches and proceeded to *sit* at ease. Then came a quarrel in the ranks which ended in a smart fight; a crowd of excited outsiders having in the meantime stormed the Domain gates amid a general volley of fisticuffs sent right and left at the nearest

heads. Altogether, it was a "site," as Artemus Ward might have said, which only needed a grand wind-up, after the classic model, between the two clerical commanders, to make it "trooly surblime." But, joking apart, let us hope that those who are entrusted with the management of these Church Parades will, on the next occasion, try to avoid the blunder of exposing a thousand men or more, for the best part of two hours, to the heat of a broiling sun; the blunder of tempting them, under such an arrangement, to put aside their soldierly and even gentlemanly habits; and the blunder, lastly, of countenancing, by a division of the men into two religious camps, those petty sectarian divisions which, however unavoidable as features of our Christian civilisation, might surely be forgotten, for one day in the year, by a body of gentlemen banded together under one flag for a purely patriotic purpose. We are aware that our suggestion involves a difficulty of the religious sort. But it is not insuperable. Cease to regard the presence of a clergyman as indispensable to the holding of a Church Parade service, and the thing is done. There are scores of gentlemen in Sydney who, though unlicensed to preach and without the talismanic Rev. to their names, could and, we doubt not, would conduct such a service, and that, too, without offering offence to the religious scruples of the most sensitive. Let the experiment be tried. Why not?

"AND God said, Let there be light, and there was light." Preaching from these words a Sunday or two back in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Dean Cowper, with a quiet audacity that is unfortunately but too common among clergymen, took upon himself to affirm that the "Testimony of the Rocks" is in perfect harmony with the cosmogony propounded in the opening chapter of Genesis, and then the general proposition, that the teachings of Science, in any of its departments, are never at variance with the teachings of the Bible. As the Dean was quite oracular in making these statements, and did not attempt to defend them by a single argument, we beg, quite as oracularly, to inform him, that more unfounded ones were never made from a Christian pulpit. His sincerity we, of course, do not question; but must, at the same time, express our regret that this virtue should, in the case of ministers of religion, be so frequently linked with a mental obtuseness which, under the plea of zeal for God and his revealed truth, refuses to surrender a single fragment of good old orthodox doctrine in answer to the respectful but firm demands of modern knowledge. We live, ecclesiastically speaking, in critical times. For men, no longer terrified by the bugbear of Scepticism, are fearlessly casting to the winds whatever fails to harmonise with the highest revelations of reason and conscience, while the clergy, or the mass of them, doggedly station themselves behind the crumbling buttresses of Tradition, or point to the crowds of unthinking people who for mere fashion's sake are to be found in church as often as Sunday comes round, as a proof that their system is all that it should be. Dean Cowper himself must be cognisant of the efforts that are being made by the foremost thinkers of the day—many of them members of his own church—to eliminate from the Bible whatever scientific research or historical criticism has pronounced unworthy of its pages; and, in so doing, to find a place for the Bible in the esteem of thousands who at present regard it with distrust or ridicule. Is it not to be regretted that the chief obstacle to the performance of this work is not so much in the unwillingness of people to be instructed in these high matters as in the persistency with which clergymen, presuming on the ignorance or the apathy of their hearers, propound, Sunday after Sunday, the most repellent dogmas in the company of legends that are simply unbelievable? But their system is clearly doomed, and, in these rapid times, may be down about their cars before they are aware.

"HENRY Wenton and Thomas Armstrong were fined 5s., and 5s. 6d. costs of Court, for engaging in a work which was not a labour of necessity or charity on Sunday."—*Sydney Morning Herald*, Feb. 26. It is no doubt desirable that people should now and then be reminded how thoroughly the Pharisees of old have been outdone in hypocrisy and cant by modern Christians. We could wish, however, that the above paragraph had been more explicit. Who are these sinners, and what was their specific crime? Is one of them a coachman detected in the act of driving to church some able-bodied saint who could very well have walked? Is the other a cook who, neglectful of the interests of his soul, was found preparing dainty dishes for the saint's table? Or was Pitt Street the scene of the crime, and were these men caught at preparing a daily newspaper for Monday morning breakfast tables? Or, again, to come nearer the regions of probability, were they industrious mechanics, who found it hard to make the ends meet, and who preferred working even on Sunday to begging, borrowing or stealing in any shape or form? Some time ago a man in the employment of the Illawarra Steam Navigation Company was ordered to carry some coals on board a steamer which had put into port short of fuel. It was Sunday. The man, recollecting possibly the apostolic injunction to servants concerning obedience to their masters, or more probably, apprehending that refusal on his part would be followed by instant dismissal, did as he was told, and on the following day was brought before the local board of magistrates as a Sabbath-breaker. Their worships in consideration of his ignorance dismissed him with a reprimand and a caution. We are not aware whether any proceedings were taken against the agent of the Company or the directors. How little now-a-days survives of the *spirit* of that noble ethical maxim which is contained in the command, Rest, that thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou,—a command which is systematically violated by not a few of those who are eternally prating about that detestable Sabbatarianism which Jesus and Paul denounced, and which is as irrational and cruel as it is unchristian.

THE truth of Mr. F. W. Newman's remark that "we dictate to the clergy from their early youth what they are to believe, and thereby deprive them of the power of bearing independent testimony to it in their mature years," was forcibly brought home to us as we sat listening the other evening to Dr. Z. Barry's lecture on "The Origin and Destiny of Man." With the recent literature of this profoundly interesting subject Dr. Barry is evidently familiar; nor have we much to say against his lecture considered as an *ex parte* statement of a confessedly debatable thesis. It was temperate in argument, tolerably modest in tone, and made extremely interesting by the Lecturer's happy selection of illustrative facts, and his way of using them. So long, again, as Dr. Barry confined himself to the scientific bearings of his subject, he was not without facts and arguments which told, or apparently told, against the speculations of Huxley and Darwin; this, indeed, being the inevitable lot of every new discovery or speculation in Science until, by the requisite accumulation of corroborative evidence, the loudest objector is silenced. In due time, however, Dr. Barry's theological bias began to exhibit itself, insidiously but unmistakeably gathering strength, until he was betrayed into the assertion, that the teachings of Science as to the origin of the human race are wholly subservient to the teachings of the Bible; even the "Blessed Book"—so argued the Lecturer—which explicitly affirms that God made man after his own image; and, again, that So-and-so—see St. Matthew's genealogical table—was the son of So-and-so, which was the son of So-and-so, . . . which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God. More we need not say. The natural cast of Dr. Barry's mind evidently inclines him to inquire into the truth of things; but of his fitness to deal with a question at once so purely scientific and untheological as that of the first appearance of human beings on the earth, we leave our readers to judge from the fact that he is prepared to subordinate the verdict of the most eminent investigators of modern times to such fragments of the Bible as may seem to favour his foregone conclusion that the first man was moulded by the Deity from the dust of the ground, as the first woman was manufactured from one of her partner's ribs. For ourselves, we agree with Mr. Newman that to expect a free and independent judgment, on any question of science, from a clergyman thus mentally cramped and fettered by the doctrinal restrictions of his early theological training, is to expect what from the very nature of the case is not to be had.

MR. Alexander Gordon has fired off another long tirade against the Public Schools Act, its supporters and admirers—containing for the most part nothing new, nothing that has not been already answered, or that may not very well be left to be answered by his habitual opponent, Mr. Stewart. But he alleges "that there are many who have no desire whatever that their children should be religiously trained," especially "those whose views on education and religion are represented by such publications as the *Free Religious Press*" Now, we must remind Mr. Gordon of a fact, which cannot be too strongly insisted upon, namely, that certain words, such as "religious," "infidelity," are so frequently used with various meanings, even within the compass of a single paragraph, that every one using these terms should, at the same time, accurately define his meaning. If Mr. Gordon carefully perused the article in the *Free Religious Press*, from which he quotes, he must have found words such as these :—"the first great business of life is to prepare children to live well;" and again, "let us, at all events, make them decent, disciplined, educated, womanly women and manly men." Surely these and similar expressions are sufficient to prove that we are not indifferent to "religious training" in *our sense* of the words, and that, too, a sufficiently high and noble sense. But there is a religious training which we do not want, and which happens, moreover, to be precisely the kind of thing which children get in so-called religious schools. It consists of (1) Scripture History, (2) dogmas. The use of the first is propped up by the strange fancy that the domestic squabbles and foreign wars of one people called Jews are matters of solemn importance, while those of another people, called Greeks, are of trivial interest. A strong-limbed Hebrew, called Samson, kills a lion and slaughters multitudes of his enemies, and his exploits are rehearsed on Sundays to wondering children, who are expected to accept every word of the narrative as literally true, while the deeds of a strong-limbed Greek, named Hercules, are construed by school-boys on week days before a master who is quite at liberty to criticise the legend and to point out how it differs from real history. Now we have no respect for this arbitrary distinction. We cannot regard Solomon's song as sacred, and the Phædon of Plato as profane. We find nothing ennobling in the history of Jewish wars, nor should we think of insulting the memory of Cromwell by classing him with Jehu. Then, as for dogmas, in what way has the world been bettered by them? The history of the development of creeds and doctrines is the history of wars and persecutions, of social cruelty and political tyranny, in which the basest have triumphed and the best have suffered. Such then is the religious training which we most certainly do not want. Let Mr. Gordon write as many long letters as he chooses, of this he may be assured, that men are at length beginning to see that religion has its root not in dogmatic formulæ, but in the deep moral instincts of our nature, which, without the intervention of Church or Priest, conduct us heavenwards.

Australian Churchmanship.

It is strange, but no less true than strange, that ecclesiastics will always carry their wallet behind them and only have an eye for their neighbours' peccadilloes. Whether it arise from an obliquity of vision especially attaching to this class of persons, or from the unfavourable view they are supposed to take of human nature, their ordinary aim seems to be to stir up strife, and to smite a neighbour's cheek whenever they can reach it. This is by no means an amiable characteristic. But fortunately, here as elsewhere in creation, the will to injure and the power to accomplish are not conceded to one and the same creature.

There has existed, as our readers are aware, for the last two or three years a weekly print styled the *Australian Churchman*, somewhat ambitious as to size, and sufficiently respectable as to its typographical get-up. Unhappily for the projectors, its circulation is as limited as, unfortunately for the public, is the talent that edits it. And though perhaps in this instance no great pecuniary harvest was anticipated, it is generally considered to be a somewhat undignified drawback when the returns of a venture do not square with its expenses. After all the clergy can only be wheedled and squeezed up to a certain point, and even episcopal countenance is but sorry metal wherewith to pay the printer's account, or to satisfy the cravings of his "devil."

But let us for a few moments examine the tone and bearing of this hebdomadal production. And first, as to its motto—"Love the brotherhood." How are we to reconcile this motto with its ordinary proceedings? Is it a covert satire on its own pages, and is it to be interpreted by the doctrine of reservation? Must those be the brotherhood, and those only, who obediently think as the *Churchman* would have them think, and who have too little independence either of mind or position to murmur dissent or to hazard an objection? If this be the condition of brotherhood, we must be allowed to express our satisfaction that we are not of our contemporary's guild.

If this self-constituted organ of the Establishment confined itself to its legitimate sphere of action, hectoring its own clients only, we might, it is true, think the whole thing as good as a play, but we should have little right to comment on the matter. But when we find it lecturing Unitarians and others, on their "superfluity of naughtiness," we cannot for the life of us refrain from asking what other superfluity it is that comes far more prominently before our eyes—whether it be in the much overpaid stipend of a bishop, or in the quasi-baronial display of his surroundings. It is a homely saying, that he who has a glass house should never throw stones. But our haughty sciolist gives the adage no heed. In throwing down the gauntlet, however, he must not decline the lists, but give us the "essential and fundamental truths" from the assumed vantage-ground of which he makes his theological assault.

Now, in religion, as in all else, man longs, so far as he may reasonably do so, for some infallible organ of truth, whereby he may once for all set his mind at rest from the religious embroilment around him. Its exposition must be concise, or it will weary; intellectual, or it will be scouted; truthful, or it will inspire disgust. It will not suffice, as it has sufficed in days gone by, to reason as Caesar might, with his thirty legions at his back. Our nearly extinct Establishment long gloried in this procedure, and even now utters its unheeded wail over the degenerate days that will neither accept frauds for truth nor myths for Gospel. The spirit of the age that will table-turn, and gape with wonder at any mountebank who has the boldness to defy common sense, must not be held to be the spirit that will accept as religious truth the *ipse dixit* of any religionist. Its operations are different in the two cases. In the one, it is the result of an easy sort of admiration which, if productive of little good, does little harm. In the other, the case is far different; for with all man's apparent outward apathy, he longs for some exponent of a faith whose tenets should impress a world-wide sense of virtue and goodness. The carping character, the narrow views, the stupid assumptions of the clergy of the Church of England, and, indeed, of ecclesiastics generally, regard all this with no friendly eye. In all difficulties, whether of mind, spirit or position, they would constitute themselves, individually as well as collectively, the one sole court of human appeal.

Are they really qualified for such a trust? Let us see. "If you want to persuade us"—we say to these self-assumed exponents of the word of truth—"of the honesty and squareness of what you preach, prove first that all those are wrong who differ from you on points of religious doctrine; and after having done this in a way satisfactory to your own feelings and convictions, show us how it comes to pass that you who have proved yourselves right are at loggerheads with your own party on those identical points whose adoption you insist on in others. You may talk about squeezing and mutilating Scripture, and prate as you may about the heretical tendencies of the age. But which of your unassailable tenets has been left wholly intact? What squeezings have taken place? What mutilations perpetrated? What grotesque mummeries ruthlessly exhibited to the public eye. Arid, again, by whom has this been done? Not by your *bêtes noires*, the Heretics, but by familiar friends and companions; by men at least nominally of your own faith, but before whom the Sydney 'Men of Gotham' are not fit to hold a candle, being infinitely their superiors in energy and talent, and in every quality that renders even an adversary free from contempt."

In brief, a man's religion is a delicate thing to handle. It dislikes being mauled about—being insulted by the drivellings of mental dotage, or desecrated by weak-headed ecclesiastics; and especially so, when these

disturbers of a longed-for world's religious peace, these scoffers at the inalienable rights and privileges of reason and conscience, have nothing better than their own doctrinal patchwork to offer as a substitute for what they would impugn. The intelligence of the age is clearly ahead of these would-be religious censors; nay, has already consigned them as a body to the obscurity that secures their being innocuous. Man must have some sort of religion, even if it be the *religio* which is little more than a superstition, so long as it embraces some kindly consideration for our fellow-men and a respect for those tenets whereon are based their several principles of faith. Some people can wear their faith as they do their shorts and gaiters, and make it, too, fit as easily. And even if they should experience a twinge of conscience or discover a hole in their belief, they are far too wise to whisper it even to the winds for a bird of the air to carry it. They prefer to give up for the moment their own intestine squabbles about rubrics, synodical action, and so on, and abuse all sects that differ from them. Unsettled themselves, they would unsettle others; and if their success in such efforts is but small, it apparently urges them on to farther action, even at the risk, if not to the certainty, of additional contempt and ridicule.

Dangerous Popular Delusions.

THE account of the death of the Welsh fasting girl by starvation, reveals a phase in human nature of a very saddening kind, and should teach a lesson to many beyond the precincts of that remote district in Wales, where this poor young victim to avarice and fraud has perished.

It is a great error to suppose that the days of imposture and delusion have passed away, or that the progress of science, and the increased facilities afforded for the acquisition of knowledge suffice to protect every class of minds from the current impositions of the day. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact, that the mode in which a community receives, and punishes, on detection, the various offenders against honesty and truthfulness in this particular, is not at all in proportion to the enormity of the offence, or to the gravity of the consequences thereby induced.

The nimble-fingered thimble-rigger and card-sharper, who fleeces his victims by cunningly surrounding his proceedings with circumstances which induce the one party to believe that he has noticed something which has been unobserved by the other, merely relieves some silly fellow of what he might have applied to some more harmless purpose, is dealt with summarily by the police, takes his place at the treadmill, and resumes his occupation on his release. This person is an acknowledged cheat, has no place in what is called "society," and his influence is therefore *nil*.

But let a plausible character assume the title of Professor, take the Hall of an Institution, call his vagaries *séances* and charge his dupes so much a head for admission, and he will succeed in inducing some persons, not entirely without education, to take the Chair at such exhibitions, and thus to aid him in his knavery by giving him their countenance and their money. To such an extent was this system carried on, not very long ago, in this city, that an individual of this description, after having been spoken of as a very wonderful person, and having distinguished himself by various other eccentricities, completed his harvest and left his patrons to reflect upon his honesty and their own folly. It cannot be too widely known that the encouragement of delusions of the kind practised by the individual alluded to, has, in many instances, led to absolute insanity, and that many a sensitive mind has been permanently destroyed by fostering delusions of this description. It is but just to state that all those whose education and scientific acquirements entitled their opinions to any consideration on subjects of this kind, discountenanced the fraud when it was in the ascendant, and cautioned the public against it.

A still more dangerous deception is encountered, when a person, being a member of a learned profession, observing a tendency on the part of the unthinking portion of the multitude, to repudiate the principles of the profession of which he is a member, in favour of some worn-out fanatical theory, takes advantage of the ignorance of persons who are utterly incompetent to form any rational opinion on the subject and forms a profitable alliance with these extremely silly people.

The consequences of such an alliance may easily be imagined; many have lost their lives, whilst many more have languished under the steady and insidious advances of disease, simply from neglecting to avail themselves of those rational principles of science, which are supported by the experience, and have received the sanction and approval of ages, and which are applied by the government of every civilised country, not only for the benefit of every soldier and sailor in their service, but of even the humblest pauper that may be received into their hospitals.

Notwithstanding the numerous catastrophes that have occurred under the influence of this revolting infatuation, there are persons who not only give themselves up to it, but endeavour to induce others to follow their example, and who may, therefore, so far as the tendency of their delusion operates, be far more reasonably looked upon as "dangerous lunatics" than the unhappy individual who, whilst labouring under some other form of delusion, inflicts a few bruises and scratches upon his attendants, is put under proper restraint and consigned

in due form to an asylum.

The delusions referred to, it will be observed, are self-inflicted by those who suffer under them, and are not sanctioned or encouraged by any competent or responsible authority; but, in the case of the Welsh girl, to which reference has been made, it seems that four trained nurses, under the sanction of the authorities of Guy's Hospital undertook to watch the child, and thus deterred her from taking the food which would have preserved her life. Such continued watching must necessarily have indirectly caused her death, and it seems that a heavy responsibility must therefore rest upon the hospital "Authorities." That any respectable medical men could be found to take part in any such proceeding is indeed extraordinary. Knowing as they must have done that it was simply impossible that the child's life could be sustained without food, they ought resolutely to have declined to take any part in an experiment at once so repugnant to right feeling and so indubitably based upon imposture.

Review.

WE have before us a copy of the Address recently delivered by the Bishop of Nelson to the clergy and lay representatives of his diocese. It appears to us to be the composition of an amiable rather than a clever man—one who has the wish to do good rather than the knowledge how to do it—one who is, probably, as incapable of insulting a theological opponent as he is of shaking his convictions. In these days when orthodox malice has reached such a pitch that Dr. Temple's enemies try to deprive him of his office on the charge (false, as it turns out) that he was not born in wedlock, it is a fact worthy of notice that a Christian bishop should talk for some hours on the "foundations of the faith" without once forgetting that he is a gentleman.

As a contribution to the religious literature of the day the address is not of great importance, and the Biblical scholarship contained in it is decidedly obsolete. Witness a grave quotation from the Second Epistle of Peter, a work which every modern critic worthy of the name abandons as spurious. Yet it is in one respect at least, well worthy of attention. It affords, we think, a striking illustration of the fact that the spirit of free inquiry which is characteristic of the present age, is doing its work even in the very strongholds of orthodoxy. Here and there the Bishop betrays, consciously or unconsciously, a suspicion that there *may* be something weak in the orthodox citadel. Take the following passage, the candour of which will not, we think, commend it to his more astute brethren of Melbourne and Sydney. After expressing his full conviction that Christianity is not of man but of God, he says—"I will not sag that I conceive it impossible that I could or should regard it in any other light. All I can say is, that knowing what I do of it, knowing more of it, its claims, its history, its adversaries and the arguments for and against it—having read and re-read many a suggestion and insinuation against it, *many of which I have never read any answers to, nor am I at present able to see how they can be answered;* nevertheless I protest my belief that Christianity . . . is of divine origin and universal obligation."

For such language as this, proceeding as it does from episcopal lips, we may well be thankful. How unlike the arrogance with which certain theologians of the Evangelical School affect to despise the views of some of the best and most learned men of the age as a "re-hash of the stale and oft-exposed fallacies of Gibbon and Hume," and beneath any serious notice. We were about to add, that it is the language of a man who loves Christianity much, but truth more. Unfortunately, another passage savouring far too much of priestcraft, forbids us.

"Some one will say, how can I teach my children, when I do not believe myself? First of all, teach them all you do believe, and they will know much more than they do now. Secondly, do not be afraid to wait till you can explain what you do not understand, *or even what you disapprove.* You may, for example, think it very difficult to receive some of the historical parts of the Scripture—*they are more than you can receive.* Now do not think the child is as Sceptical as you are; childhood is not sceptical, it is confiding and serious; and while you are not to take advantage of that receptive faculty to instil folly, falsehood, and fiction as truth, *you need not be so anxious as some are on this subject.*"

Very sagacious advice. If all instructors of youth were anxious to abjure every species of folly, falsehood, and fiction, what would become of the Church and her Priests in the next generation?

That portion of the address in which the Bishop invokes Science in aid of Scripture, is perhaps the most interesting of the whole. We select the following as an example :—

"The narrative of Genesis xix, tells of something that must always have appeared strange, in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by brimstone and fire from the Lord out of Heaven; but what shall we think when we learn that there existed then, as at the present time, in the heavens about us the very materials for bringing about this catastrophe; and that the composition of the soil about the region where the Cities of the Plain stood, is identical with that of aerolites in the train of a comet, which was so near to the earth about, the assigned period, that a vertical shower of them on the doomed cities would satisfy all the demands of locality and planetary time? It is not demonstratively proved, but the discoveries of the last three years have made it

three millions to one that the Cities of the Plain were destroyed by a vertical shower of a crowded group of solid magnetic meteors, known to have been following Temple's telescopic comet of January, 1866."

How any man endowed with finite intellect can calculate to within one three-millionth the probability of an event, based on such uncertainties as the elements of an almost unknown comet's orbit, and a catastrophe of which we have no means of fixing the date, it is hard to understand. But let that pass. It has always seemed to us, that such attempts as these to verify miracles by forcing them within the domain of natural law, are worse than childish; they are suicidal from the orthodox point of view. Every such attempt is unconscious homage paid by superstition to rationalism, and it is a blow struck at belief in the supernatural. It seems to indicate, moreover, a dim uneasy perception of the truth, that miracles are the burthen, rather than the prop of Christianity. What are we here asked to believe? Virtually this, that in the original design of the universe, the iniquity and consequent punishment of the men of Sodom, were specially kept in view, and the solar system disposed accordingly! Surely this is as hard to believe as any miracle. Again, we are told in Genesis, that Abraham prevailed on the Lord to spare the city if ten righteous men could be found in it. Did it occur to his lordship, that if the requisite number had been mustered, a special providence would have been needed to get the comet out of the way?

We have to thank the Bishop for a very apt illustration of the use of Creeds and Standards of Doctrine. He compares them to fences.

"Many think that, if we were relieved from this limitation, we should have a wider range in our sympathies. Possibly so; but gain in one direction would be loss in another. The Waimea was more picturesque and better adapted for roaming in the early days before the Fencing Acts—but on the whole we have gained by fencing it. It is true, that in theology as well as in farming, some kinds of fence grow till the paddocks are all fence; but, having fences, we ought not to be found fault with as if we had none; or because in our progress we do not break them down, but are willing to use a lighter but not less effective material, with outlets at stated intervals. On the whole we prefer fences, and consider them good both for convenience and safety."

Precisely so. The pastor who owns sheep, likes good sound fences, lest peradventure his sheep should stray, and be lost, *i.e.*, lest they should go over to another fold, and so cause him to lose wool and mutton. Excellent reasoning, *from the pastor's point of view*. But suppose the sheep themselves had a voice in the matter. If they knew their own interest they would, we suspect, scorn the best of fenced ground, and prefer to roam in wild pastures, where they would be safe from being shorn and grilled, and where boiling down caldrons have no terrors for them.

The Evidences.

"LET Reason," observes Bishop Butler, "be kept to, and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shown to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, in the name of God, be given up." Yet in the face of these noble words, Butler makes, not experience and reason, but crafty ever-shifting probability the guide of life, and affirms that there is evidence enough on all the most important Christian truths to warrant our belief and determine our conduct—evidence of the same nature as that we act on in the ordinary affairs of life; and that this fact, if Christianity is rejected, condemns the unbeliever; for what right has he to decline on this subject the very kind and degree of evidence that he never hesitates to act on in all other cases?

To this argument there is an easy answer. It is because the subjects presented by Christianity are of awful moment, involving nothing less than the gift of supernatural power to the Church, and the general curse and damnation of our race, that we require the strongest, most distinct of all evidence, to determine their truth. One, for a very inadequate cause, will cross a mill-stream on a single unstable plank, but justly pause and shudder and refuse to cross for such a reason and on so frail a footing the wide and dreadful chasm in front of Niagara. The evidence that is enough in the ordinary affairs of life—the cost of a dinner or the succession to an estate—is too slender and insufficient to establish an authority that claims to determine man's eternal destinies.

But the evidence relied on by the orthodox is worthless compared with what is required in the most ordinary questions that arise,—to prove the theft of a silver spoon, or the price of corn last Michaelmas. Compared with the direct proof required for such common matters, think on the hearsay, vague, constructive evidence offered that the two sole original written statements of the facts of Christianity are the work of the witnesses Matthew and John whose names they bear.

In one essential element of proof the Gospels are defective—they are dateless. Strange documents of evidence to rely on in a question so momentous? Neither the year nor the season of the year when Christ was born is known. It is not certain what age he was when he died. All is conjecture. Some think that he went about preaching for little more than one year; others, for three years. It is not clear whether he was born at Bethlehem

or Nazareth. One gospel says he ascended from the road near Jerusalem; the other gospels say it was from a mountain a hundred miles distant from that city. In the very scope and substance of the gospels there are discrepancies that for three hundred years have defied the ingenuity of the cleverest priests to reconcile.

But the evidence being weak, the Church backs it up by terrific imprecations; and you and I, dear reader, because we question the accuracy of a four-fold history, defective in the commonest elements of proof, have our souls devoted, like the soul of poor John Huss, to the infernal devils.

Dateless wonders are not very credible; but the orthodox labour hard to show that the gospel's miracles are at least not impossible, and might have taken place if it had been God's will that they should take place. To get you to admit this, is a great point with them.

Now the contrary of any matter of fact is not impossible. It is not impossible that a word might raise the dead or the throwing up of a pebble blot out the sun. But it is a matter of fact that such effects do not follow such causes. No one ever said that all miracles are impossible; but utter impossibility may certainly be affirmed respecting some of them. What we say is, that as miracles are contrary to matters of fact, they are incapable of proof—or in other words, that the breath of a man's lips may have raised the dead, but the proof of it to the world would itself be a new miracle. We hold that a man affirms he has himself wrought a distinct miracle, when he says he has proved Christ's miracles. He is precisely in the position of the priest who pretends by the breath of his lips to transmute a piece of dry bread into the bodily presence of his absent master.

A law of nature—that solids, for instance, sink in fluids lighter than themselves—is simply a matter of fact. Now you can only prove that Christ walked on the sea—or the contrary of this matter of fact—by means of some other matter of fact,—your own senses or the testimony of others. But however complete your evidence may be for walking on the sea, it cannot be more complete than the evidence for the law of nature that solids sink in fluids lighter than themselves. We say, then, that in this case, having sense and testimony for the law of nature on the one hand, and for the miracle on the other, all that you have gained is merely that the two opposing senses and testimonies mutually destroy each other, and leave you, if a reasonable soul, in a state of absolute suspense, or logical equilibrium.

Far, then, from establishing a solid foundation for religious belief, as some good but ill-informed men think, by proving the truth of Christ's miracles—that proof, could it be got, would be destructive of all belief, and the very highest triumph of scepticism.

But in respect to this miracle of walking on the sea, and in every case like it where the conditions of the miracle are distinctly stated and are capable of measurement, its impossibility and consequent falsehood can be as surely demonstrated as any proposition in arithmetic.

The miracle of a man walking on the sea consists in this, that the one pound of water displaced by his feet shall outweigh, in the most delicate and exact of all balances, the one hundred and sixty-eight pounds of living matter that constitutes his bodily frame,—or in other words, that a thing shall be made not only equal to all its parts but equal to one hundred and sixty-eight times more than itself—a proposition that is a contradiction in terms,—an impossibility that God's will you appeal to cannot effect—and which remains for ever and eternally untrue.

And what are the proofs the orthodox rely on to rebut these conclusions of common sense? Their boasted proofs consist neither of their own senses nor of human testimony, but of certain copies of old manuscripts that contradict each other and of which there are no originals. These writings were not published in the place nor at the time Christ's miracles are said to have been wrought. They are not even in the language of the common people before whom he exhibited his wonders, but in Greek, the tongue of a foreign and distant people; and they did not exist till a whole generation after Christ's death, when the statements they contain were safe from all possible scrutiny or detection. Such are the gospels—the evidence of holy writ—whereby divines prove the truth of miracles and the eternity of hell torments,—the two vermilion-coloured pillars of the orthodox temple.

Luke says he wrote what others told him; and, to a certain extent, the other gospel writers did the same;—and good, but credulous men, on the authority of these writings, believed then in the gospel miracles, very much as they do now, without troubling themselves about evidence; and the belief then, as now, gave rise to many practical results,—just as, two centuries ago, good men, on the authority of Moses, believed in witches, and burned alive in consequence many innocent persons.

Had their contemporaries known who Luke and the rest were, and that they were the writers of the gospels, as authentically as we know who James Boswell was, and that he wrote the life of Johnson,—this would only prove, what no one doubts, that knowing their character, men believed these writers,—a very different thing indeed from knowing that the miraculous facts they stated were true. But there exists to us no public contemporary independent information respecting the gospel witnesses. If the witnesses themselves are myths, what can their evidence be? Men however, to whom reason or common sense is troublesome, may very well be content to display the vast multitudes who in all ages have believed the gospel miracles, and so establish their creed on authority which saves all inquiry and is easily understood.

In vain you appeal to the marks of credibility the gospels themselves contain. You will find in Homer and the Arabian Nights, miracles ascribed to gods and genii that are undoubted falsehoods; and yet the narratives containing these miracles overflow with strokes of nature and expressions of piety the most tender, true, and beautiful, and with genuine details of the life, customs, and opinions belonging to the state of society, government, and civilization that existed in the days the poet and the story-teller describe.

Is it not very possible that men shall endure ignominy and the last extremities of torture to assert a cause on which their self-importance and power over others depends? How many fabrications are there in the world, simple, natural, minute, and having all the confidence of truth? Happy is he who has not been taught by experience that the highest claims to gospel light may be found side by side in the same bosom with baseness and knavery.

But Miracles Christ himself avouches as his witnesses, and on their evidence he rests his claim to the messiahship. Go and show John, says he, those things which ye do hear and see : the blind recover their sight and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up. In distinct and solemn appeal to his miracles he says, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." Let us then take him at his word, and assume the test he offers of his truth.

The husbandman who ploughs and sows and divides to his children the bread that rewards his forethought and toil, is a doer of the works of God. No other manner of God's working is seen on earth. To give existence by the word of one's mouth to wine, barley loaves, and fish, are not the works of God. These are wizard's works, that might be the credentials of a messenger from Zeus, but not from God. His works are before our eyes; and they are entirely different from Christ's miracles. How then could his miracles, even were they true, be evidence that he came from God, or spoke the words of God? If they are evidence of anything, they must of necessity prove that he was not sent and is not to be believed; for miracles are wholly contrary to all God's undoubted works that we have ever seen or known.

We know neither mind nor matter except through the orderly laws which constitute and rule them. By the use of this knowledge we obtain whatever we possess of moral or material well-being, and through the same sacred medium we as rational beings perceive and are brought near to God. To say, then, that miracles or violations of His own orderly laws were by the Almighty chosen as attestations to a mission from Himself, is to say a thing that is antecedently or beforehand incredible. Christ's miraculous works consist of two classes—namely, things which are absolute impossibilities, and things which may be true but which are incapable of proof. Can we for a moment suppose that God selected such violations of the order of nature as attestations of a mission from Himself, to beings who beyond that Order know nothing, and who are unable to conceive of His own existence except as the adorable fountain of immutable Order?

You say, indeed, that Christ's works were attestations to a divine mission, and that although limited to individuals in their effects, their usefulness to mankind was of little moment compared to the fact that they were miracles—and on this fact you rest their unspeakable importance to our race. But unfortunately for their purpose, the miraculousness of Christ's works, which constituted their orthodox value to the men that saw them, far from fitting them to be attestations to the rest of the world of a divine mission, has rendered those works themselves incredible. As miracles they quite as much need attestations as the divine mission they attest. If as works they are limited in effect and without intrinsic worth to mankind—if they cast no guiding light on the capabilities of mind or matter—if they afford no aid to human progress,—then are they in truth worthless works; for as miracles, by their own distinct terms they are violations of the Order of nature, and unfit therefore to be proofs of anything, being essentially destructive of the very root and foundation of all evidence. Their natural, or rather priestly value, seems to be to qualify and prepare the mind of the believer to admit readily any amount of further theological error.

The avowed purpose of these orthodox miracles is to overawe reason into meekness and credulity: the divine purpose of science is to establish reason's validity and power. Miracles are witnesses and attestations to primeval curse and ultimate eternal suffering : the facts of science are evidences of Order, Intelligence, Goodness—the hope and eternal root of human well-being. The triumphs of science are at once a revelation of God, and form toward Him one long and free and glorious hymn of adoration. But no eloquence can redeem the inherent littleness of the New Testament's recorded miracles, and the malignity of its predicted ones, or quiet our revolt against the tenets they sanction. Far from being proofs that the son of Mary is, any more than you or I, the son of God, human progress has turned them into distinct evidence that he was but a veritable man—weak, erring, and passionate as we.

But your heart is not bold enough to urge these arguments : education, affection, the dread of singularity, tie you to the Church. The priest entreats you to pray to the Holy Ghost to operate on your soul, and the subtlety of the entreaty lies in this, that the moment you begin to pray, you become the priest's property. In the very act you are born again—you enter the kingdom of credulity, and out of guilt and darkness obtain gospel peace? And what is this peace? Not the sunshine—the carnal peace of honesty and common sense, the priest boldly

tells you, but peace through Christ's blood between your soul and God—the peace that can be given or taken away by priests—the power whereby they aim to reign over the mind, and through it over the civil state of every man under heaven. "I am not come to send peace but a sword—I am come to set a man at variance against his father—The brother shall deliver up the brother to death—I am come to send fire on the earth." These words—this repudiation of the peace of common sense, the priest quotes from Christ's mouth, your master,—and Loyola, De Montfort, Dominic, Alva, Catherine, answer to the call.

O strangest spectacle exhibited on earth! Violence the cruellest and most base, and learning, genius, zeal, devoted to uphold the dogma that God has cursed mankind and fixed eternal woe and ruin as the fate and portion of our race! But it is on this terrific doctrine priestly power depends. Take this away, and of what value is the boasted efficacy of Christ's atoning blood? Priests would be a mock and an absurdity—their wealth and power would melt away. Primeval curse is the very basis of their existence and glory.

The proof by miracles—the evidence by what is in itself contrary to all evidence—is the boldest experiment ever practised on mankind. But in them is the safeguard of the human understanding. The Christian narratives, so sweet—divinely artless,—written in tones of heartfelt reverence and adoration that take the holiest natures captive—were almost irresistible if miracles had not been enwoven in them. On the forehead of each evangelist is written by his own hand, *miracle*. It is the seal of the Almighty that their narratives are untrue. On those narratives are priesthoods, churches, creeds established, claiming supreme domination over human life; but the Great Disposer has willed that the Church, like all else, should bear in her bosom, in these boasted miracles, the tokens of change—the very seeds of her own death

Heavenly messengers—unnumbered miracles :—Nothing can be a revelation of the God of the universe but the universe itself. No lesser symbol can be received. God—the Infinite :—an impassable gulf for ever interposes between that thought and all circumscribed existence.

The founders of the Church knew not the immeasurable grandeur amid which they lived. The idea of God they give is too narrow for man's ever-widening thoughts, Religion is the apprehension and emotion of the soul toward God, progressive with man's progress. The apprehension and emotion correspond to the glory, immensity, benignity of this infinite universe science discloses. Nor Christ nor Paul could enlarge their doctrine by the world's then undiscovered glories, and the ideas they bid you form of the attributes, works, and government of the Eternal, are erroneous, and the believer forms less exalted thoughts, and offers a less sublime adoration, than science gives the means to attain. When, in despite of holy texts, astronomy and geology are established, and the old cosmogony and its doctrines overthrown, the Church admits that Scripture does not teach Science. But she sees not that this is her own condemnation; for in that case she cannot teach religion, but like a fantastic mother she abides by the wayward emotional utterances of the childhood of our race.

But the night is come. The redbreast, the sweet singer amid falling leaves and the shortening day, is silent. Around are the sea and the dark mountains, and above the all-glorious universe of God. Who can look on that scene of majesty and beauty—the immeasurable distances, the innumerable worlds, the dread motion, the ever-widening horizon of infinitude,—who can look on this amazing vision of God, and not say, Till science revealed this, adoration could not exist—religion could not be.

And these eyes that open to me this vast sight—that admit light from these stars—that stand in relation to existences far off in the depths of eternity—these eyes—this organ of these great perceptions, may in a few days be a little dust that feels nothing. I would rise above the imbecility of this mortal life—I would claim kindred with the Eternal which surrounds me. Can it be that this *Me*, that marks and compares and combines the impressions of the senses, shall share their fate and return to dust? Here indeed the response of science is still unheard; but can we doubt that it will come, and that it will be found in unison not only with the greatness of being, but with all our fondest and highest anticipations of good.

This music that in the darkness awakens emotions of serene life and desires after inexpressible goodness and beauty, is made up of sounds high or low, soft or clear, dilated or compressed, whose measurements, and the intervals that divide them, can be taken. There is, however, another geometry—another series of proportions, by which these sounds are arranged and the senses formed. But there is also a higher order, in which the soul in music and our souls and the beauty and goodness we adore, have their origin. Here matter and spirit are not opposed as separate or distinct, but are rather the varied parts of one whole, the waves ever-flowing of eternal life. They roll and change into each other, or the distinction is lost to our reason.

Surely it is something spiritual as human thought that animates these sounds and crowds the memory with the past.

There are the savage notes of a trumpet sounding defiance—the wild roll of a drum at midnight—a maiden singing by a fountain—a violin heard on the dark and lonely streets—the soft fond cradle hymn of a mother—the solemn adoring hallelujah of a resigned heart,—sounds formed on combinations the most profound, but of which, while they give them expression, the soldier, maiden, mother, saint, know no more the principles than the working bee does those on which it constructs its cell. Are our emotions formed on the same

principles also, and the elements of that high geometry out of which they have their birth hid from our eyes? The emotions of the soul are not fantastic, religion is not a dream, nor faith in the Unseen a delusion. The vibrations that awake emotions of order, goodness, beauty, or their opposites—the sounds to which the soul responds, are marshalled and interwoven on principles which are eternal;—and is the soul, and the Unseen to which it tends, untrue? Sooner than believe this, I would believe that there had never existed an antagonist, a true love, or a mother. These objects of our emotions indeed are seen, and the other is not. God is still to us the Unseen, but to whom our trust, our hope, our adoration join us, not only as earth enchains us by our affections and wants, but in the same eternal stream of reason and goodness that unites to Him all conscious intellect. Our existence here is transitory—its fountain is Eternal. The channels life animates are material—the waters are Immortal.—*Campbell's New Religious Thoughts.*

The Modern Devil.

THE mythological devil of times past has almost vanished from the earth. We rarely hear of him now. But the real devil of our time—what is that? Very different is he from our fathers' devil, who was afraid of a church in daylight, and slunk off, and was afraid to look at a Bible. The modern devil is respectable, and does all things decently and in order. His brutal hoofs and savage horns and beastly tail are all there, only discreetly hid under a dress which any gentleman might wear. They do not appear in his body, but in his face; you can see them there, though he does not mean you should. He rides in the streets, appears at public meetings, and sometimes presides over them. He is always on the side of the majority, or means to be. He does not like the majority, but he likes their power; he loves nobody but himself. He has large understanding, and a deal of cunning. He has great power of speech, and can argue your heart out of your bosom. He cares nothing for truth, only for the counterfeit of truth. He is well educated; knows as much as it is profitable for the devil to know; not truth, but plausible lies. He knows most men are selfish, and thinks all are. He knows men are fond of pleasure in youth and power in age, and that they can be cheated and wheedled, most of them. That is the chief philosophy the modern devil knows, all he wishes to know. He is cruel, sly, has a good deal of power to manage men, to suit his burdens to their shoulders. He thinks piety and goodness are nonsense; he never says so. His religion is church-going—for now the devil has learned a trick worth two of his old ones. He is always in his pew, with a neat Bible nicely clasped, with a cross on the side of it—for he is not afraid of the cross, as the old devil was. He fixes his cold hard eye on the minister, and twists his mouth into its Sunday contortions. He has read the "Bridgewater Treatises," and "Paley's Theology and Morality"; he knows the "Evidences" like a Doctor of Divinity, and he must not doubt the casting of the devils into swine, or that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice Isaac. He is a life-member of the Bible Society, takes tracts without stint, obvious and universal one in nature, the good seem destined to predominate. Hence the low race inevitably ascends; the facts of science being thus made to harmonise with the warmest sympathies and finest feelings of the human heart.

Dr. Barry again is clearly in error as to the mental condition of the lower animals: he seems to regard it as fixed and unalterable. This is a profound mistake. Let Dr. Barry note well the low cunning and vacant look of a native dog, and compare it with the intelligence, benignity and sympathy of a thoroughbred Coolie, and he will not long remain unconvinced of the immeasurable superiority of the one over the other. And although he may not, like Saint Anthony of old, occasionally preach to the fishes, or say to the ass "thou art my brother," there is surely no reason why he should be so quick to disown his poor and less-gifted relations.

With one of Dr. Barry's statements I, indeed, must cordially agree; that namely, in which he affirms that "man differs from God, not in kind, but in degree." In other words, God is the infinite man, and man is finite God. But if this doctrine be true, does it not show that the grand fact in the history of the world is not the solitary and exceptionable union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, but the incarnation of the Deity in humanity at large? We are all then Sons of God; and *the* Son of God is not Christ, but Mankind. Here then is a noble prospect for the nations. When a man has realized it in all its significance, he has reached a height where the devil disappears for ever; and the grim dogma of eternal perdition is remembered but as some hideous dream from which one wakes up to perfect peace and security. Truly Dr. Barry, like other members of the Cloth, is picking up notions that will yet give the dry rot to his own system.

W. B.

Classical Education.

To the Editor.

SIR,—A more or less warm expression of feeling attends every question of the present day. Mind is jealous

of its independence, and will have its say whatever come of it. We should deal fair by ourselves, and look to this. We may possibly have adopted some pet theory, and nervously resent any reflections upon it. This touchiness is often owing neither to crookedness nor narrowness of mind so much as to some lurking resentment at the exacting character of another's demands. The recently discussed point of classical education is still engaging some public attention, and I would fain be allowed to say a few words about it.

Here in New South Wales we move among a class essentially commercial; one where human wit is ever on the stretch, and where the intellect that tells is the intellect that will realise the greatest profit, and get the best of a bargain. The battle of life is to be fought on mercantile ground, not in the ordinarily unpaying lists of a classical arena : consequently the muse must commonly yield at once, and retire before the day-book and ledger.

In the nature of things this must be so here. The warmest upholders of classical education will admit that such teaching, earned out in its integrity, is not the direct means to an end, and will, therefore, in the present day, meet with small encouragement. Under the outward pressure of commercial circumstance, the Latin grammar may be a very respectable book, but it must not enter the field against "double entry : " the Ethics of Aristotle are all very well, but will hardly become current at the Corn Exchange.

But still with this admitted impediment to the pursuit of classic lore, how frequently in the common intercourse of life does the classical penchant peep out. How grateful is its perfume at odd moments of our life when we tumble about our mental chest, and light upon some treasure of earlier days long stowed away, and well nigh forgotten. Some lofty sentiment—some half forgotten quotation—something that tells a truth or conveys a precept as only Rome or Greece can do it. The enlarged and generous mind may, even in the very turmoil and struggle for position, wish that its opportunities had been greater; that it could have lingered somewhat longer at a study whose power is so apt to season all after thought and clothe it in the charm of early memories.

But, of course, a partial knowledge like this is not the knowledge of the finished scholar who from youth upward to a sprightly old age has bent low at the classic shrine, and whose one regret is, perhaps, that life should be so insufficient for gathering more, even at best, than a mere modicum of the treasures of learning; who allowing, howbeit, no day to pass without picking up on the great ocean-shore of life some more than usually attractive pebble for mental stowage, can never rid himself of the one regret how his treasures must be limited after all by the comparatively brief period allowed him to collect them.

Classical education will suffer no depreciation at our hands. We believe in it, and we hold to it. Nevertheless when we cannot have what we will, we must take what we can get, Few of Mr. Lowe's *asseclæ*, with all their loose talk about tabooing Greek and Latin from an ordinary middle class education meant, it is likely, more than a wholesome restraint upon this branch of study—graduated, so to say, to the recipient's future position in life. As for discarding classics altogether, such an idea could only have entered the head of one who affects singularity at the price of common sense. Possibly the time allotted to Greek and Latin in some public and private schools, would not be, as it is now thought by many, excessive, if the advantages were proportionate, which confessedly is not the case. Parents are not generally unwilling to accord their children some of those higher mental resources that originate so much after gratification. But when they come, in the somewhat utilitarian spirit of our age, to balance the desultory and apparently aimless course of modern higher class study with the time, stolen as it were, from more obvious and necessary branches of commercial study, they are but too apt, in the impulse of the moment, to reason against a thing and its use, from what is, after all, its accidental abuse. If we say that the teaching the dead languages now-a-days is a system of cram, as unsatisfactory to the teacher as it is unengaging to the taught, we do no more than state what is fully borne out by nineteen-twentieths of our colonial lads, who will stumble over a page of Phædrus, or look, as Homer would say, *achreioi* at his own immortal lines.

It may be difficult to suggest a remedy here, and where to draw the line of classical limitation. Perhaps to teach little, but to teach that little well—to put into the hands of each scholar, after ascertaining the bent of his mind, one popular Greek and Latin author, and make him keep to it, is our best course of action. Such mode of study will at least have this, if it shall have no more profitable result, that the boy's mind will be free from the confusion and mist that must envelop a youngster's brain that finds itself smothered by a dry and fusty set of metaphysical authors, who neither captivate his imagination nor allure him into study.

With all our best wishes for that gentleman's success who has recently been trying hard to create and foster a taste for ancient authors, we much fear his profit will be little commensurate with his trouble. The fond aspiration has gone a little ahead of a somewhat hard and still unappreciating present. An elegant scholar and able critic is apt to forget in the hourly converse with those noble spirits whose servant he is, and whose claims he is ever ready to allow, that their countenance is not to be gained nor their *adyta* rifled in a moment of literary idleness and business relaxation. It surely takes more than a trifle of time to become familiar with the chatty tales of honest Herodotus—with the sweetly-flowing diction of Lucretius—with the no-quarter-giving satires of

Juvenal and Persius—or with the gibes and fun of caustic Lucian. It is in these and kindred authors where the mind is edified and thought ennobled—where appetite grows with the food supplied—where recurrence never palls—where inclination and pleasure go hand-in-hand—and listlessness finds no loophole of approach.

It is this and such-like mental exercise we would suggest instead of much of the bald and unimproving literature of the present day. We can answer for the quiet gratification such study will impart; but we feel we can lay down no rule whatever as to how, when, or where each one is to set about it. Desire will, we have no doubt, give birth to opportunity; and perhaps, after all, he may regret it but little, if familiar converse with friends like Homer and Virgil should steal him away from some evening lecture where not infrequently the originality of thought and the grammar are about on a par.

Let events, however, tend as they may, of one thing we feel well assured. The classics stand on far too steady a basis ever to be put aside by clamour or depreciation. We may admit the day has not yet dawned that shall see them occupy their proper position here, unconsciously influencing a rising generation in all that is good, reverent and patriotic. At present the far too precocious youth of our Southern Hemisphere would bolt their classics as they do raw fruit, and can scarcely be expected to estimate at its proper value a taste that energy and perseverance only can form. But sooner or later it will force its way and become in no degree a mere secondary part of education. For judiciously taught by those who shall be really qualified to teach it, and fostered by a legislative body whose members shall have become competent by education to deliver an opinion on the subject, this growing taste for the founts of ancient literature will induce a healthy and refreshing mental vigour, enabling the soul to put off, at intervals, the shackles of its every day life, and to repose in a higher region of self-examination and thought.

Quilibet.

Biblical Inspiration and Infallibility.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Let me, first of all, congratulate you on the beginning of your spirited enterprise, and offer my hearty wishes for its success.

And now to my text. A Biblical legend tells us that on the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, "Cherubims and a flaming sword" were placed at the east of the garden "to keep the way of the tree of life;" in other words, to prevent the return of the evicted tenants. But coming down to historical times, we find a very different order of being placed by fallible human authority at the entrance to the domain of Free Religious Inquiry; a very devil, in fact, which at first did his work of warning off would-be intruders by means of the prison, the stake and the scaffold, but was eventually restricted to the infliction of legal penalties and disqualifications. Now-a-days, we have only to look fairly into the face of this devil in order to despise him. But, then, what a few of us there are who can or will do this! I myself know many who, from fear of unsettling what they are pleased to call their opinions, but which are merely assumptions taken on trust, or from sheer unwillingness to obey the apostolic injunction and "prove all things," are content to go on in their several worldly occupations, hoping that, if they are not very wicked, all things will somehow or other come right to them in the end. Here, then, is an imp which the *Free Religious Press* may help to exorcise, and to this good work I venture to offer my poor assistance.

Not long since I was conversing with a Presbyterian minister of this city, and on my asking him how he could maintain the dogma of the Inspiration of the Bible, unless he was prepared to assert the inspiration and infallibility of all its transcribers and translators; he replied, that scholars, like himself, did not go to the authorised version, but to the Hebrew and Greek originals. And can it be, said I to myself, on turning his answer over, that this Reverend Doctor, with all his fame for classical and oriental learning, is really ignorant of the fact that the originals of the Bible writings are not in existence? Or did he presume on my ignorance of this fact and try to impose on me? Let us, at all events, see what Tischendorf, in his Introduction to the "New Testament of the Authorised Version," says on this point:—"As early as the reign of Elizabeth, the English nation possessed an authorised translation, executed by the Bishops under the guidance of Archbishop Parker; and this, half-a-century later, in the year 1611, was revised" (*revised*, mark you; if the Book was already infallible, what need of a revision?) "at the command of James the First, by a body of learned divines, and became the present 'Authorised Version'".... "But the Greek text of the Apostolic writings, *since its origin in the first century*, has suffered many a mischance at the hands of those who have used and studied it; *the mere process of constant copying and recopying alone having given rise to many alterations*. The Authorised Version, like Luther's, was made from a Greek text which Erasmus in 1516, and Robert Stephens in 1550, *had formed from manuscripts of later date than the tenth century*. . . . Since the sixteenth century Greek manuscripts have been discovered of far greater antiquity than those of Erasmus and Stephens; as well as others in Latin,

Syriac, Coptic, and Gothic, into which languages the sacred text was translated between the second and fourth centuries; while in the works of the fathers, from the second century downwards, many quotations from the New Testament have been found and compared. And the result has been that while on the one hand scholars have become aware that the text of Erasmus and Stephens was in use in the Byzantine Church long before the tenth century; on the other hand, they have discovered *thousands* of readings which had escaped the notice of these editors. Providence has ordained for the New Testament more sources of the greatest antiquity than are possessed by all the old Greek literature put together. And of these, two manuscripts have for long been especially esteemed by Christian scholars, since, in addition to their great antiquity, they contain *very nearly* the whole of both the Old and New Testaments. Of these two, one is deposited in the Vatican, and the other in the British Museum. Within the last ten years a third has been added to the number, which was found at Mount Sinai, and is now at St. Petersburg."

I should occupy too much of your space by quoting, at length, Tischendorf's account of these Mss. Suffice it to say that the Vatican Codex is believed to be not older than the fourth century, the Alexandrine not more ancient than the fifth, and the Sinaitic also the fourth, that they are all more or less imperfect as compared with the Authorised Version, that the two latter contain Books or Epistles not to be found in this version, and that they all differ more or less in their readings. Where then are the originals? Echo answers—Where?

Much more might be written on this subject, but I will, for the present, conclude as I began, by saying that, if this untenable dogma of verbal inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures were once for all got rid of, the gate of "Free Religious Thought" would be permanently opened.

I am, SIR,

Yours faithfully,

Iota.

Truth and Repose.

GOD offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please—you can never have both. Between these, as a pendulum, man oscillates ever! He in whom the love of repose predominates, will accept the first creed, the first philosophy, the first political party he meets—most likely, his father's. He gets rest, commodity, *i.e.*, wealth and reputation; but he shuts the door upon truth. He in whom the love of truth predominates will keep himself aloof from all moorings and afloat. He will abstain from dogmatism and recognise all the opposite negations between which, as walls, his being is swung. He submits to the inconvenience of suspense and imperfect opinion, but he is a candidate for truth, as the other is not, and respects the highest law of his being.—*Emerson*.

Original Poetry.

"Light, Lord, more Light!" cried Goethe as he lay
Calmly awaiting the approach of Death—
Himself a Light, yet with his latest breath
Asking for light, light of a purer ray.
So we for "Light, more Light!" should ever pray;
Not merely live to grope about like moles,
But act as creatures having eyes and souls,
And seek a brighter intellectual day.
Oh! let us, then, we of the present age,
Strive to make mind triumphant over might,
To realise the wishes of the Sage,
And out of mental darkness call up Light.
Truth must shine forth, fell wrong, dark error fly,
If "Light, more Light!" be still our constant cry.

—D. T.

It is the offering up to God
The purest thoughts of mind,
The lifting up of Reason's veil,
Not letting her go blind:

Blind to the truths of this our day,
The land-marks of our ago—
Inspired by God in man's deep heart,
And writ on Nature's page :

Truths freed from Superstition's sway,
And from the damning knell
That tells of God's avenging wrath—
A never-ending Hell.

See, Earth yields up her boundless wealth,
Yon Stars their tale unfold,
And nightly speak of wondrous love
That never waxeth cold :

But bright and brighter ever shines,
And ever warmer grows,
And clasps us in its fond embrace
To still our heart's deep throes:

Throes fostered there by priestly craft
To keep us in its power;
At length we break the unholy spell,
And live in Heaven's own bower :

Heaven's bower surrounded by the flowers
Of God's own love and truth,
And where from age to age they'll bloom
In an eternal youth.

G. F. J.

Extracts.

So long as a belief in propositions is regarded as indispensable to salvation, the pursuit of truth *an such* is not possible. The sense of alarm and haste, the anxiety for personal safety, unmans the nature, and allows no thorough, calm thinking, no truly noble, disinterested feeling.—*Westminster Reviewer*.

We honour God before the Church; God's law in our hearts before any law in a book; a godlike man before an ungodlike priest. God, and virtue, and conscience are venerable primarily, in their own right. The Church, the Bible, the priest must prove themselves first to be God's Church, a true Bible, a virtuous priest, and then we will give them the secondary reverence they deserve from such relation. Just in *proportion*, and neither more nor less, that anything is united with God and goodness, in so far and no more, is it deserving of our reverence.—*F. P. Cobbe*.

He who would banish priests from the Church must first banish miracles from religion.—*Strauss*.

He who *cannot reason* is a fool; he who *dare not reason* is a coward; he who *will not reason* is a bigot; but he who *can and dare reason* is a man.—*Dods*.

We live in the midst of religious machinery. Many mechanics at piety, often apprentices and I slow to learn, are turning the various ecclesiastical mills, and the creak of the motion is thought "the voice of God." You put into the hopper a crowd of persons, young and old, and soon they are ground out into the common run of Christians, sacked up, and stowed away for safe keeping in the appropriate bins of the great ecclesiastical establishment, and labelled with their party names. You look about in what is drily called "the religious world." What a mass of machinery is there, of dead timber, not green trees! What a jar and discord of iron clattering upon iron! Action is of machinery, not of life, and it is green new life that you want.—*Theodore Parker*.

Editorial Notices.

IN consequence of the heavy demand upon the Editor's time by an unexpectedly large influx of inquiries and communications, most of them needing a written reply, he has been compelled to hold over his promised examination of the Bishop of Melbourne's lecture on Science and the Bible for No. 3. This arrangement, as it happens, secures a greater variety of matter in No. 2.

The Editor is unwilling to go to Press with his second number without congratulating the friends of Free Religious Inquiry, as he would modestly congratulate himself, on the large and influential circulation which, from the actual sale of copies as well as from the promises of support he has received from every direction, the A. F. R. P. seems destined to secure. Under these circumstances he feels himself justified in enlarging his Journal from 24 to 32 pages, feeling assured that the zeal of his friends will more than meet the additional outlay.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 126 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription : Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George street, Sydney, March 7, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 3. April 4, 1870.

Notes.

The speeches at the recent annual meeting of the Bible Society were, with one notable exception, singularly free from those absurd attacks on science and scientific men with which theologians of the present day are so apt to make themselves ridiculous. Indeed, to those who seem to think that a spice of invective is essential to earnestness in the cause of the Bible they must read somewhat tame. Ample amends, however, were made by the Rev. G. H. Moreton for any superabundant meekness on the part of his brethren. That excellent divine looks with alarm upon the progress of infidelity in this city, and hints that a course of lectures on Inspiration might prove an effectual antidote—a suggestion which, we fear, his brother ministers are too shrewd to adopt. He has "but too much reason to fear that infidel works were very commonly disseminated amongst us—a species of literature which, under the pretence of providing for free religious inquiry, was actively spreading the gross,

blasphemous and oft-refuted errors of Paine and other unbelievers—unhappy men who, in the other world, were doubtless now reaping the reward of their iniquity." Even Calvin himself would hardly venture in these days to burn a man alive for not believing in the Trinity; and his degenerate and halfhearted successors are now doomed to look on with impotent rage at the rapid emancipation of the human mind from the tyranny of priestcraft and superstition. "Lectures on Inspiration" and maledictions against unbelievers are sorry substitutes for the stake, the dungeon and the rack. What is to be done? We can only suggest to Mr. Moreton that, in accordance with a time-honoured device for the extinction of heresy, he should engage the common hangman to burn in front of his church, during the solemn tolling of the bell, a copy of the *Free Religions Press*. This plan would be quite as effectual for the suppression of free thought as any which Mr. Moreton is likely to devise, and it would certainly be more amusing. At all events no time should be lost, for the "Age of Reason" is rapidly approaching, when a sentence of future damnation by a Moreton upon a Huxley, or a Tyndall, or even a Paine, will be regarded by the indifferent as harmless theological buffoonery, and by the religious as impudent blasphemy. We have, of course, no intention of seriously remonstrating with a man who could utter such silly and atrocious sentiments as those we have quoted above; but we should like to put a question to some of the reverend gentlemen who were on the platform with him. Does it not occur to them that their characters as ministers of the Gospel are somewhat compromised by their recognition of one who openly sets at nought the teaching of his Divine Master and of that book which they were met specially to exalt? Why did not one of them cry out in the words of Christ, "Judge not, that ye be not judged?" or in the words of James, "Who art thou that judgest another?" or in the words of Paul, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." If some Voysey had stood up and thrown some doubt, say on the story of Jonah and the whale, or if he had impugned some barren or mischievous dogma, the whole colony would have rung with a prolonged clerical howl.

IN Mr. Alexander Gordon—fitfully discharging those very heavy guns of his through the columns of the complacent *Herald*—the Council of Education has, to say the least of it, a right plucky antagonist. This gentleman has evidently nailed his colours to the mast and resolved to fight while there's a stick standing. In the Council's action nothing is good. From Dan to Beersheba all is barren. He has made up his mind that no system of Education can be worth anything which does not take cognisance of, and provide for, the religious training (as he understands it) of the child; and as for reserving this religious training for the home circle or the Sunday-school, it is, reasons Mr. Gordon, as if you would give a child no salt six days of the week and an excess of it on the seventh—quite forgetting, in the ardour of attack and the supposed happiness of his illustration, that the flavour of devotion, like that of other luxuries, may be enhanced by less frequent indulgence. Enlarging on this sad deficiency of the existing system, Mr. Gordon goes on to affirm that "nine out of ten parents who value the religious training of their children cannot make use of the Public Schools." Our own impression is quite the other way. But conceding for the moment Mr. Gordon's assertion, the only inference we can arrive at is that certain parents will not accept a decided advantage because it is unaccompanied by some other advantage of a problematical character. Of course Mr. Gordon is at liberty to earn what laurels he may as the champion of these dissatisfied people, nor shall we further reflect on his gratuitous errantry than by advising him to brush up his logic and look out for worthier clients. Of one thing, at all events, Mr. Gordon ought by this time to feel well-assured—the *secular* education of the country is being well provided for. It is now for him to show us, briefly, distinctly, and with no misty phraseology, what may be his "adequate religious teaching," and how he would set about it, so as to embrace the religious affections of all classes, and unite them as firmly in one religious harmony and order as the Public Schools Act is uniting them in the great arena of science and intellect. Unless he can give us a measure equally comprehensive—a religious training that shall rouse our energies and engage our affections generally—so that while growing by the former teaching in knowledge, we grow by the latter teaching in virtue; unless he, or may be some other with larger grasp of mind and wider vision, do this, or something like it, it is folly (to use no harsher term) to be for ever carping at an existing benefit, and go peevishly maundering about some religious crotchet. Two little boys belonging to the Parramatta Roman Catholic Orphan School are convicted of unspeakably disgusting conduct at the dinner table, and receive—justly enough to our fancy, but to the great indignation, as it appears, of some people—a sound flogging. Suppose we substitute for these dirty urchins a pair of well-conducted lads who, for failing to work out the right answer to some problem in algebra to which they have honestly addressed themselves, should be placed by their teacher for a few seconds on a blazing fire! What a stir among the people would there be? What struggles to lynch the ruffianly teacher on his way to court? What an awful lecture from the judge in passing sentence? Yet, if the current creed of Christianity be true, a cruelty of this sort would be as nothing when compared with that of the God who is believed by the mass of Christians to consign good and upright men who, in the honest exercise of their reason are unable to believe as the Church would have them believe, to a pit of ever-lasting fire. How else are we to interpret the declaration which every decorous Churchman will make on Easter Sunday next: "He therefore that will be *saved*, *must thus think* of the Trinity?"

Does it not distinctly imply that exert ourselves as we may to solve this infallible mystery—or absurdity, which?—we must either arrive by some theological hocus-pocus at the Church's solution of it, or incur the displeasure of Heaven? There may be tenderness in the hearts of men for the dirtiest of little boys, and even for the blackest of mature sinners, but there can be no tenderness in the heart of God for honest sceptics who cannot *thus* think on abstruse doctrines which, by the confession of those who drew them up, are incomprehensible to the carnal mind, *i.e.*, to common sense. We are fully aware that this repulsively blasphemous view of the conditions on which men are to escape the "wrath to come" are practically disowned in the common affairs of life. Heresy is no longer a bar to love and marriage between Catholics and Protestants, between a Baptist and a Unitarian. We conduct our business transactions and contract the closest friendships without a shadow of misgiving as to whether the faith of our fellow-creatures is or is not of the *saving* kind. It is, however, none the less true that the Church still keeps the dogma of Salvation by Belief in her armoury of ecclesiastical weapons, ready to the hand of the bigot as often as he wishes to make his theological assault. In a word, it means either something or nothing. If something, then that something is a horrible cruelty on the part of God which more than justifies the crudest persecutions on the part of man. If nothing, why do Churchmen stoop to the conventional hypocrisy of solemnly repeating at stated times the lying declaration that there is no salvation for men who refuse to make a show of believing what their consciences compel them to repudiate? We pause for a reply.

A LECTURE was recently given at Newtown by the Rev. G. H. Holmes on "Some presumptive evidences of a Divine Revelation." If we are to trust the notice of it which appeared in the *Herald* on the following day, it took a theologico-metaphysical turn and abounded in startling aphorisms, so suggestive that it would be utterly impossible to do justice to more than one at a time. Let us take the following as a specimen. "Man," says the lecturer, "requires absolute certainty on religious matters; and this implies a revelation." Now, let us grant for the moment that the order of Nature is so capricious or malignant that the finger of God can only faintly be traced in it; let us assume that rival claims on the part of Mahomet, Zoroaster and Buddha have been satisfactorily disposed of, as well as all doubts about the authenticity and genuineness of any chapter or verse in the Bible. We now propose to apply a crucial test to the "certainty" theory. "Justification by faith only" is, according to the most orthodox Christian teachers, the sole condition of future happiness. Mr. Holmes will allow then that a more awful question than the following cannot be conceived: *Is the doctrine of Justification by Faith true, or is it not?* What does Revelation say? The Apostle Paul unequivocally and with characteristic energy answers in the affirmative. (Romans iii. and iv. also Galatians iii. 16). He denies any merit in good works, and quotes the case of Abraham as an instance of a man justified by faith only. The Apostle James (ii. 14-26) vehemently opposes and almost ridicules Paul's views. He says that the man who upholds justification by faith only is a "vain man," and maintains that Paul's conclusions concerning the justification of Abraham were quite erroneous. Does not the trumpet here give a somewhat uncertain sound, and that too in the most momentous crisis of the battle? And have not the teachers of the Christian flock differed more and more widely in each succeeding epoch, from the days of Paul and James to those of Dr. Cumming and Pius the Ninth? Nay, let us glance for a moment at a single section of the Church, that in whose communion John Wesley lived and died. Dr. Temple, Dr. Pusey and Dr. MacNeile are all prominent members of it. They profess to hold the same doctrines, to believe the same creeds, and to offer up the same prayers every day. Surely we might here expect to find some certainty and unanimity. Yet, what is the fact? Dr. Pusey says in effect that the elevation of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter is the admission of a wolf into Christ's fold; while Dr. MacNeile asserts that both Dr. Pusey and Dr. Temple are lepers; the former being the worse leper of the two, for he has a sound spot (hatred of rationalism) and may therefore deceive the unwary, while Dr. Temple being leprous all over, can impose upon no one. So much for the certainty we are likely to obtain from Revelation and its orthodox expositors.

"CAST-OFF Clothes for Australia!" We observed some time since an advertisement thus headed in a London newspaper, and were not a little amused at the idea of a consignment of old clothes from London, swarming with its tens of thousands of squalid paupers, to Australia, where such quantities of used-up wool and cotton are allowed to rot. An anomalous proceeding, it will be admitted; but not more so than that of the Australian statesman who obstinately clings to his old-world prejudices, though cognisant of the fact that Englishmen of the progressive stamp are resolutely casting them to the winds. Surely the spectacle of our old friend, the Flying Pieman, perambulating Sydney streets in the faded glories of a Belgravian livery suit, and beneath a gorgeously-craped hat, is hardly less absurd than that of legislators striving to force notions upon Society—as was the case in the New South Wales Upper House on occasion of the second reading of the Cemeteries' Bill—which are plainly opposed to the spirit of the time. For ourselves, we care little for the petty details of this Bill, and take our stand upon the general principle that our pitiful distinctions Wesleyan and Baptist, Catholic and Protestant, Gentile and Jew, ought not to be carried to a place where such differences should be absorbed in the solemn consciousness that the Departed have gone to a sphere of existence where *isms* are quite unknown.

Eighteen hundred years have elapsed since Paul told the Galatians that under Christianity "there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free," and sharply rebuked their punctilious observance of matters which were really of no consequence. Could the Apostle revisit our world, with what disgust—to select one out of our many stupidities—would he contemplate the ostentatious funeral show, the formal procession of melancholy cabs, the ghastly undertakerism, in a word, with which, clogging and disfiguring so simple an act as the burial of a kinsman or a friend, we convey our dead to the particular consecrated patch of soil which most strongly appeals to our sectarian proclivities. Just as if "the sod is not as holy before as it is after some miserable priest undertakes to mumble over it his benedictions. But the great evil of consecration is, that it is only another word for separation. It divides Christians; it outrages humanity; it falsifies scripture : 'The rich and the poor meet together in the grave; the Lord is the Maker of them all.' Yes, it answers, but he has not made them all Churchmen; so they shall not all lie down in the dust together. The rich and the poor *may* meet; but not the Churchman and the Dissenter. Can that institution be called either National or Christian which thus causes the intolerance of its distinctions and divisions beyond the limits of our mortal being, and asserts them in the face of that great teacher of universal charity, Death? Is it worthy to be called a Church at all? In some, at least, of its doings, and this amongst them, it has more resemblance to a whited sepulchre."

Science and the Bible.

AN important pamphlet—important both on account of the subject with which it deals and the source from which it emanates—has for some months past been before the Australian public in the shape of a lecture by Dr. Perry, Bishop of Melbourne, on Science and the Bible. We have heard this episcopal effort well spoken of by many, and eulogised by not a few, as a masterly defence of the popular notion as to the origin and authority of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures which expresses itself in the doctrine that certain men were, at divers times and in divers places, specially or, in plain words, super-naturally qualified to produce documents, which were destined to form a duly authenticated collection of sacred writings, and be at the service of mankind, to the end of time, as their sole infallible and therefore unerring standard of faith and doctrine. We perceive, too, that the newspapers, in their notices of Dr. Perry's lecture, have complacently piped to the same tune; extolling it not only as an unanswerable vindication of the popular belief in the Bible, but also as a masterpiece of severe logic from which the doughtiest septic might well shrink with fear and trembling. To ourselves we must say that this flattering estimate of Dr. Perry's lecture appears anything but just. We have given it our careful attention; but the only conclusion, after a close and candid scrutiny of its contents, we can come to is, that a more milk-and-watery, a more illogical, a more disingenuous defence of the dogma of biblical inspiration and infallibility was never sent to a printing office. The reasoning throughout is singularly weak and inconclusive, and at times strikingly puerile. Fallacy follows fallacy, and subterfuge subterfuge; while the boldness of the Bishop's assumptions is only equalled by his dexterity in evading the points upon which he and those who differ from him are really at issue. There is a fair sprinkling of cant, which, however, we might have passed over, but for the offensive manner in which it is hurled at the heads of eminent thinkers who will shine as stars in the intellectual firmament when every living bishop—Drs. Temple and Colenso alone, perhaps, excepted—will be comfortably housed in oblivion. In a word, let us say that this famous prelatial disquisition on Science and the Bible, of which so much has been eulogistically said and written, is, in our opinion the puniest *Vox et præterea nihil* that has been uttered, or is likely to be uttered, for some time.

We are willing, indeed, to confess that from our first glances at his lecture, we were tempted to expect better things from the Bishop. His candour, on entering the theological arena, is as refreshing as it was unexpected : a candour couched in such sensible avowals as that "a man is not to be regarded as a disbeliever of the Bible because he is a votary of Science," and that "when our object is to ascertain what Science says upon a particular point *we must listen only to its voice*" and that "in the investigation of truth we must always use our independent judgment," and that "what we can judge for ourselves, we ought not to accept on the authority of others." Alighting, as we did, on these and some other utterances pitched in the same key, it naturally occurred to us that we might be on the threshold of an inquiry, in the conduct of which the cramped and supercilious attitude of mind, unfortunately so common among ecclesiastics, was for once to be eschewed. Another glance or two, and never was expectation more suddenly demolished. For the Bishop, it seems, is, in the face of these brave confessions, unable "to entertain the idea of Science contradicting the Bible;" he has made up his mind "that any disagreement between them is impossible;" he is quite sure "that all questions relating to Science will eventually be settled without discredit to the Bible;" and earnestly counsels the humble believer, when the discrepancy between them becomes unusually glaring, "to accept it as a trial of his faith and patiently wait." Now, what is the gist of all this? Simply that Bishop Perry's logical faculty is, in common with that of the vast majority of professional divines, so dwarfed and enfeebled by the theological training to which it has been

submitted, as to invalidate its free and independent action on most fields of intellectual research. "It is mere hypocrisy," remarks F. W. Newman, and we quite agree with him, "to defer to a clergyman's authority in any theological question of first-rate importance." Why? For the reason that his head is full of certain foregone conclusions, which, on the assumption that they are heaven-descended and therefore unassailable truths, must be scornfully snatched from such tests as the natural reason and conscience of man may propose to apply to them, and be resolutely defended to the death. So with Dr. Perry. He believes that the Bible is an inspired book, and that, being inspired, it is absolutely free from errors of any kind. The Bible, he admits, was not intended by its Divine Author to teach science; yet he unhesitatingly avows that whatever the Bible says on any point of science must be true, because God, by whose Inspiration *all* scripture is given, cannot possibly lie. This, then, is the Bishop's assumption; the assumption—to use his own words—"that any disagreement between Science and the Bible is impossible;" but who does not see that to go to work in this fashion, is not only to beg the question at issue, but also to render any inquiry as to whether such disagreement is or is not the fact, a palpable waste of time. If any discrepancy between the teachings of Science and those of the Bible is an *a priori* impossibility, surely Dr. Perry might have saved himself the trouble of defending the proposition, *a posteriori*, with thirty-two octavo pages of solid long primer. No wonder that the obtuseness of the clerical mind is rapidly passing with us into a proverb!

From this major assumption anent the Bible as a whole, the Bishop readily slides into a number of minor ones relating to its doctrinal contents. "I have no more doubt" he says, "of the diurnal and annual motions of the earth, or of the monthly revolution of the moon, or of the leading facts of geology, than I have of the birth, life and death, the resurrection and ascension, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Let the reader note the address, nay, the unctuousness which underlies this statement. First, there is the assumption that Jesus actually left his grave, after having been placed there as a corpse, and was carried into the skies, and, accompanying it, a gracious intimation on the Bishop's part, that theologians and men of science should pay court to what may be considered the ascertained truths of their respective departments of investigation, and be the best of friends for the future. As for the assumption, Dr. Perry can hardly be ignorant of the fact that the "resurrection and ascension" of Jesus, and some other Christian dogmas of the same class, are in the present day regarded, by nine out of every ten scientific men, either as open questions about which the evidence is conflicting, or as incredible myths for the historic validity of which the proffered evidence is ridiculously insufficient. Let Dr. Perry hug them, if he will, to his heart's content; but not attempt to obtain popular credence for these dogmas—at least, if he would have his judgment carry weight with it—by adroitly classing them with such well-established truths of science as the diurnal and annual movements of the earth, and with which every schoolboy is expected to be familiar. As for the men of science, our impression is that they will meet the Bishop's proposal in much the same spirit as Æsop's foxes met that of their wily comrade, who, on losing his tail by some mishap, endeavoured to convince his vulpine brethren, that, for the sake of uniformity, they should seek surgical aid, and relinquish their brushes all round. Doubtless his lordship of Melbourne will remember the answer which a 'cute renard, speaking on behalf of the assembled company of foxes, returned on that memorable occasion; and we need not, therefore, quote it. It is an undoubted misfortune that a man should be disqualified—no matter by what set of influences—for the task of free and fearless, howbeit calm and reverent, inquiry into the deepest problems of human thought; but surely he is not justified thereby in attempting to place others in the same unwholesome fix.

We are not going to trudge after Dr. Perry, noticing all the points and phrases of his argument—if argument it may be called—in support of the thesis, that Science and the Bible are not and cannot possibly be at variance. Suffice it to say that he defends it by the formal enunciation of four, elaborately manipulated propositions, respecting which it will be necessary to say a word or two.

Proposition the first: "*That much of what is called Science, is nothing else but arbitrary and unphilosophical hypothesis.*" Granted. What could be more obvious? The reaches of the human mind, in its first attempts at deciphering and classifying the phenomena of the universe, are necessarily tentative and more or less misleading. Ages may, and in fact, do elapse before the materials required for the building up of a given system of knowledge are brought together by the assiduity of successive workers, and a true scientific generalisation becomes possible. Name what science you will,—chemistry, physiology, astronomy, geology,—and we can at once revert to a time when what are now regarded as its leading truths, were but dimly apprehended by the keenest observers, and when "arbitrary and unphilosophical" hypotheses were resorted to, one after another, as the sole available condition on which Nature might be tempted to yield up her secrets. Granted, then, to the Bishop's first proposition, we say. But what has this fact—the fact that more and more light dawns upon the world as it grows older and older—to do with the agreement or disagreement of the teachings of Science as a whole, with the teachings of the Bible as a whole? Just this: that the Science of to-day, waxing bolder and more inquisitive than ever, has opened up questions relating to the Origin and Nature of Man, which are confessedly linked with theories and speculations, which, as time rolls on, will have to be

revised or abandoned. No scientific man of eminence would think of pledging himself to the theory of Darwin as to the "Origin of Species" in all its details, or to that of the author of the "Vestiges," or to Professor Huxley's doctrine of "Protoplasm." That the researches of these eminent men clearly point to truths, which, however dimly seen at present, will eventually brighten forth, and revolutionise conceptions of the Creative Energy that are now deeply fixed in the popular mind, can hardly be doubted; it is, however, just as certain, that, as this consummation works itself out, the theories we have noticed will fling off one error after another, until cavillers like Dr. Perry will, in their nibbling search for objections, be left absolutely without pabulum, and compelled to surrender another story of the "structure in which the Hebrew and early Christian imagination found room and time for everything, earthly, devilish, and Divine." If the Bishop really wished to test the question as to the agreement or disagreement of Science with Scripture, why did he pass by the sciences of astronomy and geology,—not to mention others—where the discrepancy is glaring and insurmountable, and confine himself to speculations that are known to be anything but flawless? To quote Mr. Martineau, the true aspect of this Bible-and-Science controversy undoubtedly is, that the "Scriptures, in the presence of the Baconian logic, have merely encountered the inevitable fate of any inflexible *litera scripta* existing side by side with ever widening deductions The series of questions on which the conflict has been renewed in modern times between the closed Word and the opening Works of God is as long as the chain of inductive sciences themselves; and the result has been invariable,—the patience of nature overcoming the authoritative plea of miracle. Copernicus, in spite of the hierarchy, has cried with more effect than Joshua, 'Sun stand still!' Ships are daily chartered to those Antipodes which Lactantius declared to be impossible, and Augustine unscriptural, and Boniface of Metz, beyond the latitude of salvation. Witchcraft, so long preserved by the Mosaic Law among our list of crimes, has disappeared from every European code; and demoniacal possession in mania and epilepsy, though in the Gospels giving form to the miracles and evidence to the Messiahship of Christ, has been unable to hold its ground against the exorcism of the College of Physicians. The common parentage of the human race, already rendered distasteful by Prichard's suggested probability of a black Adam and Eve, has become an open question with the advance of ethnology, notwithstanding the dependence upon it of the whole scheme of ecclesiastic theology. The Tower of Babel faded into a myth as the affinity of languages was better understood. Egypt, so long measured by the patriarchal chronology, and cowed by the song of Moses and Miriam, has at last taken strange revenge upon her fugitives, by discrediting their traditions, and exposing the proofs of her dynasties and arts beyond the verge of their Flood, nay, prior to their Eden. The terrestrial cosmogony of Genesis, in spite of all the clamps and holdfasts of a perverted exegesis, has long been knocked to pieces by the geologic hammer. And now it would seem doubtful whether, even with regard to the specific types of organised beings, the idea of sudden creation may not have to be altogether relinquished in favour of a principle of gradual modification. . . . Everything has turned out grander in the reality than in the preconception: the heavens that open to the eye of a Herschel, the geologic time whose measures direct the calculations of a Lyell, the chain of living existence whose links are in the mind of a Hooker, Agassiz, or Darwin, infinitely transcend the universe of Psalmist's Song and Apocalyptic Vision. However obstinate the battle may seem to be on each of these particular points, as it arises, the combatants again and again fight out a peace at last:—why, indeed, should the theologian object to find the scene of Divine Agency larger, older, more teeming with life, than he had thought? But all these collisions have a significance far deeper than the special topic of each occasion. They are signs of a more fundamental conflict, whose essence remains when they are set at rest;—of a real, ultimate, irreducible *difference*, easily mistaken for *contradiction*, between the whole scientific and the whole religious mode of approaching and viewing the external world."

We invite Dr. Perry's attention to this eloquent account—would that he might "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" it—of what Science, notwithstanding the "arbitrary and unphilosophical hypothesis" it is often "nothing else than," has ultimately accomplished in the way of purifying and elevating the religious system of which his lordship is so distinguished a representative. For the rest, is he quite sure that much that is still called Revelation is anything else than unmistakeable error, which the same glorious science will eventually bury out of sight and mind?

Proposition the second: "*Science, although it sometimes has, for a while, appeared to contradict, and, in many instances, has necessitated modifications of the received text and interpretation, yet it has always borne not only negative, but upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, positive testimony to the truth of the Bible.*" In proffering this statement, Dr. Perry places himself in tolerably good company. For the late Professor Whewell, in his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, speaks, in much the same tone, of the necessity of bringing forward new interpretations of Scripture, to meet the discoveries of Science. "When," he asks, "should old interpretations be given up; what is the proper season for a religious and enlightened commentator to make a change in the current interpretation of sacred Scripture? At what period ought the established exposition of a passage to be given up, and a new mode of understanding the passage, such as it is, or seems to be, required by new discoveries respecting the laws of nature, accepted in its place?" But, divesting

these statements of their rhetoric, what do they really mean? When Dr. Perry affirms that science "has necessitated modifications of the received text and interpretation" of the Bible, and Dr. Whewell talks of the "proper season for a religious and enlightened commentator to make a change in the current interpretation" of the Bible, it is difficult to acquit either the Bishop or the Professor of deliberately sanctioning the mischievous principle that theologians and others may bend the simple and obvious meanings of the biblical writers to express what meanings they please, in order to preserve a *quasi* agreement between Scripture and the discoveries of Science. To what extent, and to what damage to the cause of religion and of our grand old Bible, ecclesiastics have carried this Jesuitical principle into practice, we need not here discuss. An instance or two, out of an available score or scores, will suffice. Time was, for example, when the greatest philosophers believed that sun, moon and stars were the mere servitors of our little earth, which they regarded as the centre of the universe. This doctrine, or one like it, commended itself to the minds of the biblical writers, and gives shape to their geographical and astronomical allusions as often as they occur. When, therefore, Copernicus started his counter theory, and Galileo and Kepler rendered it formidable by their demonstrations, the Church was right in declaring that Scripture was dead against these daring speculations. Yet, in spite of her ugly roar, the old and scriptural conception of the universe gradually fell through, leaving the new to take its place, and the Church to arrange matters as best she might. And what was her plan? What but to come the "religious and enlightened commentator," and maintain that Scripture instead of being opposed to, was really in accordance with, the new doctrine, and that Science, in displacing the geocentric theory by the heliocentric, had thrown no more light on the subject than was furnished by the Pentateuch or the Book of Job. The next roar of the Church was directed against those who dared to suggest that the earth might be somewhat older than she was registered in the ecclesiastical chronology, and that six thousand years, as geology has since indisputably proved, were as nothing in comparison with the immense period which had elapsed since the "earth was without form and void." But the Church was again equal to the emergency, and resorting to another "modification of the received interpretation," declared that the six creation-days referred to in Genesis, were not meant by the writer to signify common or literal days of twenty-four hours each, but immense stretches of time such as the geologist cannot do without; whereas "the manifest entire tenor"—to quote from Powell's Christianity without Judaism—"of the narrative in the first chapter of Genesis can only convey the idea of *one* grand creative act, of a common and *simultaneous* origin of the whole material world terrestrial and celestial, together with all its parts and appendages, as it now stands, accomplished in obedience to the Divine fiat, in a certain order, and by certain stages, in six equal successive periods, expressly designated as day and night, measured and determined by an evening and a morning, and necessarily (from the very nature and object of the whole representation) of the same length as the succeeding seventh natural day on which a peculiar blessing was pronounced." On the other hand, "the formation of the variously dispersed beds of diversified materials did not occur at one time, or even by any successive universal simultaneous acts, but by the gradual and local operation of the varied physical agencies, accompanied by corresponding series of changes in the forms and species of organised beings tenanted the earth and the water, each partially continuing during the rise and increase of the next; some more persistent, others dying out, as new forms were introduced, and this in a continuous succession from the earliest epochs, when none but forms now extinct prevailed, down to a time when those now existing, began to hold a joint dominion; while the period which is characterised as the most recent reaches to an infinitely higher antiquity than any contemplated by history or fable." So much, then, for what the truths of geology unequivocally prove, as opposed to what the Hebrew writer in his simplicity affirms; but which the modern orthodox divine, having a consecrated theory to serve, yet driven by Science into admissions which appear to falsify it, feels himself at liberty, nay, bound, to twist and colour, so as to make it mean anything or nothing. Theologians may, for all we care, take credit for their ingenuity in this matter; but what of their honesty? their straight-forwardness as men? their sense? "Well did Mr. Huxley observe at the late meeting of the British Association, that "theologians hang on to certain dogmas or doctrines till their fingers are burnt, and then, letting go, say it is of no importance, or was not meant in the sense they have been contending for." Good! Who but this eminent Professor could have picked out the eye of Bishop Perry's second proposition so?

Proposition the third : "*There is no reasonable cause for us to doubt that all recent discoveries, and the speculations to which they have led, will likewise issue in the confirmation of the truth and inspiration of the Bible.*" No reasonable cause to doubt, etc. Of course not! Why should there be? Theologians have only to stick to their false and dishonourable plan of falsifying the real and obvious meanings of the biblical writers, by squaring them down to any pattern they please, in order to make the task of reconciling scripture with science one of the easiest imaginable. It is but right, however, that they should know that their procedure in this matter is the veriest laughing-stock to the thoughtful as it will in time be universally treated with the contempt it deserves. The "recent discoveries" alluded to by Dr. Perry, in his third proposition, are those which have been brought to bear by Hooker, Wallace, Darwin and Huxley on the origin and antiquity of the human race; and we venture to affirm that should Science succeed in showing by incontestable evidence, that the first human beings

were barely an advance, mentally and physically, on the anthropoid apes, Dr. Perry and theologians of his order would at once make the discovery that the fact was strictly accordant with Scripture. The Jesuits!

Proposition the fourth: "*The evidence which we have the whole Bible being inspired of God, and therefore substantially true, is so conclusive, that we cannot conceive of any facts discovered by Science, or any theories grounded upon such facts, being able to invalidate it*" Rubbish! The evidence for the Inspiration of the Bible, as popularly held, so far from being conclusive, is glaringly, irreparably defective. It is, in fact, worthless. But let that pass. The Bishop, it seems, is *unable to conceive of any scientific discovery* which might militate against the essential harmony, as he considers it, of Science and the Bible; this being his way of intimating that every scientific discovery, as it turns up, shall be squared, by hook or by crook, with a supposed infallible Revelation. Really we have no patience with his lordship. It is too bad of him.

Such, then, are the four propositions which Dr. Perry advances in support of the thesis that Science and the Bible are essentially and indefeasibly consistent, and which, with an audacity that fairly staggers us, he thus propounds:

"What I now want to impress on your minds is, that neither the science of history nor that of language, neither the investigation of the archaeologist nor that of the geographical explorer, neither natural history nor natural philosophy, has convicted one of the sacred writers of any actual mistake. In the Bible there is found no such fabulous animal as the phoenix, referred to in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians; no such absurd reasoning as that of Plato for the immortality of the soul, no such contrariety with any trustworthy historian as Xenophon's *Cyropedia* exhibits to the narrative of Herodotus."

We doubt if a feebler or a falser utterance than this was ever worded. *In the Bible there is found no such fabulous animal as the phoenix.* Untrue. Let Dr. Perry turn to the Book Job (xxix 18), and he will find an indubitable reference to this imaginary bird; also a similar reference (iii. 8) to a celestial dragon which produced eclipses—for such was the current superstition—by occasionally swallowing the Sun and Moon. Again : *In the Bible there is found no such absurd reasoning as that of Plato for the immortality of the soul.* Let Dr. Perry take his Bible and turn to the well-known rhapsodical argument (I Cor. xv.) on this subject, which, however conclusive as to the intensity of Paul's belief in a risen and glorified Christ, and in a future state of existence as an inference from that belief, is incomparably inferior, as a piece of reasoning, to the Platonic argument for the immortality of the soul as set forth in the Phædon or the Apology; nor would we lose the opportunity of reminding his lordship of the now generally conceded fact that the Book of Ecclesiastes was actually composed in defence of the opposite and materialistic doctrine which pronounces future life an unwarrantable whim of the religious fancy. Once more : *In the Bible there is no such contrariety with any trustworthy historian as Xenophon's Cyropedia exhibits to the narrative of Herodotus.* We affirm, in reply, that such contrarieties are innumerable, and, more than this, that the discrepancies of statement between the authors named are matched and more than matched by the conflicting narratives of Kings and Chronicles, by the conflicting genealogical tables of Matthew and Luke, to say nothing of a host of minor instances which might be rapidly named. As for Dr. Perry's assertion "that neither the science of history nor that of language, neither the investigation of the archaeologist nor that of the geographical explorer, neither natural history nor natural philosophy, has convicted one of the sacred writers of an actual mistake,"—it exhibits, as we have said, an astounding audacity which nothing but the crassest ignorance or the most lamblike docility could save from an indignant disclaimer. Has, then, neither science nor history anything to say in disproof of the creation of the world in six days? of the descent of mankind from a single and in all respects perfect human pair, who were beguiled of their innocence by a devil-possessed serpent? of the cohabiting of the sons of God (Gen. vi. 1) with the daughters of men, or of the giants and mighty heroes (Gen. vi. 4) who were the fruit of this humano-celestial connection? of the longevity of the Patriarchs? of a flood which, in the time of Noah, overspread the earth, covering the tops of the highest mountains, and destroying all vestiges of human and animal life but the members of Noah's family and the creatures he took with him into the ark? or again, of the confusion of tongues and consequent dispersion of peoples, with which the attempt of Noah's descendants to build a heaven-reaching tower was miraculously foiled? Is there any historical or scientific warranty for the fact that the Nile, at the command of Moses, was turned into blood? that a stick, at the prayer of Aaron, was converted into a savage reptile? that the calamities which fell, one after another, at the command of Moses, upon the people of Egypt, were anything but purely natural phenomena which the Biblical account has grossly exaggerated? or that a reach of the ocean was divided by a clear passageway for the accommodation of a host of fugitive Jews, who were then conducted, under the special guidance of the Deity, to the borders of their "Promised Land," the main river of which, on feeling the touch of priestly feet (Joshua iii. 17) instantly followed the example of the Red Sea, and the main city of which—a strongly fortified city—was in a moment reduced, by the blowing of some trumpets, (Joshua vi. 20) to a heap of rubbish? Are we to throw reason, probability, and science itself to the winds, and make a show of believing that the sun stood still at the request of a blood-thirsty soldier, or that the same luminary receded ten degrees along the ecliptic (2 Kings xx. 9) to satisfy a weak-minded monarch that his illness would

not be a fatal one? Are we to swallow without protest such outrageous absurdities as that an ass carried on a conversation with his rider? or that the Hebrew Hercules after killing a small army with the jawbone of the same quadruped, obtained a supply of fresh water from its interior reservoirs? or that a corpse, on being dropped into a grave where a prophet had been interred (2 Kings xiii. 21) immediately started into life? or that three men went into a fiercely-heated furnace and, after a considerable stay there, came out uninjured? or that a man spent three days and three nights in the bowels of a sea-monster, and was then vomited, handy to some shore, *in statu quo*? or that five thousand people were fed and filled from a stock of food that was about sufficient for an ordinary family, and that the quantity left was vastly in excess of the original stock? or that people suffering from acute nervous disorders were possessed with devils which could be transferred from the bodies of human beings to the bodies of pigs? But enough of this. Dr. Perry affirms that science has not convicted one of the biblical writers of an actual mistake. Astonished at his boldness, we tell him, in reply, that while actual mistakes in the Bible—mistakes as to matters of fact, of history, and of science—are, at least, as numerous as its chapters, the whole tenor of the Book is irreconcilably opposed to those conceptions of unswerving law and order with which *our* ideas of God, and the Universe as the vestment wherewith he clothes himself, are inseparably linked. In reading Herodotus or Livy, we have no difficulty in discriminating what is likely to be true from what, as being tinged with the miraculous, is certain to be more or less adulterated with error. In reading the Koran or the Zenda Vesta we unhesitatingly fall back upon, and make use of, the same principle. Why, then, in reading our own sacred literature, should we contend for the truth of narratives which, both on historical and scientific grounds, are every bit as incredible as any that may be culled from the histories of Greece and Rome?

As for a scientific theory of Nature, the author of Job, alone among the biblical writers, attempts to propound one: with what result? "A severe monotheism," remarks Dr. Davidson, "shuts up man within the continual thought of his powerlessness, excluding metaphysical speculation, and consequently all approach to a refined theology. God is presented in this poem as the Creator and universal Agent animating all beings with his breath and producing at once all the phenomena of nature. Angels form his court around him, pure and holy; among whom, however, an accuser sometimes appears. Semitic meteorology is conditioned and determined by the same rigid monotheism. The clouds and space above them are the habitation and special domain of God, who governs everything thence. There are the reservoirs; his arsenals, pavilions. Thence he fetches storms, making them his messengers in dealing out retribution. Thunder is always viewed as a *theophany*, marking the descent of God to earth. The noise of it is his voice. Lightning is his light; and the electric flame the arrows hurled from his hand. In all this there is no trace of the great idea expressed by *laws of nature*—the basis of modern philosophy." We call attention to these remarks, as they very closely bear upon the point at issue between those who, while admitting the surpassing worth of the Bible, as a collection of soul-stirring literature handed down to us from ancient times, can see no reason for exempting it from the application of principles of interpretation which, in the case of similar literary works, are always employed for the winnowing of the wheat of truth from the chaff of error, and those who, on the assumption that the Bible is literally the "Word of God," and therefore faultlessly pure and true, recoil, with something like a shock, from the notion, that there are errors of any kind to be detected. For as the Bible is a collection of writings, extending, chronologically speaking, over more than a thousand years, another two thousand years having elapsed since the composition of the latest of them, how, in the name of common sense, should we expect to find an agreement between such scientific information as belonged to Moses, or Solomon, or Paul, and that at the disposal of the British Association or the Royal Society? The proposition is simply monstrous. It is like saying that the lapse of three thousand years has taught us nothing; and that all the great Apostles of Science, having lived to no purpose, might, instead of distracting their poor heads as they did, have comfortably buried them in their nightcaps! A proverb says, that "an ounce of mother-wit is worth a *pound* of Clergy;" or a *ton* of the article—which?

In bringing our remarks to a close, it may not be out of place—following Dr. Perry's example—to offer a word or two of advice for the benefit of such as they may concern. His lordship affectionately counsels the "anxious inquirer" whose faith has been shaken or disturbed by the sceptical tendencies of modern thought to "acquaint himself with the evidences, external and internal, for the truth and inspiration of the Bible;" to read Birks (who's Birks?), Bishop M'Ilvaine, (another nobody), Whately, and some other writers on the *one* side of the question, whose opinions are generally counted unto them as nothing or less than nothing; to "read constantly, day by day, the Bible itself," and, by so doing to arm himself "against all the wiles of the devil," *i.e.*, the advancing strides of modern religious thought; and, finally, to crush the rising doubt, or, if unusually formidable, to regard it as "intended to try his faith." For ourselves, we counsel the anxious inquirer to reject this advice as an attack on the integrity of his mind and conscience. We counsel him to love and revere Truth in itself as infinitely grander than the purest doctrinal phase of truth, and to remember that a professed opinion, which reason and the conscience belie, and is held to merely in deference to the social or theological fashion of

the day, is a black—perhaps, as Jesus teaches, an unpardonable—offence in the sight of God. We counsel him, in a word, to trust his own soul, and to treat the man—were he a thousand bishops rolled into one—who would deride or deny its sacred and supreme authority, as a babbler to be shunned.

But we have also a word of advice for Dr. Perry himself. He tells us that he is an old man, and speaks of the "privilege" which is usually accorded to Age in the delivery, for the benefit of younger minds, of its accumulated experience. Admitted. We respect age; we can even sympathise with one who, like Dr. Perry, has devoted his life to the propagation of a creed, which, in his declining years, the progressive thought of society appears to threaten. It is to be regretted, however, that the Bishop should, in the exercise of his 'old man's privilege," have deemed it necessary to speak of some of the foremost of living men in terms which are greatly to his discredit. What does he mean by speaking of Mr. Huxley, and others, as men "whose object it is to propagate *infidelity*," as "adversaries of the Bible who would, if possible, make all men *unbelievers* like themselves," and as "fools" to whom "God sends strong delusion that they should believe a lie?" Old as he is, we trust Dr. Perry will live to see the folly, and repent of the injustice, of these silly allusions.

In conclusion, we wish to say that our admiration, awe, and our reverence, for the Bible, considered as an inestimable collection of grand religious utterances, interwoven with touching and heroic phases of human experience, which will thrill the soul of humanity to the end of time, are as intense as those feelings possibly can be. We prize the brave old Volume for the depth of its devout trusts, the purity of its pious aspirations, the godly memories of which it is the record, and for that record especially which tells of the glorious young man who, by the waters of Galilee, or among the hills about Jerusalem, propounded a faith in the one ever-living and all-loving God, which, in spite of the corruptions it has undergone, is with us to-day in its ever-freshening purity; and who, mighty-souled youth that he was, did not hesitate to seal that faith with his dear blood. Precious, however, as is the Bible to us, it ranks below the human Reason and Conscience, of which it is the product, and to the tribunal of which it must be brought for the determination of its real place among the educational agencies by which the destiny of the human race is being worked out. Thus judged, the Bible contains much in sentiment, in motive, in doctrine from which the heart of man instinctively recoils; intuitively condemns : much also in relation to matters of history, matters of science, matters of philosophy, which the mind of man unhesitatingly pronounces untrue. Is it infidelity to recognise this fact? Is it unbelief to act upon it? Then pray we, and that most earnestly, that Infidelity and Unbelief—twin pillars of the world's salvation—may seize upon the heart of Christendom, and rouse it to a new and more vigorous life.

J. P.

The Godless.

A GENERATION has passed away since the Reform Bill became law. A reference to some events which were the immediate offspring of this great measure may supply us with a little daylight by which we may arrive at a more correct estimate of the antics of our Ritualistic and Puseyite parsonry, and show what Puseyism really is in contrast to what it appears to be, and what it hypocritically pretends to be. At the same time, we purpose paying our respects to those gentlemen, reverend and lay, catholic and protestant, who perpetrate longwinded letters in the papers with the view of extinguishing, what they are pleased to style "godless education." We associate the ritualists and the antagonists of "the godless," because they are all of them tarred with the same brush—purpose to compass the same ends by similar means, and are all of them, without exception, nothing more nor less than wholesale dealers in unmitigated pretence.

Very often the papers treat us to a paragraph apprising us that on a certain Sabbath the Rev. Mr. Blank, of Blanktown, comported himself to the great indignation of his congregation—bowing here—scraping there—jumping Jim Crow in a corner—now exhibiting choice and unexceptionable millinery, and finally throwing a light upon the whole performance by the radiance of candle something thicker than his leg. Again, the papers let us know that the Right Reverend Bishop Bunkum, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Greenhorn, has been astonishing the natives and everybody else, at Softtown, by doing Noodle and Doodle to the same ritualistic tune that the Rev. Mr. Blank discoursed so sweetly to his astonished flock at Blanktown, a few days before.

With these ridiculous exhibitions the public, very generally, are fairly taken aback. They are surprised that the Church of England should have produced anything so monstrous, and still more astonished at the symptoms of weakness that the Church betrays in her inability to eliminate the evil that is at once her disgrace and bane. To do the Church justice, however, it must be admitted, that the majority of the clergy are opposed to the innovation tooth and nail. They know the nature of the nuisance, and regarding it as a genuine upas, have made many attempts to uproot it, but hitherto without success. Outside the church, however, the public estimate ritualism as a religious craze, and wash their hands of it altogether by abandoning its unfortunate victims to find their way either to heaven or to Tarban as the ease may be. But this is a grand mistake, and it will be our

business to show that there is no more religion in ritualism than there is milk in a male tiger.

Mr. Brougham's impertinent inquiry into the way in which the trustees of sundry charitable and school institutions were discharging their duties, led to the exposure of incredible dishonesty on the part of the clergy. The public were robbed right and left; the large pay set apart for the purposes of education being appropriated by clergymen, whose consciences allowed them to pocket the pay of the schoolmaster, whilst they, at the same time, shirked his irksome duties. One highly principled gentleman had for years received twelve hundred per annum, without so much as a single scholar to serve as a poor apology for the plunder. Another, with eight hundred a year had the grace to have at least one scholar, but that scholar, was his own son. But these and a hundred other instances of clerical misappropriation are duly recorded in the chronicles of the times to which we need not more particularly refer. Suffice it to say, that the reverend brethren of the plunderers were abominably shocked and annoyed; not, however, by the plunderers, but by those who sacriliciously spoil their little game. If such impertinence as this were to be tolerated where would it end? But they were doomed, with but a brief interval, to still further annoyance, and from a similar cause, namely, the popular determination to recover their long-lost rights. Their first disgust was scarcely digested when it was succeeded by another of still more formidable proportions, namely, the Reform Bill; and then their cup of tribulation was full to overflowing. Tooth and nail did they oppose this measure. Immense was the hole and comer business that they carried on, and unnumbered were the lying petitions concocted with the view of thwarting the popular will. But all was in vain, Revolution had clearly set in. The Church was in danger! What was to be done? This rattling amongst the dry bones was not to be endured. If the swinish multitude imagined that they had souls of their own (and such a sentiment was unmistakeably indicated in the universal and emphatic cry for reform), they were to be undeceived. They must be taught that the Church was everything—themselves nothing and something less; and for this ridiculously vain purpose have a few imbeciles zealously set themselves to work to whistle back the birds that have escaped their nets. With this purpose in view they have Romanised the services of the Church of England where they had the chance, and have boldly taught the beauty and desirableness of a blind and unquestioning obedience to Church and State. Thus ritualism in its origin was plainly nothing more than a political dodge, kindred to that of the antigodless educationalists; and they, believing that ignorance is the mother of devotion, have determined to secure devotees as ignorant as need be, with the view of retaining their spiritual hold upon the poor ignoramuses.

The education provided by the State is objected to because it is godless. Believe the objectors, and the quality of the education that they would dispense, had they but the chance, would be vastly superior to the authorised article. But pardon us, gentlemen, if we decline to extend a ready credence to the vaunted superiority of your teachings. The educational feats of the church to which many of you belong are chronicled in blood, and in characters that will be legible, to the horror of mankind, till time shall be no more. We know, as well as you do, that you are bound to teach whatever the Church has taught, however execrable that may be. What novelties dare you venture in regard to dogma? The dogmas of the Church bear the Vatican stamp "*semper eadem*:" we therefore gather with certainty what the present teachings are from what has gone before; and a precious teaching it is: worthy at the very best of the detestation and execration of mankind.

A liberal age has extended to the lay catholic the benefit of the saying "*tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis*," and so far as it relates to our catholic acquaintance it is true enough. My very good catholic neighbour Smith has, I am sure, no more idea of roasting me than I have of discharging the same friendly office to him. But we are talking about teaching, and we know that the catholic objectors to "the godless" are bound to teach what the Church has always taught, teaches now, and always will teach, namely, the right and the duty of the Church to annihilate the heresy and the heretic together by roasting the latter alive.

And now let us see what the Church has been teaching for ages, and what are the felicitous results of that teaching on the taught. There was no godless education, it is worth while to remember, in either Italy or Spain. Difference of opinion was not tolerated in those blessed countries where the Church was all-powerful. Freedom of thought was stamped out there by the iron heel of oppression in blood and flames. It was easier to dispose of the objector than to answer his objections, and not the ghost of a scruple stood in the way of issuing the fatal *mittimus* that sent both him and his objections out of this world into the next. The Church had it all its own way, without let or hindrance, and what did it teach?

"Honour all men," is a Christian command; but the Church that criticises and condemns our teachings, now teaches, and has always taught, that the way to honour man is to make a bonfire of him. The advent of Christ and Christianity was triumphantly heralded as the earnest of high heaven's kindly intentions to mankind. It was the guarantee of "Peace and Goodwill to man." Hut the peace of the Church is a very different affair to the peace of God. The peace of the Church implies wholesale death to mankind, and the earth has already been soaked to saturation with the blood of its inhabitants inhumanly spilt by the Church in the name of the Lord. In one respect, however, the peace of God and the peace of the Church are alike. The former "passeth all understanding," and if any of our readers can understand how it was that such inhumanity was for a moment

tolerated, we will cheerfully yield to him the palm of intelligence.

History has many a cruel page that excites our horror, and extorts our tears; but the accumulated atrocities of a cruel world are reduced to a bagatelle when contrasted with the wholesale slaughter of this merciless Church.

Such were, such are, such always will be the teachers; and now what of the taught? What are Italians now? The foremost of mankind when Pagan, now, the very last on the roll of civilised and Christian nations—an ignorant, vile, immoral, cutthroat generation. Or if there be another people to dispute her pre-eminence in infamy, it is one that, like herself, has ever played reptile to the Church, offering her the homage of a senseless, unquestioning allegiance.

Let any one read Mr. Moss's recent publication touching his capture and detention by bandits in Italy only two or three years ago, and he will find that there is an utter unconsciousness amongst the lower strata of the Italian community, of anything seriously wrong in going out for the express purpose of robbing and, if need be, of murdering the unoffending traveller, whoever he may be. Indeed, they talk of it with the same nonchalance as their brother cut-throats of the Malayan archipelago discuss the question of piracy. If they are caught they suffer as a matter-of-course, and there is an end of it; but what it has to do with religion they cannot imagine. "Do they not say their prayers, and manœuvre their beads with exemplary assiduity? Are they not true sons of the Church? Do they not swear by the pope, and are they not ready at all times and at all seasons to defend the Church against all comers?" Not a doubt of it; and equally certain it is, that every cut-throat expedition can and does secure the services of some pious priest to sanctify the murder and to share the chivalrously-won plunder.

These, these are the glorious results not of a godless education, but of an education prescribed by the Church without let or hindrance, or opposition of any kind, the Church having, as we have said before, disposed of all opposition in its own peculiarly amiable way. We will not dwell upon the horrible picture of innocent people burnt to cinders, but we may ask what sort of a community could it be that permitted the Inquisition, with all its horrors, to initiate and mature in its midst, without opposing to it so much as even a weak remonstrance? Remonstrance! Why, such a thing was never thought of. On the contrary, the mob could not only stand by and contemplate the horrid scene unmoved, could not only maintain their equanimity—felt not the slightest temptation to throw the officiating priests into the flames after their victims; but, in the distortions of the agonised sufferers, could find the apology for unbounded fun and uproarious merriment. The demons!

The fires of the Inquisition, it is true, burn no longer; and we should willingly accept the fact as an indication of a more pacific feeling on the part of the Church if we could; but we can do nothing of the sort. The potent threat of Oliver Cromwell was effectual in arresting the persecutions and burnings of the Protestant Waldenses by their Catholic ruler, the Duke of Savoy; and the execrations of outside humanity may have taught the Church the possibility of an undignified knuckling down to Protestant commination, were these atrocities continued much longer. As to any improvement in the Church of a pacific tendency, the recent blasphemous importations from the (Ecumenical Council are decisive on that point. The same growl and the same roar indicate the same ferocity as ever; but just now, thank heaven, it is associated with so much impotence as to be entitled to no more consideration than is usually extended to a howling idiot or a braying jackass.

The godless education of the day, we are told, will inevitably issue in atheism; just as if the Church itself did not supply the atheist with the most efficient shaft in his whole quiver—the most destructive ammunition in all his arsenal. Suppose we were under the miserable necessity of disposing, one way or the other, of this alternative, which the atheist may not unfairly submit: "Either believe that there is no God, or believe that he sympathises with the atrocities of the Church of Home in the slaughter of heretics." We sincerely believe in the existence of the Deity; but still we should prefer the former branch of the alternative, and, certainly, if we must subscribe, will underwrite it in preference to stultifying ourselves by admitting for a moment the possibility of anything so derogatory to "our father which is in heaven," as is implied in the latter portion of the *utrum horum*. Annihilation, ten to one, before heaven under the autocracy of such a monster!

Rampant in France, as in Italy and Spain and Portugal, the Church of Rome, till toward the latter end of the last century, tolerated no rival faith in France, and cleared it of heretics by the same process that had been effectual for that purpose elsewhere. So that when revolutionised France had to choose between Rome and atheism, the latter was almost universally preferred, insomuch that when Hume, dining at Paris with Baron D'Olbach, casually remarked that he had never seen an atheist, was assured by his entertainer that he then had the honor of dining with seventeen.

But let us now turn to another field of the Church militant's operations, where her horn has been exalted to her soul's content. Her laurels here, as elsewhere, have been won through blood and flame: let her felicitate herself on their acquisition if she can. We can contemplate her accumulated honour with equanimity and entertain not the slightest apprehension that by so doing we shall burst with envy. "God made man upright," but the Church, under the impression that he was much more manageable in the quadrupedal form, has brought him down on all fours, and now, educated under the auspices of the Church, with none of your godless pabulum,

ecce homo!"—behold the man—a sneaking, contemptible reptile. A devoted son of the Church, he believes what the Church believes, and the Church believes what he believes, but what they both believe he knows no more than the post to which the poor Jew is fastened preparatory to his immolation, and to whom we beg to introduce the reader.

Moses is a Jew. He is about to be reduced to a cinder, because, by no fault of his, he happens to be one of God's chosen people. We need not say more plainly than we have said, that we are now in Spain, in a land of as good Christians as the Church can boast. They believe the Bible, and therefore must believe that Moses is one of that race that commanded the preference of the Almighty. Nevertheless for the good of his soul the Church is about to burn his body. And now we claim the reader's attention to the evidence of the brutalising effect of the education dispensed amongst a Catholic community composed of the most humble servants of the Church.

The last moments of Moses are rapidly approaching. The spectators are uneasy, impatient and excited, and from a thousand throats ascends the self-same cry, "*Sta fa Mosé!*" The wretches are afraid that Moses will recant, and thus cheat them of the ineffable pleasure of seeing a human being burnt to death. "*Sta fa Mosé!*" Your shrieks will be sweeter music to our refined ears than the choicest music of the opera, and your agonised writhing will afford us more genuine merriment than the efforts of the most accomplished buffo. "*Sta fa Mosé!*" Burn, my good fellow! burn, like a man, and do not, on any consideration, be so unreasonable as to cheat us out of our holiday. These, these, are the choice specimens resulting from an education that is not godless: let the Church be proud of them if it knows how. And this is an "*Auto da fé*," too, an act of faith. A precious faith it must be truly. But we have gone far enough in this direction. The atmosphere is becoming suffocating. Surely we must be approaching the meridian of the infernal regions: let us turn, then, to notice the operations of another state-paid institution.

The clergy of the Church of England rarely trouble themselves relative to the education of the people: never, indeed, unless some rival system suggests the expediency of some little exertion in opposition. When the quaker Lancaster, aided by his friends, first floated the Lancasterian system, the clergy merely laughed at it as the nostrum of some restless imbecile; but when it rapidly grew into respectable proportions, and was extensively patronised by members of their own flock, it became worthy of opposition, and accordingly Mr. Bell and Bell's system appeared with all the patronage that the Church could command in its favour, in rivalry to the Quaker and his system. The progress of education amongst the people is due principally to exertions outside the Church. The commencement of the present century found the working classes and the peasantry of England very little better than a mob of ignorant clodhoppers. The howling idiots that pulled down Dr. Priestley's house, destroying his library and choice philosophical apparatus, and forcing him to find a grave in another country, were a fair specimen of England's lower orders at that time. Not one in a hundred was able to read, but they were, nevertheless, devoted members of the Church, and that virtue, like charity, covered a multitude of sins. Church and State was their war cry, and under its influence they expelled from house and home and country one of the most celebrated men of the day to the eternal disgrace of the country that had the honour of his birth.

But the Church of England agrees with her mother in denouncing the national school system as "godless," and therefore is she opposed to it, which merely means that state-paid churches are opposed to the education of the people in any form. Ignorance is the mother of devotion, and the best friend, therefore, of state-paid churches. And truly they are wise in their day and generation. The absurdities that disgrace the modern pulpit are doomed to be laughed at by the matured pupils of the national schools, and we confess that we are not indisposed to join in the cachinnation. It will not do for Dean Cowper to tell them much longer that Science confirms the cosmogony of the Book of Genesis, or they will most assuredly take the liberty of thinking the old gentleman's assurance is only exceeded by his ignorance. And when the clergy venture to explain, with the view of making the cock-and-bull affair at all intelligible, that by a day we must understand an age, a million years perhaps, we hold our sides under the pressure of the absurdity suggested relative to the Maker of all things resting for a million years. What a nap! Shade of Rip Van Winkel, hide your diminished head! The parson has fairly cut you out, and has become the first favourite of the popped god.

That an Omnipotent, Eternal God, should require rest at all, is a joke of very respectable dimensions; but there is, nevertheless, something suggestive in his possible long sleep that may be of service to us in this discussion. Perhaps this will account for the long-continued affliction of the world under a rampant and sanguinary Church. That the thunderbolts of offended Heaven should not long ago have terminated its mild career has been a difficulty with us for some time past; but thanks to the Dean, he contributes a little daylight which helps to a solution of the difficulty.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the offspring of the Church of Home, and was one of the choice morceaux which the Church of England brought with her on quitting her venerable parent. As if this doctrine was not already sufficiently absurd, the Jesuitical supporters of the Pope in connection with the (Ecumenical Council have succeeded in making it still more so if possible: but, at any rate, they have afforded us the pleasure of

contemplating a trinitarian novelty; and perhaps those who experienced no difficulty with the old doctrine will be equally facile with the new. We extract from the London *Times*, and can assure our readers that they will find it a pill of no ordinary manipulation.

"He (the Pope) wishes to be held the sole depositary of the words of eternal truth," and the Ultramontane papers devoted to him blasphemously described him as "the Son of God," adding that "when the Pope thinks it is God who thinks in him." And further, "the Church of God," they say, "is made in the semblance of the Holy Trinity. As the Father begot the Son, and from Father and Son proceeds the Holy Ghost, so the Pope begets the Bishops, and from the Pope and Bishops proceeds the Holy Ghost."

The Holy Ghost is God; so then it amounts to this, that God made man in the first place, and now man (that is if the Pope and his bishops are men), returns the compliment by making his maker. When and where will these pitiable fooleries end?

But monstrous as these profanely absurd doctrines are, they are associated with another absurdity of equal calibre, namely, the invocation of the power of the Church to force them down the unwilling throats of outside unbelievers, and by the old method of persecution, where that can be safely ventured. But the days of persecution on the score of religion are numbered. Persecution for religious opinion is clearly as foolish as it is wicked, and the persecuting aspect recently assumed by Rome only serves to show the low intellectual stature of the Head of the Church and his Jesuitical prompters. It may be clearly and readily shown that belief is not dependent on the will. We cannot believe if we would when the evidence forbids any such conclusion, nor can we resist believing when the evidence excludes all possible doubt. But the progress of education will determine these questions in spite of the Holy Father and the (Ecumenical Council, an aggregation of intellectual General Tom Thumbs with the Pope as generalissimo of the Lilliputian host. Libra.

Correspondence.

The Robinson-Irby Squabble.

To the Editor.

SIR,—It would have been a novel feature half a century ago for Bishops to be found periodically appealing to those whom they are pleased to style their "dear brethren in Christ." The lay mind has scarcely yet become accustomed to this strain of episcopal effusion, and feels itself somewhat in the light of that member of a family who, from the position of a mere cipher, suddenly rises by some freak of fortune into influence and consideration.

In dealing with the laity of the present age Bishops have a double part to play—and to the best of their ability they play it. A too open cajolery is not to be thought of, engendering, as it would, suspicion and consequent disgust. The modern course of policy is that the many shall be made to fancy they have an interest in what is after all at the beck of a few; that the many shall be little more than puppets, and be pulled with strings equally minute and disguised. The parochial meeting, the public platform, the fussy synod, are all meant to be, as it were, permissive outlets for the furtherance of an Establishment that has never been over nice about, the instruments it makes use of to secure either pelf or worldly position. While it makes use of the laity by virtue of necessity, the Church of England accords that laity only such minimum of power as previous slight renders perhaps more by contrast. But what it dreads above all is that this struggling Hercules of modern growth should once become conscious of its native strength, burst the serpentine coils that have so long shackled it, and free itself once more *and for aye* of those who, very Laodiceans in word and deed, are prominent as the great impellers of religion and her beneficial action.

His Reverence of Grafton and Armidale is in trouble, and has been giving us some "few words" through the public Press. He is scarcely got into his diocese, and had time to look about him, ere he is charged with being a ritualist, and with being unwilling to show it. Now a public accusation like this may try even a bishop's patience, and while we are scarcely surprised that he should rush into print, we confess ourselves somewhat "at sea" as to the upshot of his explanation.

With all the little ins and outs between Mr. Robinson and Mr. Irby we have nothing to do. It is immaterial to us if and little soreness exists between these two gentlemen, or whether circumstances are more or less coloured than fairness will altogether warrant. The two points to be kept in view are, first, Mr. Irby's charging the Bishop with ritualistic tendencies, and secondly, how far the Bishop's disclaimer (if it amount to as much,) is satisfactory to the public mind.

Now Ritualism is a many-headed beast, and when people speak of it, its features are often portrayed in a kind of misty outline that the warmer or cooler imagination of the human mind is wont to fill in with divers colours. It is difficult in fact to describe what is itself a nondescript. But with all this difference of classification, it is apt to possess certain marks, which, how varying soever under different temperaments, are at once easily detected by a moment's steady examination. As a bone served Professor Owen to discriminate between long-forgotten types of animal creation, so does this religious emanation of the present, day present some outline sufficiently distinctive of its origin. And what are some of the marks? What else than a watery kind of religious sentimentality, more frequently heard in the pulpit than, happily, elsewhere. There it becomes a safe screen for shallow intellect, and a very poor substitute for more worthy matter. The words come soft and tripping off the tongue, and are accompanied with a demeanour which the generality of hearers are too good natured to criticise with severity. And so the farce goes on, to our no small wonderment that I hey who would occupy a position of respect, should so expose themselves to ridicule. When chance brings us within range of this emasculate devotion, while we regret our mishap in having to notice it, we make the best of our bad bargain, and we study the man. We notice his exceeding correctness of outline, his prim and dainty bearing, his lisping diction and falsetto delivery, sufficient for the moment to take your very breath away, and to put all sober and severer judgment to the rout. On our recovery, however, we ask ourselves—What does it all mean? Why these genuflexions, these crossings, these bowings and changes of position? Why such a studied propriety of demeanour, such affectation, such vulpine watchfulness for mute approval? If a more-than-ordinary manifestation is sometimes exhibited—such as the Rev. Mr. Robinson is charged with in the celebration of the Eucharist—it is so much additional "caviare" to the religious appetite: and what may be reprehensible is looked over for the moment on the score of its charming novelty. Now these, and such-like are some of the characteristics of so-called Ritualism, marked enough we should say, to prevent any misconception on Mr. Irby's part when charging Mr. Robinson with erratic practices. But after all, Mr. Robinson may be open to the charge only of self-exaltation and vanity. He may possibly conceive that he has felt the religious pulse of his flock at Tenterfield, and can safely venture on exhibiting a few nostrums to relieve the dullness of common-place and passionless protestant devotion. So far then Mr. Irby may have just cause for his strictures; and just so far Mr. Robinson may feel no remarkable anxiety to undeceive either him or the Bishop.

Assuming then that Mr. Irby has really some ground to go on, we come to the more important inquiry as to the character of the Bishop's action during the whole matter. And here it is we meet with what is to us especially offensive—a want of openness and fair dealing—an oracular and of course an ambiguous phraseology—a studied reticence—a would-be dignified bearing that, under cover of an accidental position, shirks the responsibility of that position. We are well aware his Reverence could plead that he is doing only what his brethren in Christ are doing and have done for a long time past; that is, they have discreetly avoided every test that might prove their sincerity, though it might be perchance at some sacrifice of status. But, no! Cranmer like, it is only when pushed into a corner they dare speak out; and then—Heaven save the mark!—they marvel at the extinguishment of that former respect, not to say veneration, which greeted them so warmly under our second James—when nonconformists, of whatever creed, could for the moment merge all their diversities of religious opinion in one all-pervading feeling of respect and honour for those who not only professed a principle but were in no way backward in maintaining it.

Mr. Robinson's peculiarities are of no moment whatever to us. He may mimic another Church to his full bent, ape its venerable and time-honoured formularies, and fancy himself getting gradually Catholicised. We might, it is true, be tempted to ask him how he can reconcile the little above-noted aberrations with his oath of clerical allegiance, but that we have reason to believe the ecclesiastical conscience is as absorbent as any sponge—as loose as any overcoat put on on a rainy day. If his congregation like him, no doubt reasons his Reverence of Armidale, why shouldn't they keep him. While he builds up their faith, they may surely build him a parsonage. And what does it matter if the former be of somewhat untempered mortar, providing the materials of the latter be sound and the basis secure. Bishops after all are but human, and their train of thought is apt to be coloured now and then by outward circumstance. What did it matter, we may suppose, to Hezekiah, if the prophet foretold of ill days that should come, so long as there was some guaranty of peace in his own. It has ever been so, and it would almost appear as though direct apostolic descent need not necessarily be accompanied with apostolic virtues and self-denial. We must not—we see it more and more—be too exacting or expectant; but wait patiently for that periodically recurring cycle of ages, when the substantial blessings of another golden age will show us that early tradition is not after all so fabulous as the present state of human conduct might lead one to imagine.

Quilibet.

Praying for Rain.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In your first number you gave an extract from Professor Tyndall's "Miracles and Special Providences" on the proper function of prayer.

The "rain-makers" among the savage tribes of Central Africa invariably postpone their necromantic rites as long as possible, so that in the very nature of things a meteorological change of some kind or other may fairly be counted upon. Such, also, has been the practice of our orthodox churches. Of course, rain or fine weather *must* come sooner or later, after their prayers; but whether *post hoc*, or *propter hoc*, is just the distinction which the clerical mind is so prone to overlook. It may be only a coincidence and a mere normal change occurring in due course. Why do not ecclesiastics put their theories to the test by praying for something about which there can be no reasonable doubt?

In the seventeenth chapter of Matthew, fourteenth and following verses, we are told that a certain man came to Jesus, asking for mercy, urging that he had brought his son, who was a lunatic, to the disciples, and that they could not cure him. We are further told that Jesus cast out the devil that possessed the child, and that his disciples came to him apart inquiring as to their inability to exorcise the demon. The reply was, "Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith" as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

Now, to the application of this. It is believed that the proximity of the Blue Mountain chain to our Eastern coast has considerable influence on the uncertainty of the rainfall and on its distribution. Let, then, prayers be offered for the removal of this mountain barrier further into the interior of our continent, so that the rainfall might be more equable and more impartially divided than at present. (N.B.—I am writing during the small deluge under which we are suffering).

Well, if the desired result followed on this proceeding, I, for one, would most cordially accept the miracle. But would it? At any rate the act would go far to prove the sincerity of the *faith* of the actors in the efficacy of prayers of this kind, which, in the present state of matters, is by no means so evident.

Truly, the grain of mustard-seed is small, but what of *the faith*?—Iota.

Classical Literature.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I cordially agree with your correspondent "Quilibet" as to the value of classical literature, but think he takes up more than one position from which he would not unwillingly withdraw; as, for instance, when he says, "Perhaps to teach little, but to teach that little well—to put into the hands of each scholar, after ascertaining the bent of his mind, one popular Greek and Latin author, and make him keep to it, is our best course of action." But as a test, let us ask, how would such a plan succeed if English, not Latin or Greek, was the dead language taught in some foreign university, say about the time Macaulay's New Zealander is (if ever) to stand on London bridge moralising on the ruins around. The success, would, I fancy, be quite infinitesimal. Hardly any book, however well thumbed, would furnish a more complete idea of the language, taking an Englishman's knowledge as the standard of comparison, than the brick brought to the market did of the building its owner wanted to sell. On the same plan one could hardly achieve more in Latin or Greek. The something would be nothing. Surely we ought to exact far better results than this. Our schools and colleges ought to ensure us—not indeed an absolute proficiency in one or two books, but the key to the whole classical literature—the power *at least* of reading all the classical authors as readily as one would read corresponding works in the English language; and this, not as an ultimate result, but as a preliminary basis on which the science, the grammar and the philosophy of language would be founded, although none but the *elite* would carry their studies so far.

That a mighty change, amounting, in fact, to a complete revolution, impends over our whole educational system, I firmly believe—a change, too, that will prove far more beneficial than injurious to classical literature. For the manifest destiny of all the colonies of the southern hemisphere is clearly to be commercial, agricultural, manufacturing and industrial to an extraordinary degree, and consequently the cultivation of the physical sciences must come to the front. It is in fact a question of life or death, so far as the material prosperity of the colonies are concerned. But the rise of science does not mean the setting of classical literature. Far otherwise, as "Quilibet" holds. For as the tendencies of science are essentially religious, it cannot subserve the myriad wants of a materialistic civilisation, without rising into higher and nobler spheres of usefulness. Physical facts lead to intellectual science, intellectual science to moral science, and so will expand our knowledge of the universe, unfold for us a grander conception of the Deity than would otherwise be possible, show that all the forms of living things are but the letters, words, sentences, chapters and symbols of a divine revelation addressed not more to the intellect than the heart of man, and throw a flood of light upon that grand confederation of interests

in which all the nations of the earth are indissolubly linked; and which, whether working spiritually, politically, artistically, or materially, are but doing God's will. See how the growth of this view exalts and enhances the value of classical literature. In his recent work, "Juventus Mundi," the Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone has penned the following significant passage :—"It (the Olympian religion) incorporated itself in schemes of notable discipline for mind and body; indeed of a life-long education; and these habits of mind and action had their marked results (to omit many other greatnesses) in a philosophy, literature and art, which remain to this day unrivalled, or unsurpassed. The sacred fire indeed that was to touch the mind and heart of man from above was in preparation elsewhere. Within the shelter of the hills that stand about Jerusalem the great archetype of the spiritual excellence and purification of man was to be produced and matured. But a body as it were was to be made ready for this angelic soul. And as when some splendid edifice is to be reared, its diversified materials are brought from this quarter and from that, according as nature and man favor their production, *so did the wisdom of God with slow but ever sure device* cause to ripen amid the several races best adapted for the work, the several component parts of the noble fabric of a Christian manhood and a Christian civilisation. 'The Kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall give presents. The Kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring gifts.' Every worker was with or without his knowledge and his will to contribute to the work; and among them an appropriate part was thus assigned both to the Greek people and to what I have termed the Olympian religion."

Here are noble words embodying the results of science—the voice of an enlightened rationalism, but instinct with the spirit of universal love—recognising the fatherhood of God—the solidarity of the human family—and consequently assigning to classical literature a momentous importance—a wondrously fascinating significance, to which the narrow theology of the past, with its superannuated dogmas of "the Jew as the chosen people," and "the Gentile" as reprobate and God forsaken Heathendom could never comprehend or justly estimate.

The most extreme popularisations of science, then—a popularisation rendered inevitable by the exigencies of modern life—is but the advent of a more glorious destiny for classical literature. For men are waking up to see in its entirety the brave deliverances, the noble services which the great pioneer nations of antiquity have wrought for them; just as we of the nineteenth century know what was hidden from contemporaneous and even subsequent generations—that Shakespeare was not a mere play-house hack, nor Dante the author of a malicious libel; but poets of all time—representatives and exponents of the outer and inner life—the secular and religious activities of the middle ages.

That the diffusion of classical literature would be a mighty boon to any country, and especially to a young, energetic and matter-of-fact one, I entirely believe. Therefore I have the greatest sympathy, if not with the specific plans, at all events with the motives of Professor Badham. But I have long been led to think that the great obstacles in the way of such diffusion are artificial rather than natural. I find, in fact, that the method of nature and the systems in vogue in our schools and colleges are diametrically opposed. Under the method of nature languages are learned *prior* to the study of grammar, and their laws are infallibly, yet unconsciously, conformed to. Under our scholastic and collegiate system, the structure and laws of language are consciously taught; yet the difficulties of conforming to them and of even reading the literature are something enormous. I hold the fundamental error to be *both* the excessive predominance of grammatical studies, *and* especially their employment in the *earlier* stages of study. Now, there is a time for all things, and the time for the study of grammar is *after* you have learned the language living or dead, and not at the commencement or at any of the intermediate stages. Non-observance of this principle of order is fatal to the acquisition of languages in any reasonable time, or with any reasonable facility.

I do not know what Professor Badham's opinion is, but the late Dr. Woolley often said that for one youth who had a talent for learning languages, there were three who had a talent for mathematics. It may be so. Yet it *ought* not to be so, because naturally it is the very reverse.

There are, let us say, 900,000,000 of people on the face of the earth, and these 900,000,000 not only learn all the languages of the world, but learn them as children and conform to the laws of language as surely, yet as unconsciously, as bees fulfil the laws of geometry in building their cells. Why should learning languages be the vast difficulty it is said to be? Surely what all the world does cannot be difficult. Is it not strange then that when one goes to schools and colleges but one linguist is to be found for three mathematicians: whereas in the ample university of nature for one mathematician you will meet a million linguists?

The child is the model linguist. But why? Because in him the emotional, imaginative and initiative faculties predominate—and these are the faculties not merely by which all languages are learned, but by which, as in the case of the poets, all languages are created. The child then must learn because he has in a preponderating degree those faculties best fitted to the task. *And he has no others.* For the reasoning powers are but in the germ, and too uninfluential to warp or divert him from his path. But the man is a more complex being. He is all the child is and more. In him the reasoning powers are active, developed and dominant. Hence there are, as regards learning languages, two courses open to him. Either he may study with his imagination like the child, and thus

learn to speak or read a language with facility, without consciously knowing its laws; or he may study with his reason like the critic or the philosopher, and then without being able to speak with any facility, he will construct grammars, unfold the laws of language, and build up the science of comparative philology.

No doubt both methods are necessary to attain a perfect knowledge of language—that is to say, the imaginative method of nature and the rational method of the schools. But the misfortune is that the rational method is exclusively, or almost exclusively, used, as the multitude of grammars and critical works abundantly proves; and the consequence of this one-sided and inharmonious method of study is—first, a general deficiency in that large and wide familiarity with the facts of language which the imaginative method alone can give; and, secondly, for want of such wide familiarity with the facts, an inability to master the science, grammar or laws of language without such an undue expenditure of toil and time, as serves to disgust parents and students, and as the necessities of our commercial and industrial circumstances imperatively forbid.

That grammatical and critical studies are of infinitely less importance, to make a certain progress in the knowledge of language, than is dreamt of in our existing rational system is proved by the fact that grammar is inevitably *subsequent* to the formation of language. Must not the language exist before the grammar can be written? And where do grammarians find the choicest specimens of style, but in the works of those poets and prose writers who wrote before the grammar was, or could be, composed, and who unerringly conformed to laws of which they were profoundly ignorant. For instance, the first grammar of the Hebrew tongue was written about the time of William the Conqueror. How was it then that all the masterpieces of Hebrew literature—such as the Psalms and the prophetic writings—were produced without any knowledge of, and yet in accordance with, grammatical rules? And how was it that generation after generation of Hebrew children for centuries learned the language and spoke it grammatically without having any formal or conscious knowledge of grammar? And what does all this prove, but that there *is* a method of acquiring language completely opposed to that of our schools and colleges; and that in fact the grand secret is *to become again as a little child*, and study the new language in the order it is learned by him; but that is in direct opposition to the existing method.

As it is impossible within the limits of a letter to do any justice to so great a subject; I can only throw out some general hints. Let those who would wish to study languages, but fancy from sore experience of the delays and difficulties of the rational method, that they have not the gift, be very sure that the gift they certainly have. It should also be some encouragement to think that all great linguists, like Sir William Jones and Cardinal Mezzofanti, *invariably learned* like the child. There is no instance on record of a great linguist having learned after the rational method. And these men were great linguists, not from the presence of any extraordinary gift, but from the adoption of right method. They learned as children learn; but working with the industry, power and concentration of men they achieved results proportionately great. Indeed, the case of Mezzofanti is peculiarly pertinent. He was strikingly deficient in philosophical ability or reasoning power. But the child faculties were developed in him as the sensation of feeling is in the blind; and so he had no difficulty in learning sixty languages, and could have acted, as Byron said, as interpreter at the Tower of Babel had he lived at that mythological era. He would corner off a Yorkshireman, a Swiss, or a Basque native, and in a fortnight be able to outslang any of them in their native patois.

W. B.

The Regular Course of Nature.

To the Editor.

Sir,—The writer of the article on the Bishop of Nelson's charge, has very justly criticised the astounding theory that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by a group of aerolites following in the train of a comet, which must have approached the earth just at the very time at which (by Divine pre-arrangement) the iniquity of those cities had culminated. But there is nothing new under the sun; and human nature is much the same in all ages, at least *ordinary* human nature. It may amuse your readers to be informed that precisely the same notion of harmonising special retribution with the regular course of nature, is put forward by the poet Cowper in his "Negro's Complaint," where he thus expresses himself—

"Is there, as ye sometimes tell us,
Is there one who reigns on high?
Has he bid you buy and sell us,
Speaking from his throne, the sky?

* * * *

Hark! he answers—wild tornadoes,
Strewing yonder sea with wrecks;
Wasting towns, plantations, meadows,
Are the voice with which he speaks.
*He, foreseeing what vexations
Afric's sons should undergo,
Fixed their tyrant's habitations
When his whirlwinds answer—No."*

The coincidence is remarkable. One would have supposed that both bishop and poet would have been familiar with the book of Job, which is, in fact, a didactic poem on this subject, and also with the reproof with which Jesus himself rebuked the notion of the especial sinfulness of those who were crushed by the tower of Siloam. Yet are they, like children and novel-readers, not satisfied unless they see justice done within the compass of their own individual experience. We must acknowledge, however, that both bishop and poet are above the level of the English M.P. who attributed the Irish famine in 1846 to the increase of the Maynooth Grant in 1845. They are both evidently aware of the existence of natural laws; and in the vain attempt to reconcile the order of nature with the idea of special retribution for sin they are driven to invent a theory which your critic justly styles "as hard to believe as any miracle." People of this turn of mind should take a strong dose of George Combe on the "Constitution of Man," and on the "Relation between Science and Religion." Don Quixote.

Editorial Notices.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street Sydney.

Yearly Subscription : Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

Printed by ROBERT HONK, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, April 4, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau.*

Vol. I., No. 4. May 2, 1870.

Notes.

It neither disconcerts nor surprises us to find that the *Free Religions Press* has aroused the ire of its opponents and, in some quarters, the anxiety of its well-wishers, on the score of its aggressive and even iconoclastic attitude towards doctrines and institutions usually accounted sacred. So far, indeed, from wishing to correct this impression, we are prepared deliberately to endorse it. We have already specified the sort of work to which our Paper is dedicated, nor is it likely that we shall be turned aside from it by the outcries of the superstitious or the misgivings of the timid. It is our conviction that the stuff usually taught in the churches as Christianity is glaringly at variance both with the religion of Christ and with the highest and devoutest ultra-ecclesiastical thought of the hour. We are further persuaded that but for the despicable hypocrisy of people who, both by word and deed, make a show of believing what they do not believe, backed by the want of ability and sincerity in the clergy themselves, the present false and unwholesome condition of things would not exist for another day. Hence the severity and the vehemence, as some may think, of our hitting. Far be it from us—if only in the remembrance of the doubt and darkness which once beset our own path—to take pleasure in paining those who conscientiously accept doctrines—false though they be—with which may be entwined their tenderest

memories of earth and their dearest hopes of heaven. Still, we do not feel ourselves called upon to respect, or to be tender with, any man's errors, when, by a plain, unvarnished statement of the truth, couched, as it may be, in strong and trenchant phraseology, there is every prospect of his sense of divine things being based on the rock of consciousness instead of the shifting sands of tradition. We have our case of weapons—rebuke, remonstrance, denunciation, ridicule, &c.—nor shall we scruple to use them, as the surgeon uses his knife to relieve by giving pain, as they are severally required. Orthodox Christians do not object to strong and cutting language when used against the heretical minority, but it must not, it seems, be used against themselves. Preachers of the stamp of Mr. Moreton are at liberty to gloat in their pulpits and at public meetings over the hell-torments of men who have rendered unquestionable service to humanity and passed to their account, and anathematise unbelievers to their heart's content; while the heterodox, in their allusions to the orthodox, are expected to be deferential and mealy-mouthed as may be. For ourselves, we shall say our say in our own fashion, and, for the rest, would ask our readers whenever our words fall heavy upon them, to diminish their weight, or try to do so, by loving truth more and their own opinions less.

BEFORE proposing his amendment for the excision of the word Christian from the Preamble to the Unitarian Land Bill, Mr. John Campbell, as he himself probably now sees, should have taken the trouble to sound his colleagues of the Upper Chamber. Had he done so, his mean and narrow conception as to what constitutes a Christian would have escaped a somewhat undignified airing, involving the surrender of his amendment, amid a perfect volley of remonstrances, in deference to the unanimously-expressed conviction of legislative councillors that a division upon it would be much to their discredit. We can imagine Mr. Campbell's perplexity and annoyance at finding himself suddenly isolated from his compeers by his bigoted definition of the religion of Jesus. It may, however, be some consolation to him to reflect that his proposal to unchristianise Unitarians, had it been submitted to a religious instead of a legislative conclave—say to the members of an Anglican or Presbyterian Synod—would have encountered a very different reception, and, perhaps, been adopted *nem. con.* Assuredly a matter of the smallest consequence, so far as Unitarians are concerned, especially when we remember that, in the eyes of the majority of Christian professors, there is hardly a living thinker of eminence who is entitled to cross the periphery of their little circle, with its bristling *chevaux de frise* of absurd dogmas and vulgar cants. Clear, too, is it, beyond question, that but for the rational view of Christianity which Unitarians and others are enabled to submit to the consideration of those who are disposed to throw the whole thing overboard, the popular Christianity of our day would, by the aforesaid eminent thinkers, be emphatically disowned as the untenable superstition it undoubtedly is. So much for the gratitude of Mr. John Campbell and Co.

It is at all times gratifying to find a minister of religion standing forward as the advocate of a high-toned morality, as, for example, when the Bishop of Sydney secured the prominent mention of his name in the Legislative Chamber as that of an unflinching opponent, on moral and social grounds, of the Matrimonial Causes Bill. It strikes us, however, that there have been occasions on which Dr. Barker might have flung his episcopal influence into the scale of morality to far greater advantage than in opposing a measure to assimilate the law of this colony to that of England, especially as the proposed enactment was calculated to satisfy the Bishop's love of justice and of humanity by conferring upon the woman the same power and privileges with respect to the sacredness and inviolability of the marriage vow, which the law of England confers upon the man alone. When it is remembered that a notorious actress, for many years connected with the management of London theatres was, not long since, to be seen moving in select social circles, and that, still more recently, persons upon whom the gravest imputations have been openly cast have moved in the same circles—can this be said to be a state of society which could be deteriorated by the enactment of a measure such as the Upper House, much to its discredit, has temporarily quashed? All honour, at the same time, to those members who exhibited their honest appreciation of that justice to women which the proposed Act was calculated to confer, and to that member especially, who, though opposed to the Bill on religious grounds, averred that offenders against morality, whether sentenced by the law or not, should be punished, by the force of public opinion, with exclusion from all decent society. So long as *gentlemen* who, though known debauchees, are received into the domestic circle of persons of good repute, and allowed to occupy a position of *quasi* respectability, no episcopal or other protest can be too distinct in the way of reducing such persons to their proper social level. The fact is, that as a community we are not, in the matter under consideration, nearly so exemplary as we might be. We may not, perhaps, be really more immoral than the people of other cities, but our numbers being limited, and our social defects comparatively well-known to each other, we cannot affect an ignorance which it might be possible and convenient to assume in a more extended sphere. Under these circumstances, the countenance shown by many to social defaulters gradually begets a familiarity with, and, perhaps, finally, a participation in, practices from which we should in the first instance have sternly recoiled. Public opinion can alone supply the requisite remedy; for whilst adulterers, liars and swindlers (known as such) can be received into decent society, mere episcopal protests in other directions, or the passing of the best Divorce measure, will do nothing for us.

We have, at least, the right to demand that the men with whom we associate shall be honourable and truthful, and the women honest and virtuous; and, further, to insist that all known transgressors shall, in the recently outspoken words of a member of the Legislative Council, "be utterly excluded from all respectable society."

Mr. IRBY, the antiritualist, is, it seems, disposed to rejoice with the *Australian Churchman* over the *Sydney Morning Herald* as "one of the best things we have in the colony." There can be no doubt of it, at least if the comfort and convenience of a community are in anywise enhanced by the publication of a cheap and well-printed chronicle of passing events. It has, however, often struck us that the *Sydney Morning Herald* is in one respect not a bit better than it should be; and the fault we complain of may, we think, be traced to the ecclesiastical atmosphere that is known to pervade its editorial chamber. In sending a copy of the first number of the *Free Religious Press* to the *Herald*, in common with the other newspapers of the colony, the most we expected was a short notice stating that such a Magazine had taken its place among the prints of Sydney. No such notice, however, was vouchsafed. But in reviewing Mr. Wilson's *Songs and Poems* a week or two later, the *Herald*, as if under obligation to say what it did not care to say openly, took occasion to inform its readers, that "here, as elsewhere, ephemeral literature" is occasionally produced, against which as mere "duckweed on the surface of a pool, having neither substance nor value," it was unnecessary to direct "the elaborate artillery of a microscopic criticism," with the view of clearing "such sorry stuff away." "Even when the spirit of colonial literature," says our Reviewer, "may be found resembling a deleterious extract from weeds of a ranker growth, it does not follow that it will be judicious to give the precious decoction that emphatic condemnation it may seem to demand, lest the mischievous qualities of the preparation should become more widely known, and so should, possibly, prove to be more actively injurious." Exactly so. We can easily believe that a heavy bombardment of the little *Press* by the big *Herald* would have served us to the extent of a good many advertisements, but what we complain of is, that our contemporary, not content with shirking the awful responsibility of naming us by name, should yet, slyly but pointedly, snub us as a "precious decoction" of the most deleterious and contaminating description. We wish and mean to be courteous to the *Herald*, but reciprocity of this feeling is quite out of the question so long as the leading journal assumes, as it notoriously does assume, a censorship in matters religious to which we are not at all disposed to bow. Not long since the *Herald* refused to insert an advertisement announcing that at a certain time and place the members of the Sydney Secular Society met for the discussion of social and religious questions; yet there is hardly an issue of the *Herald* which does not inform the more silly and superstitious of its readers where, and by what eminent Professor, they can have their "future revealed;" or the more rowdy and dissipated of its readers, where a "Free-and-Easy" is to be held; or some misguided girl, of the spot where at set times she may enjoy surreptitious interviews with some scapegrace of a lover; and so on. Surely there is some inconsistency about the insertion of these and similar advertisements and the refusal to advertise the meetings of the Sydney Secular Society, or to notice the advent of the *Australian Free Religious Press*. For ourselves, we mean to go-ahead, and, as we increase in popularity, the *Herald* may perhaps be tempted to recognise our respectability, and greet us with its "smile sardonic."

RELIGIOUS tests having received notice to leave the schoolroom arc, it would appear, to be provided with an asylum in the kitchen. At a meeting recently held at the Central Police Court—a most improper place, by the way, for any display of sectarianism—Captain Scott proposed to form an institution where "girls between the ages of ten and twelve, *belonging to all Protestant denominations*, might be taught to read, write, cipher, sew, wash, iron and cook." A cynic would be inclined to say that the proceedings evinced quite as much selfishness as philanthropy; quite as much regard for the domestic convenience of mistresses as for the virtue and well-being of their servants; and a great deal more (implied) hatred of the Pope than love of Christ. Ministers of religion are perpetually groaning over the spread of Atheism among the masses; but is it to be wondered at that plain, straightforward men, not accustomed to profound reasoning, should, when they see the bigotry and intolerance of many of those ministers, turn their backs on them in disgust and cry out, How much happier the world would be without any religion at all?

A DISPATCH has recently been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject of Official Oaths. Now we certainly do not object to the simplification of oaths, but we venture to go a little further, and should like some champion of things as they are to give a really sound reason why official oaths should not be simplified off the face of the Statute Book altogether. We do not lay much stress on the inconsistency of Christians repeatedly taking oaths in opposition to the express command of their Master to "Swear not at all," for this inconsistency is only one of a multitude of such which make European Christianity, A.D. 1870, little else than a burlesque of the principles and practice of Christ and the Apostles. What warranty, for example, is there in the New Testament for the enthronement of Christian Bishops at the rate of some thousands sterling per annum, with the title of "my lord" to boot; for deans and canons, for benefices sold in the market as valuable property, for many things in fact which would have astonished Paul the tent maker, or the fishermen Peter and John. But—to keep to the subject before us—what is the use of the oath of allegiance? Of

all the numbers who swear allegiance, from the Member of Parliament down to the youngest lad, who, in going through this piece of antiquated formality, has to bite his lips and pinch himself to suppress a disposition to giggle, is there one who thereby feels himself at all more bound by an oath to keep the laws of the realm? Or is the carpenter, the butcher, or the baker absolved from allegiance because he takes no oath? We trow not. Does any one suppose that this or any other oath ever stood in the way of ambition or intrigue? Is not history strewn with broken vows? From the days of Harold who, upon the bones of the Saints, swore allegiance to William the Conqueror, and broke his oath at the first temptation, to the days of Napoleon III., who swore to guard the Constitution, which he deliberately swept away within three years, what bold designing man was ever kept under by an oath? It is probable that Cromwell and his com-patriots were just as sincere in their allegiance to Charles I. as Falkland and Wentworth; yet is there abundant room for rejoicing that no scruples about oaths hindered them from raising the standard of rebellion. It may be said, what harm is there in an oath? We cannot but think that mere formality in solemn things is always bad, and this swearing, regarded as a mere preliminary to official duties, is sure to degenerate into a mere form. Religion itself is with multitudes a mere form, a something to be reserved for Sundays; and, as the habit of formality spreads, what is to hinder honesty, morality and chastity from becoming mere formality also? Surely it is time for us to make an effort to sweep away these old and bedraggled remnants of antiquity and try to get back to something like honesty and simplicity of life and manners.

AMONG the items of intelligence brought by the last European mail, there is one which seems almost too good to be true. We refer to the movement for a new Translation of the Bible. We need not say that the cause of rational religion will have everything to gain and nothing to lose by such a revision of the Old and New Testaments. We shall, however, be much surprised if this proposal for a new authorised version of the Scriptures does not produce a marked effect upon the position of the Established Church of England. For what is the condition of that body at present? As regards the higher and more educated classes it is divided into three distinct sects—the High Church, rallying zealously round the Book of Common Prayer, especially the Liturgy and the Rubrics; the Low Church, whose stronghold is the Thirty-nine Articles; and the Broad Church, whose *forte* seems to be to treat the Bible as any other book, and religion itself as a normal product of human nature. But far beneath these turbulent waves of controversy, there are still depths where little light comes and no motion is felt. Here are found the majority of the rustic population and the shopkeeping class, whose religious faith—if faith it may be called—is a blind, unhesitating worship of the exact words of the English Bible. These are they who find a strange delight in its very words and phrases, upon whose minds no argument makes so powerful an impression as that "there is Scripture for it and who, on any sudden emergency, consider no guidance so trustworthy, no advice so worthy of adoption, as a suggestion derived from the first words presented to their eyes in a Bible opened at random. Now let us imagine the effect upon these superstitious devotees, of having a new Bible put into their hands, with some of their well-known texts entirely changed, or at least presented in a new and strange dress. Take, for example, the oft-quoted passage from Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c.—words which are solemnly recited by every Anglican clergyman as he precedes a corpse to the grave, and which have been indelibly impressed on the memories of thousands by Handel's exquisite melody. If our new Bible is to be anything but a delusion, the admission must be made that these words have no reference whatever to a "Redeemer" in the ecclesiastical sense; that, in fact, the passage, as it stands in the authorised version, is both mistranslated and misunderstood. Again, what hair-raising sermons have been preached from the text, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Yet this passage must either be omitted in a revised Translation, or, at, least, marked as of very doubtful authority. There is also the story of the woman taken in adultery, which has more than once turned up in the recent debates on the Matrimonial Causes Bill; but this, too, must either be cancelled or marked as doubtful. So, too, with the spurious passage (I John v. 7) for which there is no authority whatever, but which, nevertheless, we have heard deliberately adduced in a leading church in Sydney as a clear proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. Now, when the uneducated and the half-educated find these and other familiar phrases omitted, or altered, or branded as equivocal, will they not consider themselves to have been hitherto egregiously deceived, and that too in regard to the object of their most implicit devotion? And will not their astonishment when they are once awakened to the truth be just in proportion to the depth of their slumber? We expect it will. Yet it must come. Old Bible or New Bible, the people are learning now to read for themselves, so that between the popular desire for "more light," and the clerical yearning for more darkness, or for a "dim religious light" at most, we do not think that the position of the thorough-going partisans of the Anglican Establishment is just now at all auspicious or strong.

THE Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. A newspaper scribe who enjoys the privilege, now and then, of finding himself and followers up to their necks in the ditch, has recently been jubilant over the superiority of his deglutitionary powers, and pours no small amount of contempt on Unitarians because their capacity for swallowing fiction is decidedly less than his own. He believes, without difficulty, the story of the

snake that talked and reasoned so effectually as to lead to Adam and Eve being expelled from Paradise. The liberties taken by Joshua with the sun and solar system he has carefully stowed away in the repertory of his credibles; and he can out-whale the whale himself by swallowing the account of his swallowing Jonah. The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible is the war-cry of this belligerent, and we surely must have been at his elbow the other day when he offered a deposit at the Bank. Handing a slip, accompanied with a purse, to the receiving teller, he requested that the contents might be placed to his credit. The clerk then began counting the coin, returning one every now and then with the remark that it was bad. "Oh!" said the depositor, "I don't do business that way. All or none is my principle. The purse, the whole purse, and nothing but the purse is my system; and if you will not take all, you will take none." The clerk stared, as well he might, and returned the deposit, his astonishment exploding, as the applicant reached the door and became invisible, with the exclamation, "Why, the man is quite a fool!" Now, for ourselves, we follow, in matters religious, the teller's practice at the Bank. We gladly receive theological coin of the genuine metal and right ring, and accept it as one of God's choicest mercies; but the base article we reject even if offered by the tallest archangel that ever blew a trumpet, and nail it to the counter of the *Free Religious Press* as a warning to dealers in the contraband and fictitious.

"I AM very glad," said the Bishop of Sydney, in the course of his address of welcome to the new Bishop of Bathurst, "to think that the hour has arrived when the torch of Divine Truth may be passed over by me to younger hands;" and, with all due respect for his lordship, and best wishes for his increasing happiness and usefulness, we must say that we share his satisfaction in the matter of his contemplated retirement from active episcopal duty. It is quite true, as he observes, that the Church has arrived at a very important era of its history; and it is for this very reason that Society stands in pressing need of religious teachers both morally and intellectually qualified to deal with the religious crisis through which our Christianity is now passing. That the reverend gentlemen who assembled in Phillip Street the other day are in nowise qualified for this great work is clear both from their address to the new Bishop and from the accompanying speech of the Metropolitan. Bishop Barker welcomes Bishop Marsden, "who has come to take the overseership of the flock of Christ in the Bathurst district, . . . having been consecrated in Westminster Abbey to this high and important office by several bishops of the Church of England." And what of that, pray? We are quite aware that consecration in the old Abbey is reckoned an essential feature of the *noli episcopari* ceremony; but does any one in his senses suppose that this consecration can add to a man's moral or intellectual attainments, or even to his efficiency as an overseer of souls? The Bishop, again, is careful to let us know that at Dr. Marsden's consecration *several* bishops were in attendance. How many, we are not informed; but the statement is at all events suggestive of a curious rule-of-three sum, the fourth term of which refers to the number of mitres that would be required to consecrate, adequately and efficiently, a Ralph Waldo Emerson, or a John Stuart Mill. "We hail in you"—we are now quoting from the address—"another chief pastor, to preside over a new Australian diocese, in which Christ's sheep are scattered abroad, too many of them at present without a shepherd, to lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes of our beloved Church; to uphold the true faith, once, for all, delivered to the saints, and to carry the Gospel and its holy ordinances to the distant regions of the West, that souls may be saved, and a Divine Head glorified." Of the metaphysics of this passage, including the "cords," the "stakes," and the "glorified head," we say nothing. They are simply beyond us. We are quite sure, however, that it exhibits a blindness or an indifference to the religious aspects and yearnings of the age, and a callous determination to stick at all hazards to obsolete symbols of faith, which, at a time when the very existence of the Church is imperilled by the obtuseness of its accredited leaders, are pitiable and ominous enough. We wish we could look to the new Australian Bishop of Bathurst as the inaugurator of a better order of things. But he, too, comes among us "as an overseer of Christ's sheep in the Western districts, many of whom are without either fold or shepherd," there to labour in "the Lord's vineyard" and "win souls for Christ." We wish we could rejoice in the prospect of the Church in this and other parts of the world being speedily blessed with guides and teachers *consecrated* by genius, earnestness, and a stalwart, upstanding piety, to the task of making manlier men and more womanly women of us, and to the release of our souls from the bondage of false and unlovely creeds. This consummation may be nearer than we think. We, at all events, wish these would-be pastors of ours to know that we are not the *sheep* they take us to be, or, if they will treat us as such, that we shall ere long peremptorily discharge our incompetent or faithless overseers and adjourn to fatter and more wholesome pastures.

The Athanasian Creed.

IN the pure days of the early Christian Church, before worldly prosperity had corrupted the morals, or post-apostolic dogmas had enshrouded in metaphysical fog the simple faith of the disciples, creeds, in the

modern sense of the term, were entirely unknown. With the Christians of the first century the only confession of faith was that which Philip required from the eunuch—"Jesus is the Son of God and the only rule of conduct, the example of the beloved Master's life. It was not long, however, before standards of doctrine—"symbols" as they were called—began to be introduced as tests of church membership. In writings as old as those of Justin Martyr and Irenæus there are to be found confessions of faith resembling the Apostle's Creed. When this came into use no one can tell, nor is anything known as to its authorship except that it was certainly not written by the Apostles. Its strict Unitarianism, however, suggests for it a date anterior to 200 A.D., about which time the dogma of the identity of Jesus with Jehovah was first propounded, although the doctrine of the Trinity had then been by no means fully developed. Even in the symbol of the Council of Nice, which was convened under the authority of that exemplary Christian, the Emperor Constantine, in A.D. 325, there is no distinct enunciation of the Trinity in the Athanasian sense, although the Deity of Christ is made in it an article of belief.

It would be a dreary task, however useful it may be to one who desires to trace the gradual degradation of Christianity under the development of dogmatic theology, to wade through the history of the various heresies of Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Pelagius, and a host of others, and of the attempts which were made to suppress them. Each new heresy necessitated a new declaration of orthodox belief in some fresh direction, and at last the primitive faith of the early church became so overlaid with a tangled mass of unintelligible or absurd metaphysical propositions, as to have lost most of its distinctive features. The climax of this state of things must have been reached somewhere about the fifth or sixth century, when that extraordinary composition, "the creed of St. Athanasius," as it is falsely called, was first brought into existence.

This "bulwark of the Church's faith" which was repeated a few days ago by many pious Christian lips in tens of thousands of churches, and which for folly, presumption, and unchristian-like spirit stands in the first rank amongst the literary ecclesiastical enormities of the last eighteen centuries, was written—no one knows when, where, or by whom. It reflects some credit on the early Church of Rome, that it was not received by that body until the tenth century. It was adopted in England about A.D. 800, a time when the people generally had sunk into the lowest depths of barbarism, and when the clergy were so grossly illiterate that King Alfred, a short time afterwards, was unable to find anyone south of the Thames who could interpret the Latin service! These ignorant priests probably understood little of the damnation which they were bestowing in bad Latin upon all around them. But that such a monstrous production should have ever since retained even a nominal vitality, especially since the Reformation, seems little short of a miracle. Presented for the first time to a sensitively religious mind, it cannot but seem blasphemous and profane; to a logical mind, self-contradictory and absurd; and to a charitable mind, uncharitable and intolerant in the last degree. So blind is it in its damnatory zeal, that it deals damnation to all who hold the Nicene Creed in its purity, and consequently to the whole of the Greek Church.

We have used strong language on this point—language which mere theological error or false views of God's dealings with mankind would seldom justify. The "Te Deum," for instance, abounds in doctrines which we utterly repudiate: yet who will say that it is not a sublime, soul-stirring hymn of praise and adoration? Even Deborah's ode, in honour of the most perfidious wretch who was ever incarnate in woman's form, has at least the merit of being poetical. We must add, too, that we are now dealing with the creed itself, and not with its author, of whom we know nothing. Whoever was, he wrote in an age when men's heads were turned with abstract speculations on theology; about the time probably when, as a Christian writer complains, you could not ask "if the bath were ready," or "what is the price of corn?" without receiving for reply some disquisition on "the eternal generation of the son," or "the procession of the holy ghost." It was rather the fashion in those times, too, to gloat over the future fortunes of unbelievers and heretics. So that in many cases, while human energies were occupied in cultivating the intellect (with very rank theological weeds), the affections of the heart were allowed to starve. The author of this creed must not then be judged by what he has written without due regard to the times in which, and the circumstances under which, he wrote.

Regarding the question, however, as one affecting only the present times, it seems shocking and scandalous that with the full light of the nineteenth century upon us such words should solemnly be uttered by ministers and people in Christian churches. It would be awful to think that men and women with their hearts and intellects in a normal condition mean what they say in repeating this Creed. Surely they cannot. But if so, is it not equally awful to reflect upon the overwhelming amount of hypocrisy and lying in the very face of God which surrounds us on all sides. The clergy—many of them at least—are quite alive to this fact, and almost ever since the Church of England has been in existence they have writhed under the self-imposed infliction. Tillotson, in the reign of William III., wished to be well rid of it, but still less, it appears, did he wish to be rid of his archiepiscopal revenues; so he retained both! About the middle of the eighteenth century, before Wesley and Whitfield had aroused the sleepy parsons to do some work, and when discipline was very lax indeed, a Kentish clergyman used, it is said, systematically to refuse to read the Athanasian Creed, on the ground that he did not believe it. On being remonstrated with by some friends, and reminded that it was believed by more

learned men than himself—the Archbishop of Canterbury, for instance—he quietly rejoined, "True, but his Grace believes at the rate of £15,000 a year; I, at only £100." What a bitter satire upon himself and his superior! Men do not talk so boldly now-a-days, but there is the same infidelity. The present writer knows of a clergyman who admitted that there is one verse in the Creed which his conscience would not allow him to utter, but *fortunately it was always the turn of the cleric and congregation to read the offensive passage, and so he escaped it!* Is it possible to conceive a more degraded position for a minister of religion to be placed in? Yet he differs from those of his brethren whose ecclesiastical training has not eradicated from within them every trace of intellect and conscience only in being somewhat imprudently candid. Take the case of the present Archbishop of York. A few week's ago that primate received a memorial from a number of clergymen praying for "relief" in the use of the Athanasian Creed. His Grace's reply is what a vulgar critic would call shuffling, and is certainly characterised more by caution and sagacity than by frankness and honesty. He says,

"I am struck by the fact that the signatures to this memorial include some of the most respected names among the clergy and laity, and those drawn not from any one school or class of opinion, but from every school. It is not, I think, difficult to understand the general reasons which bring so many persons together upon a subject so important. Without going into the history of our creeds, which is familiar to all the memorialists, I will only say that I should be prepared, for my own part, to consider a measure of relief in the use of the Athanasian Creed. I find that many of those who value most highly that venerable document, *as a true expression of the great doctrines of our faith*, are coming round to the opinion that the present state of the law, which makes the use of the Athanasian Creed imperative upon all clergymen in all congregations, requires some modification. It would be premature to say what that modification ought to be, and what should be its limits. But weighty reasons unquestionably exist for giving the matter the most serious consideration."

Has the Archbishop ever read the four gospels? In reference to the words which we have given in italics we should like to ask his Grace whether he is aware that the very first and, we presume, the most important doctrine enunciated in the Athanasian Creed is so diametrically opposed to the oft-repeated teaching of Christ as almost to warrant the conjecture that it was written in opposition to Christianity itself. Whoever will be saved, says pseudo-Athanasius, before all things it is necessary that he believe faithfully and in their integrity certain dogmas, and if he believe them not he shall perish everlastingly. Whosoever will be saved, said Christ, (Matt. xix. 16-21, Mark x. 17-22, Luke xviii. 18-22,) must keep the commandments and practice self-denial. And again, (Luke x. 27,) in answer to the question, How must I inherit eternal life? he says,—Love God with all thy heart, soul, and strength, and thy neighbour as thyself. *This do and thou shalt live.* Nothing further need be urged to show how hopelessly irreconcilable are the Synoptic Gospels and the Athanasian Creed.

But we are aware that our argument will not be considered a very powerful one by conventional Christians of the nineteenth century. Neither the teaching nor the example of Jesus is now much regarded. He receives some lip-homage, it is true, and his words are often found useful, as Mr. Mill observes, to hurl at the heads of troublesome heretics. But a man who should attempt to practice Christian ethics in their integrity would now-a-days, especially if an archbishop, be regarded as a madman. The Sermon on the Mount has given way to the maxims of Mrs. Grundy. We purpose, however, testing the sincerity of the Archbishop and his memorialists in another direction. These gentlemen have all subscribed and profess to believe in the Thirty-nine Articles, and amongst them the eighth, which runs thus :—"The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostle's Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture." If so, why endeavour to evade them? Why ask to be "relieved" from the truth?

The answer is a painful, but an obvious one. The clergy of the Church of England know very well that the Athanasian Creed neither is nor ought to be received or believed by any right-minded man. And they know also that the laity as a body look upon the creed itself with disgust, and upon its professional champions with increasing suspicion or contempt. Yet so precarious is the condition of their ecclesiastical fabric, that they dread the removal of a single stone, lest the edifice should totter and crumble to dust. Woe to the temple which is composed of such rotten materials as this creed! We are told in the parable of a man who built his house on the sand, but this is built on a quick-sand. Its foundations are shifting from age to age; aye, from year to year. A century ago the world believed that the testimony of the three heavenly witnesses (I John v. 7,) was a part of the Bible. The great scholar Porson demolished this text, and with it the main scriptural foundation for the Athanasian trinity. Until quite recently it was thought that there was some sanction for the damnatory clauses in Mark xvi. 16. Archbishop Seeker, indeed, had the impudence to assert, on the strength of this text, that the uncharitableness of the creed is no greater than that of Christ himself! But this audacious calumny on the founder of Christianity can hardly be repeated in our clay, for the verse is admitted by orthodox scholars to be spurious. There remains little more than some curious speculations concerning the divine essence, which not only have nothing in common with any portion of scripture, but owe their origin mainly to St. Augustine, who lived in the latter part of the fourth century. Even the flimsy plea that this "venerable document" is necessary as

a bulwark against those heretics who have in various ages disturbed the peace of the Church, cannot be admitted. What heretic ever asserted that there were three fathers, three sons, and three holy ghosts? The man who could seriously argue against such eccentric polytheism as this would be scarcely less mad than he who could propound it.

There are many timid, pious souls who look with dread on the unsettling of men's faith, which is characteristic of these times. Whither are we tending? say they. You take from us our old creeds which we have learned at our mothers' laps, and what will you give us in their place? Let them not fear. The voice of conscience which is the voice of God still speaks within them. Let them be true to that, and, as Christ himself has promised, they shall "know of any doctrine whether it be of God;" and they will have a guide as sure and as unerring as were the fire and the cloud to the wandering Israelites.

Perplexed in faith, but pure in deeds;
At last he beat his music out;
There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me than in half the creeds,
He fought his doubts and gathered strength;
He would not make his judgment blind;
He faced the spectres of the mind,
And laid them; thus he came at length
To find a stronger faith his own.

Sagitta.

Prove all Things.

THE Church of Rome has a great deal to say of Peter and but very little of Paul; and for this reason: the *name* of Peter is made the poor apology for papal pretension, whilst Paul opposes to it an emphatic and determined antagonism.

Addressing the Thessalonians, and through them the whole family of man, the Apostle Paul exhorts them to "prove all things and this is the grand charter of humanity, "more precious than rubies," worthy to be maintained against all comers, at all times, and at any cost. "Prove all things!" says the Apostle, thereby clearly showing that God in his goodness has favoured us with intelligence equal to the occasion. "Prove all things!" It is your right, therefore boldly exercise it, maugre popes and priests and tyrants of any and of every description. It is your duty, therefore fearlessly and honestly discharge it, regardless of the mumblings and grumblings of a few superannuated old women of both sexes.

But what is the language of the Holy See? How does that harmonise with Paul's teaching? Let that very modest son of the Church, Boniface the Eighth, answer in his letter to Philip the Fair of France:—"Scire to volumus, quod in spiritualibus et temporalibus nobis subes." "We wish you to know that in all things spiritual and temporal, you must knock under to us. Body, soul and spirit, you are at the mercy of our dictation, and freedom of opinion is not to be tolerated or even thought of. The same modest Churchman had the assurance to declare, "that it is an article of faith, necessary to salvation, to believe that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff."

And this pretension is based on a saying of Jesus to Peter:—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Never was play upon words followed by such disastrous sequents. There is nothing to show that Peter was ever at Rome, although it must be admitted that Rome has proved to be a rock—a rock on which common sense has split and foundered, to the serious damage of all concerned.

A feeble-minded high churchman, operating against education through the papers, fears that Rationalism will be one of the calamitous results of the modern system; and we sincerely hope that his fears may prove to be well founded. If Rationalism means anything at all, it means the exercise of our reasoning faculties; and, if so, we should like to know how the objector arrived at the conclusion that Rationalism was objectionable without using his rational powers, such as they are. Paul says, "Prove all things;" but this irrational says, "Eyes you have, therefore be sure that you always keep them shut. Ears you have, but hear not! Follow me!" A rare chance, it must be admitted, had we happened to have been frogs; but as we are not amphibious, the humid state of our ditches just now is not at all to our taste; and having learnt that the inevitable goal of such blind guidance as that kindly proffered is much more aqueous and muddy than agreeable, we beg to decline the invitation with thanks.

Rationalism, at any rate, was not one of the sins of the times when the Papacy had reached its palmyest era. Under the influence of a tyrannical priesthood, intellect was as torpid, as inactive and as unreasoning as our high churchman could well desire. And what was the consequence? Why, that the Pope of the day succeeded in enforcing all his claims, unwarrantable and monstrous though they were. Not content with being the head of the Church, not content with ranking as a temporal prince in his own dominions, the Pope must lord it over all the princes of the earth, and Pope Pius the Fifth, in his bull, *In cæna Domini*, of the year 1567, declares that all princes who shall introduce into their dominions any new taxes of what nature soever they be, or shall increase the ancient ones without having first obtained the approbation of the Holy See, are, *ipso facto*, excommunicated. This is pretty well; but another modest son of the Church ventures a step further even than Pius the Fifth, and declares "*tantum sacerdos præstat regi quantum homo bestię*"—that a priest is as much above a king as a man is above a beast.

And how much misery would the world have been spared had the unwarrantable assumptions of the Holy See been tested by reason, and resisted as they ought to have been *in limine*. But they were not, and the consequence was that eventually the majority of the reigning Sovereigns of Europe found it convenient to acknowledge the priestly usurper as "Sovereign Lord of all the Earth." The acknowledged Lord and Master of the Pope had declared that *his* Kingdom was not of this world, and this is the way the Pope made it manifest.

It must be admitted, however, that if the exactions of the Pope were enormous, he was not always ungrateful. Royal submission did not always pass unrewarded, and the exemplary generosity of the Pope to the Spanish Monarchy on the discovery of the New World is worthy of passing notice. The Pope had doubtless as much right to South America as he had to the moon, and no more; nevertheless, generous with what did not belong to him, he did not hesitate to hand over to Spain an amount of territory that exceeded the vast regions possessed by the Russian Empire, or the British possessions in Asia. We all know the horrible sequents to this nefarious transaction—how fatal it was to the unhappy inhabitants of these vast territories, who, though void of offence, were slaughtered to the verge of extermination in the name of the Lord. Under pretence of converting the heathen, kings and princes were slaughtered right and left, their subjects sharing their cruel fate till the vast country was all but depopulated, a remnant only being saved to operate as Gibeonites—as hewers of wood and drawers of water—for the benefit of their conquerors, the amiable and Christian-like nominees of the Pope. But it is an old and often-told story and we dismiss it, remarking that since God made man a fouler iniquity never invited the wrath of Heaven; an iniquity, too, perpetrated with the sanction and under the auspices of a Church which still, as ever, is plotting and conspiring against the liberties of mankind.

The last despotic dodge of this domineering Church is the attempt to secure the assent of the Council to the dogma that asserts the infallibility of the Pope. In a very few words we shall attempt to expose this ridiculous pretension, and show that it is not proof against the test of rational examination. We do not know whether the members of the Council discuss the infallibility of the Pope with their backs to the sun or not, but certain it is they ought to be ashamed to look that luminary in the face, as we shall presently make manifest.

It is pretended that the Pope represents two distinct powers—Temporal and Spiritual sovereignty. In the exercise of the former, as a man, he may err; but as a Spiritual Sovereign, representing God, who thinks and acts and determines through him, he is necessarily infallible. Very well. But when the Pope in 1638 sent Galileo to the prison of the Inquisition, he determined beyond a doubt that the question at issue between Galileo and himself was a spiritual one, and one, therefore, no which he was necessarily infallible. Hid he on that occasion prove himself infallible, or will Pius the Ninth venture to maintain that Urban the Eighth was the mouth-piece of the Almighty when he declared that Galileo was pestilently wrong, and that the doctrine that taught that the Earth went round the Sun was a damnable heresy? Galileo, it is true, was obliged to eat humble pie, and to subscribe that which he knew to be untrue in obedience to the tyrannical dictation of the Pope; but time has vindicated Galileo and the Copernican system which he advocate!. and has incontestably proved that the Pope, in spite of his infallibility, was egregiously wrong. To be candid, however, we will admit that Urban in spite of his tyranny was not altogether useless in his day and generation. He certainly made the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope about as contemptible as he was himself, a point, such as it is, decidedly in his favour.

But leaving the Pope to the enjoyment of his infallibility, let us again turn to the test possessed by every natural being, and in virtue of which he is solemnly adjured to "prove all things." When God created the lower animals he provided them with instincts calculated to assist in their preservation and well-being; but to man he gave intelligence of a higher order. He made him a rational being. But he not only made him rational, he also provided that his reason should be exercised only on invariable *data* so far as related to the laws of nature; and we may be certain that whenever God interferes in mundane matters it will always be in strict accordance with the laws of nature. The supernatural and the antinatural will never, at the instance of the Almighty, be allowed to bewilder human intellect; and we therefore insist that the supernatural and the antinatural shall not be allowed to sustain and bolster any historical narrative that we deem it expedient to test. Nor do we claim more than our Courts of Justice demand. Miracles cannot be proved because they are based on the supernatural,

which will not pass muster with the gentlemen of the long robe. The last woman that was tried in England for witchcraft was sent about her business, because the judge declined the antinatural. When the prosecutor was asked how he knew that the accused was a witch, he replied that he had seen her travelling with her heels up in the air. "A singular taste, truly," remarked the judge, "but she had violated no law that he was aware of, and the witness was at liberty to indulge in the same strange mode of locomotion if he thought fit and proper, and with perfect impunity so far as the law was concerned." In short the judge laughed at the bumpkin, and declined to accept evidence that was based on the supernatural.

But admitting the supernatural, how is imposture to be detected? How is the liar to be checkmated and exposed if we concede all that is required to secure him against detection and exposure? Eliminate the supernatural, however, and how many solemn facts paraded in all the pomp and dignity of genuine history degenerate into palpable fiction of the most contemptible order?

We shall briefly allude to one of those historical facts, for we may as well confess that we have not left ourselves room enough to deal with the subject that we proposed to ourselves when we initiated the present paper. It was our intention to show that the biblical narrative of the origin of the Universe is nothing but fiction from beginning to end; and that so far from our first parents involving the whole race in ruin by sin the narrative is pregnant with *data* warranting the conclusion that they committed no sin whatever. It is rather late in the day to move an arrest of judgment; but it is some satisfaction to find that our very respectable and much respected originators have been condemned in error.

We must, however, abandon that subject, however tempting, for the present, and deal with another requiring fewer words and less room. The Pope with his usual rapacity has run away with most of our space, so we must hasten briefly to crave attention to the narrative connected with the standing still of the Sun upon Gibeon, with a view of showing that it is a fiction of the utterly impossible order. On referring to the Book of Joshua, it will be seen that the historian's notion of the sun was the same as that of Pope Urban and Ptolemy, the astronomer of Alexandria, namely, that the Sun went round the Earth; and consistently with this view of the matter it is recorded, "So the Sun stood still in the midst of heaven and hasted not to go down about a whole day." The historian then goes on to say with captivating simplicity, "And there was no day like that before it or after it." We are happy to say that we are in perfect accord with the historian with regard to his last statement. Our opinion is that there never was nor ever could be such a day as described, except in the fertile imagination of the historian himself, and for the following reasons:—To present the appearance, gravely recorded, of the Sun not going down, the Earth must have stood stock still. But the consequence of the earth declining to rotate on its axis as usual, would be that every building on the face of the earth would be prostrated with not one stone left upon another; and to mend matters, this universal dilapidation would be accompanied by a wind that would have out-chaosed chaos—a wind blowing at the rate of hundreds of miles an hour. The earth rotates on its axis at the rate of a thousand miles per hour; but suddenly arrested in its rotation, the accompanying atmosphere would rush over the surface with a velocity easier imagined than described, but certainly to the destruction of all created beings within its influence.

But to effect the sudden stoppage of the earth's diurnal rotation, the earth itself must be suddenly brought within the influence of some enormous mass of foreign matter; and then again to persuade the earth into its usual rotation, another enormous mass must be called upon to operate in a contrary direction to the other attraction named. The moon, too, would necessarily be thrown out of gear, and would probably be absorbed by one of the two extraneous masses of matter that are to produce such astounding effects. In short, the Solar System is to be deranged, and it is all brought about because a handful of Jews are in full chase of a few Syrians with the view of exterminating them.

As the story relates to the Hebrews, we commend it to the acceptance of our old friend Apella. He may possibly believe it. We cannot. "*Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.*"
Libra.

Review.

A WARNING, in the shape of "Urgent Appeals to the Unsaved to flee from the wrath to come and lay hold on eternal life, "by the Rev. G. Sutherland, of Dunedin, has reached us, and appears, if only for the sake of putting those into whose hands this book may fall upon their guard, to demand a word or two of comment. The author has a fair notion of his position and responsibilities as a Christian minister in "these southern regions," which he would fain see pervaded by "the pure religion of heaven a religion of principle, heart and life," and weaned from "the world with its gigantic grasp of wealth on the one hand, and of pleasure on the other." Had we nothing, indeed, but his Preface, from which we quote, to draw conclusions from, we should say that Mr. Sutherland was decidedly above the ordinary run of preachers in his conception of the scope, and his

estimate of the capabilities, of the pastoral office; and further, that the members of his congregation were fortunate in being tended by a shepherd entertaining so sensible a view of "the pure religion of heaven" as to bring it within the region of moral principles, and the faithful, disinterested discharge of duties which confront us in Time instead of confounding it with the profession of certain dogmatic beliefs, stimulated by rapturous anticipations of joys that may or may not be in store for us in Eternity. On turning, however, from our author's prefatory observations to the "Appeals" themselves, the reader is at once translated to a theological atmosphere which, to any but the rigidly orthodox, must appear stifling and even pestilent. Mr. Sutherland's Christianity, in truth, is of the lowest conceivable type, and would, as it appears to us, be much more consistently professed by a worshipper of Odin or Juggernaut than by a disciple of Him who preached the Sermon on the Mount and propounded the parable of the Prodigal Son. He conceives of man as a naturally depraved and miserable wretch whose only chance of deliverance from the wrath of God and an eternity of suffering, is in his grovelling reliance on the blood of Christ as the divinely-appointed sacrifice for the sins of mankind; of God, as a stern, inexorable autocrat offering salvation to men on terms which, if rejected, will involve them in the ever-accumulating terrors of his vengeance; and as for the Universe, Mr. Sutherland can only regard it as a sort of stage whereon the great drama of *Paradise Lost and Regained* is being played out to its denouement of a general conflagration and a final division of souls between the Lord of Heaven and his rival of the Bottomless Pit. On these lurid and exciting topics the reverend gentleman evidently loves to dwell, and that, too, with a repulsiveness of illustration and a glibness of phraseology which are unspeakably painful to more refined spiritual tastes. Truth to say, there is hardly one of the 260 pages over which the "Appeals" extend, that is not blotched by a blasphemy or blurred by a threat of hell-fire. In one place the Deity is compared to a cunning and bloodthirsty leopard; in another, to a furious bear anxious to "rend the caul" of the sinner's heart; in another, to a devouring lion; and in another he is described as driving sinners into hell while the devil drags them on before. We are willing to believe that Mr. Sutherland is not unaccustomed to speak to his people of the Almighty as a God of love whose goodness and mercy are over all his works, but how conceptions of this order are to be reconciled with such delineations of the Supreme Being as we are about to quote, confounds our sense of consistency.

"God says that he will fear; that he will rend; that he will devour. These expressions surely have some meaning. Must we not interpret them as indicating that God will handle his foes with great wrath and determined energy? The time for reasoning, expostulation and entreaty is now over; mercy and forbearance give place to justice, and God suffers the full consciousness of the sinner's guilt and peril to burst upon him. Agony the most intense now seizes him. His soul is torn with anguish. Conscience stirs the fires of imagination, and the most terrific pictures of interminable woe are held up before him. Every feature is distorted, every faculty distracted, and above the loudest wailings of despair rise unceasing self-criminations. This heart-rending is not the bare effect of the full realisation of guilt before God, but is also the result of the positive curse of God, a spiritual infliction which terribly lacerates the soul. Pronounced accursed, he is driven from the presence of the Lord, and violently thrust down to hell. There the flames of perdition surround him—they consume him—they everlastingly feed upon him. Thus our God, who is a consuming fire, devours his enemies. O is it not a fearful thing to fall unpardoned, unholy, hell-deserving into the hands of the living God."

Undoubtedly, at least if we are to think of the Almighty as the savage and remorseless fiend which the debauched imagination of the author of "Urgent Appeals" has here portrayed him. In nowise reluctant, however, to finish his picture of the final judgment Mr. Sutherland is, it seems, in a position to inform us that to the sinner thus sentenced

"The infernal hosts will afford neither help nor sympathy. On them, as accursed, the same resistless stroke shall fall, and notwithstanding their great superiority in might, they sink to the same depths of perdition as their deluded victims of Adam's race. The heavenly hosts will proffer neither counsel nor support. On the contrary, they will be actively employed in the punishment of the wicked. Whither will the condemned turn? The fires of vengeance rage ail around. One avenue is open—it is the descent into hell. Down this burning passage the lost soul is hurried, and the smoke of the pit hides from our view the unutterable horrors which now overwhelm him."

Our author, again, in his zeal for genuine orthodoxy, is careful to disclaim connection with those namby-pamby Christians who, "carried away by mistaken and partial views of the divine character, deny a place of future punishment." To trace the hell of the false and ungodly soul to the stings of conscience, which, with the shuffling off of this mortal coil, and the translation of our spiritual consciousness to other and purer spheres of existence, may become indefinitely cutting, is, in his opinion, to trifle with God's revealed Word, and to set at naught its clearest affirmations. Hell, thinks Mr. Sutherland, to be worthy of the name, must be local and tangible; must have its material masses of flame wherewith to fasten and feed on the material bodies of the damned. He informs us that

"The body is a constituent part of the human person. Hence the human being is not complete in a

disembodied state. Neither redemption nor damnation is perfect till after the resurrection. The body must go to share the bliss or woe of the soul. . . . The torments of hell shall be so far material as to affect a material body. A fire there is, unquenchable, eternal, fitted to torture, but not consume—a fire so penetrating as to reach the inmost recesses of the soul, and throw its flaming folds around them, and yet so material as to feed upon the reformed material body. O horror of horrors! a human being, body and soul, enveloped in the unquenchable flames of Jehovah's wrath!"

But a truce to these blasphemies. We have devoted more of our space than was at first intended to Mr. Sutherland and these precious "Appeals" of his; but we have, at all events, fulfilled a duty in not allowing his execrable version of the Christian religion to be promulgated in "these southern regions" without a challenge and a protest. We hold his views of God, of man, and of the relation subsisting between the two, to be as false as they are abominable; and all the more so, as being propagated in the name of him whose pure and exalted religious philosophy was as far removed from the popular Christianity of modern times, as pole is from pole. J. P.

The Divorce Question.

IN the minds of a considerable class Divorce and Scripture are as inseparably bound up together as the Old and New Testaments in the family Bible. Now this is a prejudice which, however respectable in its origin, is only entitled to as much notice as mere prejudice should commonly claim. There is a *religio* of the present day even, so intimately associated with our ordinary habits of reflection and operations of the mind, that it becomes harder with increasing years to dislodge it from its position. First impressions of thought, like those of personal appearance, are often fondly clung to; we do not like to give them up, from a sense of implied reflection on our discernment; and so in proportion to the pain and mortification felt at friendship violated, or at confidence misplaced, is the feeling of injured mental pride and self-conceit at being obliged to renounce at last what the bias of education has taught us to maintain. The man of sober mind commonly avoids a singularity of thought as he would an eccentricity in dress, forgetting that an important principle may often be involved in undue concession to another's sentiment, and that ease of mind may be utterly wrecked in slavishly deferring to the opinion of others.

The adversaries of the Divorce Bill now before the Legislature may all the time then be battling with a shadow while they fancy they are fighting for a principle. They may be knights of La Mancha tilting at wine skins while they imagine themselves conservators of domestic virtue. For if they base their objections to the Bill on scriptural grounds, the burden of proof lies at their door : *semper præsумitur pro neganti*. And affirmed it may be, without any hesitation or ambiguity, that Scripture has nothing whatever to do with the question in any one of its bearings. Divorce is wholly and entirely a civil matter, and should be dealt with as such. And why it should be so treated, is from the utter absence of any legitimate proof of the prohibition of divorce in the biblical writings. Had any incontrovertible testimony existed of the opposite kind we may rest well assured the opponents of the measure would have been ready enough to bring them forward. They have not done so. And in the mean time ample evidence is being furnished in the old country of the beneficial action of such a law when judiciously, decorously, and for sufficient reasons allowed. To appeal to the Bible as adverse to divorce, in the face of a somewhat crowding list of scripture incidents which it is unnecessary to particularise, is simply to laugh at us. We recognise no reason why the darkness of yesterday should overcloud the light of to-day; or why, when the Legislature steps in to redress the wearing and more private troubles of its members, it should be charged with loose aims and iniquitous practices.

It is not good for man to be alone. So far men of all climes and creeds are fully persuaded. The expediency of marriage, and its consequent obligations, are for the most part as unreservedly admitted. The common sense of civilised humanity urges the need of the former, and the commonweal of society the policy and necessity of the latter. Here and so far we are all on common ground, professing one great unity of thought and similarity of action. As for the exceptional cases that Socialism and Mormonism would seem to offer, we need hardly linger on those whims of humanity that crop up from time to time like the eccentricities in human character. From the time of the Essenes, the Flagellants, and Fanatics of Munster, we have seen as it were these moral pustules breaking out upon the surface of society, tending, we may well believe, in the course of time, to clear the religious constitution and induce a more healthy tone. On marriage, then, and its high political import, small diversity of opinion is ever likely to exist. The educational prejudice that would stamp its origin with divine sanction is after all very harmless. The stickler for facts might of course point to those early days when even Constantine thought it policy to secure ecclesiastical countenance to his measures, and to concede to the clergy the privilege of performing a marriage ceremony. Hitherto there had been little more than a personal compact, terminable but too often at the roving fancy of a dissolute partner. And even after this, the marriage obligation

needed the more stringent code of a Theodosius to counteract that rude selfishness and laxity which, however natural, must in the long run be prejudicial to the State. And the truth of this we find fully admitted in the policy that marked all after government. Recognising fully, as statesmen did, the absolute necessity of some marriage tie, indissoluble except by the power that enacted its celebration, they were willing enough to grant the boon of solemnisation to the clergy under an implied assurance of general support. By doing this they both evinced a wholesome respect for the ignorant prejudices around them, and conferred a graceful compliment on that ever-fermenting clerical body whose ordinary lust of wealth and personal consideration is only to be equalled by their lust of power. The policy so wisely earned out by our ancestors is the policy we have since endorsed, and one that every civil society is likely to perpetuate.

Assuming then, on the above grounds, that the marriage rite is due in its integrity to state enactment, that otherwise the union of the sexes would, for a long interval at least, have been little more than what the old Roman poet tells us was the procedure of an early age—

"Et Venus in silvis jungebat corpora amantum :
Conciliabat enim vol mutua quamque cupido,
Vel violenta viri vis atque impensa libido,
Vel pretium, glandes atque arbuta, vel pira lecta"

we proceed briefly to maintain that what a state at one time has had the power to enact, it also has, at another time, the power to modify. If the state out of consideration for the general body see fit to restrain the licence of the individual by compelling him to conform to such laws and observances as shall promote his own well-being and that of others, no doubt it can legitimately do so. And with equally acknowledged right can it afterwards introduce such alleviations as may seem called for either by the more advanced civilisation of the age, or by the reiterated requests of a no inconsiderable body of silent petitioners. It is not the four or five closely printed columns of a member's speech—the cullings of any commonplace book or cyclopaedia—that will set a question like this at rest; nor will it avail to grub among the rubbish of bygone centuries, or the dusty folios of modern precedents, to teach us a policy meet for our own. "While history may be philosophy teaching by example, it cannot and does not lay down any rule of conduct that shall be equally applicable to all classes at all times. As we look around us, and see Nature's whole aspect ever undergoing change—mountains worn down, rivers diverted, coast lines altered, continents upheaved or depressed and these going on, it may be slowly, but with undeviating persistency, is it reasonable to suppose that human thought is alone to remain inactive, or be crushed under the weight of a bugbear of ecclesiastical precedent?

A young, but a would-be paternal, legislature is laudably anxious to relieve its people; and reflecting how domestic grievances need careful handling, especially when originating neither in wantonness nor lust, is endeavouring to frame a Matrimonial Causes Bill that holds out some succour and redress to suffering claimants, and in cases of well supported evidence, absolute exemption from the marriage tie. The woman's social position is very frequently one as undeserved as it is painful, and we cannot imagine why, because her adultery may be more eventful than that of the man, the disabilities under which she has hitherto laboured should be used as an argument to her prejudice. A good-intentioned legislature is supposed to act impartially, not insisting so much collectively on their sexual superiority, as they may do individually in the more contracted sphere of private life. To grant a wronged and outraged woman mere exemption from bed and board is, in our eyes, to mock her. It is not dealing fairly by her. She has her natural instincts as well as the man, and should be able in her hour of social disgrace and mortification, to look upon the legislature *in loco parentis*, and to expect an aid that shall at least alleviate what it cannot nullify. That the man should profit by his own wrong is surely contrary to the first principles of law. That the woman should be cut off from all the kindly feelings and influences of home, to be allowed to pine and eat her heart away, is no less so.

While our law-givers should be fair-dealing, they may be also inexorably just. So impartial, in fact, consistently with sound wisdom and plain common sense, that the very impartiality of their sentence should act as one of the greatest checks on the vice more particularly in question. Both history and poetry abound—heaven knows!—with evidence of woman's passion, and her headstrong impulses; and we shall not go out of our way to dispute such evidence, proffered as it generally is by the stronger and less impressionable sex. "What we would summarily conclude is this, that legislation cannot possibly provide for every phase of criminality, whether in man or woman. It can only deal with the more salient points in each case, and finally generalise for the good of all. If we would willingly lighten the hitherto unduly pressing burden of the woman, we would also punish her delinquency with stern severity. Should she be tempted—we care not now—to forget her position as a wife, and her duty as a mother, we would have her sin, when it has found her out, to lie at her own door, and be a burden on her own back. But let her rights as a woman be fairly recognised, and her weakness not be used

as a weapon to slay her. Secured by legal enactment from the life-in-death torture of being chain-bound to a partner whose moral code may be as loose as his habits are filthy, the woman's nature becomes ennobled by a conscious feeling of personal independence and of increased self-respect—powerful incentives to female caution. But let her once break her marriage vow and desecrate the name of wife, she would be one in our eyes for whom no after expression of public opinion would be too severe, though its spirit were well-nigh that of Draco, and the judgment dealt out to her that of a Rhadamanthus.

The priesthood, it may be observed, are generally adverse to the measure. We are sorry to see it. It scarcely needs this additional disregard for the feelings and exigencies of an aggrieved class, to increase the cordiality of dislike which they stupidly seem to encourage, and which will certainly bear fruit some later day. Insisting as they do on marriage being a divinely hallowed rite, and that they alone are the channels for its celebration, they forget how their very credentials emanate from the Civil Chamber, and how their priestly authority is a mere permissive agency. Years ago, for good and sufficient reasons, the Imperial Parliament legalised marriage before a Registrar. Who will pronounce such marriages invalid, or seek to disparage them on the score of their not possessing the established gloss? If a state has thought it good to do so much, who shall impugn its doing more; and its being indifferent to the sectarian clamour of a class who, with whatever claims on our respect and consideration so long as they confine themselves to the more peculiar arcana of their profession, "are and have ever been of all mankind" (to adopt the remark of Clarendon) "they who form the very worst estimate of human affairs." Quilibet.

The Church Catechism.

THE expression "crammed with catechism" is enough to raise a prejudice against a process of instruction but little recommended by its general results; and it is not to be wondered at that the Church Catechism should be regarded with especial objection by many people to whom it stands, in their ignorance of it, as the typo of hard theological cramming. Even in the Church of England there must be thousands who bear prejudice against it as the plague of many a grievous hour of their childhood. Retaining the impressions of those days, they care no more to investigate the meaning of what was then most unmeaning than to peruse again the meagre sentences of their Latin Delectus. Yet let an impartial reader take up this brief compendium of Christian doctrine and duty, and he will acknowledge that after being vexed with the broils and litigations of the modern church, it is most refreshing to turn to this catholic page, in which there is not found one uncharitable word against other men's belief, nor a single expression that might make religion repulsive.

For the information of those who have not "learned all that is here appointed for them to learn," it may be stated that the Church Catechism is divided into two sections, wholly different in character. The first section, the composition of which is attributed to Cranmer and Ridley, treats of the Covenant of Baptism, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. The second section, prepared in the reign of James I. by Dr. Overall, Bishop of Norwich, explains the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The difference in the tone of the two portions is equivalent to the difference between the hearty plainness of the early Reformation and the word-mongering taste which the later Church acquired through the influence of Geneva.

Whatever objection may be taken to the catechetical method of instruction, it is certain that the few questions in the Church Catechism are delightfully spontaneous and real. One would think that the writer had improvised the little dialogue as an example of quiet, pious talk between a pastor and some godly youth. There is a kindly humour at the very opening where, in answer to the question, What is your name? the generic cognomen of the catechumen is feigned to be, not A or B, formal and prosaic, some typical Adam standing for all who come after, but N or M, warm from the very centre of the alphabet. In three modest questions, the pastor next draws from his young friend an account of his having been baptised, of the benefits he gained thereby, of the vows which his good sponsors then under-took for him, and of his manly desire to relieve them now of their responsibility. In these answers, which we need not quote, how unobtrusive is the scheme of a good life as here set forth by the patriarchs of the Reformation. There is an outer world, not described, but to be vaguely thought of as a grandeur-loving, bubble-seeking, frivolous and wicked world where into each of us is born. By the pious arms of loving friends, we, N or M, are carried to some sacred house, where the baptismal water sprinkled on us separates us by a mysterious efficacy from the fortunes of that outer world, and gives us part and lot in all the blessings granted by God to the fold of Christ. Our sponsors promise for us, and as we grow they teach us, to renounce the devil and his works, the pomps and vanities of the wicked world, and the sinful lusts of the flesh. When we come to years of discretion and power we take these vows upon ourselves, and in reply to the inquiry whether we do not feel bound to fulfil them, say "Yes verily, and by God's help so I

will. And I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that he hath called me to this state of salvation, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me his grace that I may continue in the same unto my life's end." Do we ever hear young people speak in such fashion? No. Yet this is not a cant put into their mouths. It is what many of them feel at the generous season of their lives. It is the modest language of pious hope and high purpose, very different from the reply we should expect to hear from an evangelical young man of to-day.

Yet notwithstanding its superiority over modern theories of the religious life in its catholic reserve and sense of direct, personal obligation to God, there are two errors in the teaching of the Catechism which prevent us from accepting it as a doctrine for these days. The special virtue attributed to baptism is one error; the circumvallation of a Church within the world is another. Perhaps the idea that salvation by the Ark prefigured baptism suggested the connected idea of separation and snug safety within the boundaries of the Church, and such ideas would accord with the general desire for security engendered by the fear of man and the dread of nature in the old times of lawlessness and ignorance. But the progress of Society has altered our conceptions. We cannot now imagine a Church distinct from the world such as existed in apostolic days, and as the ecclesiastical mind of three centuries back believed, or tried to make believe, existed then. As a consequence, we cannot imagine how baptism can make or unmake. We see around us daily some who were baptised, and others unbaptised, between whom certainly there is no corresponding difference of spiritual attainment and habit such as ought to be noticeable, in a sufficiently wide area of observation, if any efficacy attended the ceremony. As an impressive inaugural rite in the case of adults, or as a solemn influence on the hearts of parents in the case of infants, there is a value in baptism, but not an effect of the kind assumed in the Catechism, where it is said to make us members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. Such as baptism is said to make us, we assuredly are, or may become, without it. Otherwise (and this is an appeal to those whom such references affect) we should not expect to read that "Jesus himself baptised not, but his disciples," and that Paul was glad for certain reasons he had baptised so few converts at Corinth.

If there be no longer a key to the Church, but any can enter or depart at will, it is obvious that subsequent ceremonies can have in themselves little virtue. When the very act that makes a potential Christian can be dispensed with (if the act of baptism may be inoffensively spoken of thus), surely all other institutions may be dispensed with or varied as may best assist the spiritual life. The theory of baptism as an essential means, and of the Select Church as the special repository, of grace was fittingly held, and without reservation, by the men of Cranmer's day, and was therefore appropriately introduced into the Catechism. But it is contrary to the growing faith of the present era in the direct communication of the Divine Spirit with the human soul to suppose that such a theory can long continue to be held, or taught when not held. The sudden success of ritualism may induce some of us to think that a belief in the spiritual privileges of a visible church is reviving; but those take a limited view who compare party with party in the ecclesiastical world, losing sight of the scattered myriads of religious men outside that world, daily increasing in numbers, who do not believe in leading an exclusive life to gain an exclusive heaven.

Looking then generously at the position of N or M, let him give heed to the questioning of his venerable friend. He is asked to rehearse the articles of his belief, and in reply repeats the Apostle's Creed, deducing from it as its chief lesson the doctrine of the Trinity, and the respective offices of the persons of the Trinity as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. To doubt the tenets of this creed is to doubt the universal faith of orthodox Christendom; notwithstanding which, it may be allowable to doubt whether the meaning of each item is distinctly appreciated by the millions who repeat it every Sunday. In any case it is a better, as being a briefer, statement than its amplifications in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; but the very existence of these latter testifies to the difficulty felt by clever men in ancient times in coming to a plain understanding of so simple a creed as the original one. Can there be less difficulty in modern times for ordinary men whose embarrassed intellects find no assistance either in science or in the new freedom of interpretation? possibly the reverse. The modern may explain his own belief as best he can, and vindicate the general utility of creeds in embalming truths that have lost their life. We will not challenge N or M for rehearsing a creed which, in his own way, he no doubt believed. Let him go on.

His godfathers and godmothers had promised for him that he should keep God's Commandments; he is asked how many there be. He answers, Ten, and repeats the Ten Commandments from 20th chapter of Exodus. Though a religious sceptic may think that where reasons and motives are assigned in this catalogue they are not the highest which might be given, yet, sceptical to whatever extent he may be, he cannot deny the greatest value in these commandments historically to the world or presently to the individual. It has been objected that they are negative, and enjoin duty by an inference; but the inference is so obvious that one need not cavil at their form, the more especially if we consider, what is often overlooked, that it would not be possible to express moral laws of so large a scope in a positive form. The negative, Thou shalt not steal, is a more distinct command than its positive, Thou shalt be honest. Brevity, which is essential to good law, is to be obtained by a sweeping prohibition, which overrides a thousand affirmations. A pencil stroke, small as may be, upon a broad

white sheet, makes more conspicuous by its negation the whole surface which it contradicts. There may be offences which the Ten Commandments only indirectly touch. There may be a higher service of love, which asks what is enjoined by the spirit, not what is forbidden by the letter; yet the greater must include the less, and so far as its laws are based on the absolute right, to that extent must the Decalogue be included in every higher rule of duty. Let us rejoice that N or M has learned it by rote, if not by heart, for he may in after years become evangelical or ritualistic, and it may do him good, in the days when his piety shall be only sentimental or picturesque, to have the voice of Sinai in his ears in his daily business and his social walk.

When the stigma of "mere morality" is cast upon Christians who are not orthodox—an equivalent merely for Christians who are in the minority—we do not know where better they could lay hands upon a defence than in the exposition next given by N or M of the duty to one's neighbour, a corollary from what is known as the second table of the Law. There are many to whom this exposition is "familiar as a household word;" probably it is as much regarded. There are many who have never heard it, who should borrow a Book of Common Prayer and read it. It is unmistakeable piety, goodness, and good sense. There may be a difficulty now-a-days as to the canon of passive obedience, but this can be glided over, and the injunction to "order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters" may cause a smile. Though truly "my betters" may have a grander significance than the writer meant, in which newer sense a seasonable humility might often be a grace in most of us. The repetition of the Lord's Prayer, and a short running explanation of it closes the Shorter Catechism, and here our notice comes to an end too.

In speaking favorably as we have done of a production of the sixteenth century, we have not forgotten that the kindly-tempered author must have had a belief in many things, some of them probably harsh enough, which his judgment or his heart would not compel upon the tender mind. Happy were it for the childhood of church-going Christendom now if it were vexed with no more irrational teaching than this unpretentious text book sets forth. Far removed as its conception of Christianity may be from the catholic views of the liberal churches of the present day, it is equally far removed from the poor literalism and ungenial temper of prevailing orthodoxy. The ideal Church as pictured in the Catechism, arises before the eye of our imagination, limited in knowledge, shut up within itself, yet trusting in God and doing its duty as it knew how; while the actual modern Church, with revelations of Science streaming upon it continually, and every evidence guiding to a simpler faith, a deeper trust, an enlarged work, is making its creeds more fantastic, its ceremonies more artificial, and is multiplying, in things of the sense and in things of the spirit, the obstacles to the coming of the one great Kingdom.
Spes.

Correspondence.

Rationalism.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Although thoroughly interested in the success of the *Free Religious Press*, I am willing to see it subjected to the most searching criticism. But some principle of honor ought to be observed, and I should have taken no notice of the attack of the Rev. J. Burke, but for its gross unfairness. I shall quote his own words, which will be found to carry with them their own refutation. "Why," he says, in reply to Mr. Gordon, "have recourse to the expressed sentiments of the supporters of the new phase of religion, and hold them up as a bugbear to frighten the ignorant and timid? Will Mr. Gordon undertake to show that the Public Schools Act has been framed to encourage this new phase of religion? or that the administrators of the Act are tainted with it? When he shows this it will be admitted his arguments are not without foundation, and his warning note to religious teachers not a false alarm." . . . And further on he observes, "I make no nice distinction between Roman Catholic and Protestant, yet I am free from the taint of the new phase of religion."

Now, before committing himself to so sweeping a condemnation, the Rev. Mr. Burke ought surely to have taken the trouble to ascertain what the principles of the *Free Religious Press* really are. But he did nothing of the kind, it seems. On the contrary, he openly avows "*I do not receive or read the Free Religious Press.*" Mr. Burke has not even observed the formalities of fair play and read the *Free Religious Press* for himself, having resolved to condemn it be its principles what they may. It is, however, scarcely the thing for a clergyman to decline to study the opinions of others simply because they are not his own, and yet arrogate to himself a right to sit in judgment on them.

But Rationalism is evidently the *beté noir* of the Rev. Mr. Burke's theology. For he says, "Why not take up

the Public Schools Act, or the books authorised by the Council of Education, and show by extracts from them there can be no religious teaching under the Act; that the principle on which it is founded is *Rationalism, or some other equally obnoxious ism.*"

I should like to know what the rev. gentleman's definition of Rationalism really is, and what harm in the world *a little* Rationalism could possibly be in the Public Schools—or even in the Church, where its absence is so pain-fully visible? He evidently treats Rationalism as he has treated the *Australian Free Religious Press*, that is, by *neither receiving nor reading* anything on the subject. Otherwise, how could he forget that during the whole of the eighteenth century and the first thirty years of the nineteenth, the Church of England was professedly, and, so to speak, officially rationalistic? Surely Mr. Burke must be familiar with the fact that some of the most eminent laymen, and all the most eminent theologians and bishops of the Church during the above period were divines of the rationalistic type? What was Addison, the glory of English literature, but a rationalist? What was Locke, the author of the "Essay on the Human Understanding," and one of the most religious of men, but the Prince of Rationalists? And then we have the names of such eminent men as Bishop Gibson, Dean Prideaux, Dr. Rogers, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Butler, Paley, Warburton, Lardner, and Archbishop Whately. Crowds of other names might be mentioned, but these will suffice for our present purpose.

In defending Rationalism, it is not necessary to hold that *it* and religion are equivalent terms. I put forward no such doctrine. If the Church of England was for upwards of a hundred years prevailingly rationalistic, the result can clearly be traced to her attitude of exclusiveness towards the non-conforming sects. Nor is it to be wondered at that Rationalism in being propounded by her as the "be all and end all" of religion should have palled on the taste; but then to pass with big recoil from setting an exaggerated value upon it, to wholesale repudiation, is outrageously inconsistent, and but a fresh exemplification of the narrowness of the theological spirit; all the more indefensible considering the great services Rationalism has rendered in defending the human mind from the ecclesiastical confusion of an arrogant and fantastic Puritanism, as well as from the degrading vassalage of a blind faith.

If ever the Church of England comes to the front, not as a great social and political, but as a great moral power, it will be under the guidance of such men as the new Bishop of Exeter—Dr. Temple. True Dr. Pusey terms him a wolf in the fold, and the Right Rev. Hugh McNeile, a leper. This but reminds us how the priests of his day scattered the ashes of Wycliffe to the winds. We have much to hope for from Dr. Temple. His ordination sermon contains a profession of principles which the *Australian Free Religious Press* will cordially adopt and support, although not necessarily in the same form. "There are," said the Right Rev. Prelate, "two sources of Divine revelation—the revelation of physical truths through the intellect, and the revelation of spiritual truths through the conscience." Here is a burst of sunshine, as unexpected in a Protestant Prelate of our degenerate days, as thunder in a cloudless and serene sky. Will it prove continuous? Or shall we be compelled to say in the language of Wordsworth

. "welcome light,
Dawns in the East; but dawns to disappear;
And mocks me with a sky that ripens not
Into a steady morning."

W. B.

The Bible Society in Nubibus.

To the Editor.

SIR,—At the late meeting of the New South Wales Auxiliary Bible Society, the Rev. H. H. Gaud, in commenting on the enormous number of Bibles (the gross total being fifty-seven millions odd) which the Society had thrown into circulation, observed that he knew of no means of ascertaining the good that had been thus accomplished, but that eternity would doubtless disclose it. A suggestive confession, I must say. Does it not betray a suspicion in the minds of even the most orthodox religionists that the Bible after all is not the universal medicine it is generally assumed to be? Surely the next step will be to discover that civilisation should, in the natural order of things, precede Christianisation, or, at least, go hand-in-hand with it; and then, perhaps, the further discovery will be made that Christianity of the evangelical type is, in some respects, as much in need of purification from religious error as the heathen religions it at present so sedulously aims to supplant. Dr. Colenso's sceptical Zulu assuredly does not stand alone. The Hindoo thinks he may as well

believe in his Trinity of Brahma, Vishnou and Seva as in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost of the Christian missionary. The Chinese thinks he may as well worship his ancestors as accept the doctrine of Incarnation or Adoration of Saints. The South Sea Islander with difficulty realises the difference between the worship of a stone and that of a crucifix or a piece of bread. Christians are too much in the habit of assuming that their own system is spotlessly pure and true, as that, of the savages they would convert is wholly corrupt and false; whereas the truth of the matter clearly is that Christianity itself is but one of many connected phases of the religious sentiment, all of which, though primarily and inherently good, are liable to suffer debasement. There is, at any rate, a fine catholicity of spirit in Max M'Ilcr's observation, that we should sometimes "shut our eyes against many things which are revolting to us in the religion of the Chinese or the wild American, and try to discover, as well as we can, how even in these degraded forms of worship a spark of light is hidden somewhere—a spark which may lighten and warm the heart of the Gentiles, who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality."

How, again, can Mr. Gaud expect thoughtful men to assist in promoting a scheme the upshot of which is after all so very problematical? Surely no statesman or man of business would think of hazarding his time, energy and means upon an enterprise a display of the fruit of which was dependent upon the disclosures of an unknown eternity. The Bible enthusiasts are alone required to do this; and, moreover, to shut their eyes to the fact that the Bible, through the false and irrational theories which men have held concerning it, has wrought incalculable mischief to mankind as well as incalculable good. The slave-holder takes his stand upon it; so does the persecutor; so does the witch-burner; so does the Sabbatarian. If eternity alone can disclose the good the Bible has accomplished, it is but too clear that time reveals no small amount of the mischief.

When will ecclesiastics recognise and give honorable publicity to the fact that the Bible is but one of many noble moral text-books which the great Secular Providence has placed at the service of mankind, and that over and above all these is a book—the Book of Nature—upon the pages of which the humblest as well as the highest find no difficulty in tracing the imprimatur of the Supreme? There may we contemplate his love—for he makes his rain to fall on the just and on the unjust: his equity—for retribution as surely follows the sinner as decay follows death: his truth—in the ever unfolding revelations of science: his power and wisdom—for the universe is full of them. When, in a word, shall we be delivered from the superstitions, ancient and modern, that so grievously oppress us, and introduced to the glorious liberty of "the religion of God without priests?" Wiremu Ima.

The Prostration of Reason.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In a recent number of the *Spectator* I find a letter containing a very remarkable statement as to the religious belief of the late Professor Faraday. According to the writer, that eminent philosopher being asked how he, being such a man as he was, could still retain the creed which he professed to believe, replied in the following terms: "I prostrate my reason in these matters; if I were to reason on these questions as I do on scientific subjects, I should become an unbeliever." Now, Sir, I have no quarrel with the truthfulness of this assertion; so far from it, I think these few words of the illustrious professor contain the only and sufficient explanation of the fact, that in this year of grace, 1870, the old-established creeds are able to boast of some remains of life and strength even amongst educated people. But it seems to me very strange that forms of belief which require the prostration of reason, should pretend to be based to a great extent upon the writings of a man so singularly argumentative as the Apostle Paul. May not this be explained by the fact that students of theology are taught to pick out texts which are in favour of their foregone conclusions, and to ignore all that make on the other side? There is, however, one question to which I should like to have an answer from the champions of orthodoxy: What is the use of all the vast expenditure of money by the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, by the various Missionary Societies, and the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, in order to extend the influence of creeds which require a prostration of reason? Why, Sir, if I prostrate my body on the ground, I would as soon be run over by a baker's cart as by a gentleman's buggy. And if my reason is to be prostrate, it may as well be so before Mahomet as before the Pope, before Buddha as before Calvin. And with what face can missionaries call upon Hindoos, Chinese, Malays and Maories to give up their so-called false gods? How can missionaries prove them to be false? They may call them stocks and stones, but what then? If reason is prostrate, why should not men worship stocks and stones? The savage man (if he were but a reader of the *Spectator*) might look the missionary in the face and say: "You call me foolish for worshipping this image. Well; but your great Christian medicine-man owned himself a fool in his worship; he prostrated his reason, and why should not I? So in worship we are all fools together; as your father worshipped, so do you; as my father worshipped, so do I—say no more." Can the orthodox Christian answer this savage? I think not. It is

easier to call names than to answer arguments; and perhaps the use of vituperation instead of argument is a striking characteristic of the prostration of reason.

Nicodemus.

You look upon the gospel as it stands as the divinest truth; but an audible voice, from heaven would not convince me, that water burns and fire quenches and that a dead man comes to life; on the contrary, I hold this to be blaspheming against the great God and his revelation in nature. To you, nothing is more beautiful than the gospel; to me, a thousand written pages of ancient and modern men are equally beautiful, as well as useful and indispensable to mankind.—*Goethe*.

I cannot call it anything else than an injustice and a robbery, that you pluck out every precious feather from the whole winged creation under heaven, as if they had been usurped, for the purpose of adorning your bird of Paradise exclusively. This is a proceeding which must necessarily offend and appear insufferable to us who are devoted scholars of every utterance of wisdom revealed by and to man, to us who, as sons of God, adore Him in ourselves and in all his children.—*Goethe*.

Piety leaves false things standing, and, therefore, I hate it.—*Goethe*.

So long as Christianity is considered as something given from without, its Author as literally heaven-descended, the Church as a machinery for procuring the expiation of human offences through His blood, Christianity, though claiming to be the religion of the Spirit, must remain unspiritual, and in fact Jewish. Only when it is seen that in Christianity man did but become more deeply conscious of his own true nature, that Jesus was the individual in whom the deeper consciousness first became a supreme all-pervading influence, that redemption means but the advent of such a disposition and its inward adoption as our very life-blood, then only is Christianity really and thoroughly understood.—*Strauss*.

With all his doubts he never doubted God;
But from doubt gathered truth, like snow from cloud,
The most, and whitest, from the darkest.

—*P. J. Bailey*.

Editorial Notices.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, May 2, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 5. June 6, 1870.

Notes.

A THRILL of holy pride and joy must have been sent through the soul of every good Australian churchman by the speech of Dr. Marsden on the day of his installation at Bathurst. "They were all aware," said the new prelate, "how highly the Bishop of Sydney was esteemed in this colony, but they did not know how deep was the regard felt for him in England. He was held in the highest appreciation at home, and he was frequently referred to as the wisest man in the Archbishop of Canterbury's diocese, and a wish had often been expressed that he could be translated to the English Bench." For fifteen long years this incarnation of wisdom, this cynosure of British ecclesiastical thought, compared with whom the scholarly Thirlwall, the crafty Philpotts,

and the saponaceous Wilberforce fade away into insignificance, has been wasting his spiritual fragrance on a very desert air. With the modesty which is characteristic of true greatness he has refrained from exhibiting his exalted merits to a vulgar and unappreciative gaze, and has meekly submitted to be looked upon by the mass of the people as a very commonplace colonial bishop. This reserve we may deplore, but we cannot censure that which doubtless is true apostolic humility. What language however can be invented which shall fitly describe the base conduct of English editors! Hireling scribes, who, suborned perhaps by some ambitious and unscrupulous aspirant to a seat on the right reverend bench, systematically suppress in their reports of parliamentary intelligence, of the proceedings in convocation, and other ecclesiastical meetings, those bursts of admiration of Bishop Barker's wisdom which are often to be heard, while they do not hesitate to give prominence on all possible occasions to any mention of such a black heretic as Colenso! It is humiliating to have to admit that the only allusion to the Bishop of Sydney within our recollection in any English paper appeared in the London *Spectator* nearly two years ago, when the good prelate was rudely and unfeelingly quizzed for having, in a noble burst of loyalty, just a week after the Clontarf tragedy, declared that "their grief and shame and horror must ever remain undiminished;" and that "there were many fathers in this community who, since the dreadful crime had been committed, did not dare to look their own offspring in the face, for very shame to think that their children should have been born in a country, the shores of which had been stained with the blood of the Queen's son." It is no small comfort to turn from this sublime, but soul-subduing picture of episcopal sorrow, to the *Herald* of May 10th, where we see reported a speech of his lordship at Bathurst quite bristling with jokes. Let us hope then that his grief is after all somewhat assuaged, and that as the Prince is now happily well and uninjured by the assassin's shot, so the more terrible wound made in the soul of the good bishop may have become cicatrised. If this be so, let us venture further to hope that the fathers of his acquaintance will deign once more to look upon the faces of their hapless and disconsolate offspring.

DR. TEMPLE has made a sad mistake. He knows it, and admits it; although his somewhat weak and vacillating speech in convocation does not by any means convey an ample retraction, or a satisfactory defence of his case. It is painful to read his half admission that *Essays and Reviews* may have done mischief as well as good by the "unsettling of faith," (did not Christ unsettle faith?) or his finely drawn distinctions between the moral obligations of the Bishop of Exeter and those of Frederick Temple, or the cruel way in which he renders quite nugatory his bold assertion of the right of free inquiry by maintaining that the acceptance of the Bible as God's Supreme revelation to man must be our starting point in all religious inquiry. To his honour be it said, however, that as long as his elevation to the Bench was in the least degree doubtful, he was persistently deaf to the beseechings and the threats of those who wished him to repudiate his connection with *Essays and Reviews*; and there can be no question that he spoke in all sincerity when he assured the world that he made the concession because he thought that good men would be grieved by his not doing so. An honest, but, as we think, a very poor reason. Take from amongst those who joined in the chorus of indignation against Dr. Temple's appointment all who were actuated by bigotry, hypocrisy, envy, or malice, and we suspect that few will remain, except those in whom the rational faculties have been completely stilled by the popular theology,—who breathe an atmosphere of faith only, and who, however pure and estimable, should not be allowed to obstruct the progress of truth. Certainly no mercy should be shown to such an insolent and audacious champion of orthodoxy as the Bishop of Litchfield, who, while denouncing the obnoxious work, ostentatiously proclaimed his utter ignorance of its contents! What would this bishop have thought if one of his Maori friends to whom he offered a Bible had contemptuously flung it back with the remark that he wanted no such trash; that he had not read it himself, but had heard that it was about donkeys talking, and men living inside of fishes, and would not waste his time over such nonsense. This would indeed be a shocking exhibition of prejudice, but not a whit worse than that which Bishop Selwyn himself has displayed in the matter of *Essays and Reviews*.

It is never too late to mend: so the *Herald* after conspicuously advertising—of course the "wages of iniquity" will be returned, or at any rate handed over to some deserving institution—"an exhibition of a very disgusting and demoralising character" recently opened in Sydney, suddenly discovers its mistake, and calls upon "the conservators of public morals and decency to suppress the nuisance referred to." We quite agree with the *Herald*. These exhibitions of wax models, got up ostensibly for scientific, but really for most disreputable, purposes are common enough on the other side of the Equator, but we question whether London or Paris contains a display of this sort which for out-and-out filthiness could vie with the one now stationed in Pitt Street. The wonder, in truth, is that the Police, acting under the supervision of the Inspector of nuisances, are not empowered to seize the disgusting contents of these mock physiological museums, and summarily reduce them to wholesome tallow. It was hardly pleasant to see, as we saw the other evening, some hundred or more of young men, many of them in their teens, turning away from the few wholesome models with a hasty glance, and crowding around others which we shall not defile our pages by attempting to describe with a scrutinising puriency of manner which but too clearly indicated how well the projectors of these exhibitions—tickling and debauching as they do the imaginations of young men prior to working upon their fears to the emptying of their

pockets—understand their damnable game. We trust the "Authorities," whoever they are, will demolish the nuisance in question before the mischief is done.

FROM recent English papers we learn that the Rev. Mr. Gilfillan, a Scotch divine of respectable status, a few months since, ventured to opine that the world was not made in six days; whereupon some of his reverend brethren in the interest of orthodoxy and the Book of Genesis, formed themselves into a board for the purpose of dealing with Mr. Gilfillan's heterodoxy. Before this board he appeared, and after disposing of the quantum *sufficit* of humble pie, endeavoured to show what he did and what he did not moan; and, under the cloud of dust thus raised, managed to back out of the difficulty as creditably as circumstances would permit. All parties, therefore, agreed eventually that the world was made in the old orthodox style of six days. But about the same time there appears on the arena a group of philosophers, Professor Huxley, Sir William Thompson, Professor Sylvester, Mr. Monteith, etc., who, in their discussion on geological time, evidently show that they never heard of the six-day Scotch divines. Professor Huxley endeavoured to show that the stratified rocks, estimated at fifty-six and three-quarter miles in depth might have been deposited in one hundred million years if only one eighty-third of an inch of sediment were to be deposited annually. Now the crust of the earth is supposed to be a thousand miles thick, and taking the formation of the balance of the crust at the same rate as the stratified rocks, we have this sum:—If fifty-six and three-quarter miles give one hundred million years, how many years would one thousand miles give? We hand this sum over for the disposal of our juvenile readers, merely remarking that possibly Dean Cowper may in this interesting calculation find an additional proof of the harmony of Science with the book of Genesis.

THE Rev. G. G. Howden has been grubbing, apparently for the first time, among the Biblical Mss., and is able, it seems, on their authority, to rebut "the theory, boldly advanced by the enemies of truth, of the Gospels being a development from facts and teachings of an entirely non-supernatural character." Upon what grounds, the newspaper report of his lecture does not say; but from the intimations given, it is clear that Mr. Howden has fallen into the common mistake of supposing that to establish the authenticity of an ancient document is to verify the events of which it may be the record. Now, we are ready to admit that Christianity is singularly fortunate in possessing manuscript copies of most of the books of the New Testament, dating as far back as the end of the fourth century, but there is no evidence to show that the Vatican or Sinaitic MS. is a reliable transcript of the original writings produced more than three hundred years before; and if there was, is it not surprising to think that well informed and thoughtful men should, on the strength of mere documentary evidence, be ready to believe that living men were ever possessed by demons, or that dead men were ever restored to life? Mr. Howden's notion of the "Christian Evidences" is, indeed, singular, if he imagines that events which are flatly opposed to the teachings of Science are to be taken as genuine matters of fact simply because certain persons, whose brains were teeming with all manner of superstitious fancies and expectations, thought proper, in their ignorance or their enthusiasm, to put them on parchment. Such rotten and antiquated props, as the mass of thoughtful men now clearly see, are not the strength but the weakness of Christianity, much as Mr. Howden and others may think and vociferate to the contrary. As for his sneer at those who cannot agree with him in these matters as "the enemies of truth," there can be little question that, had he lived in the time of Christ, he would have flung the same taunt at his Master—the greatest sceptic, thank Heaven, that ever lived.

THRICE within the last three months has the colony been swept by devastating floods, and numerous have been the suggestions—benevolent, engineering, prudential, economic, etc.—for the alleviation of the consequent distress, and for the prevention of the worst results for the future. It is satisfactory to know, however, that *the* suggestion—to the culpable remissness, we think, of the parties from whom it should have emanated—has at length been made by Mr. E. Butler, of Goulburn. This prophetic genius has, it seems, discovered that the recent floods may be traced to the same causes which brought about "the flood of forty days we read of in Genesis, when God saw the wickedness of man was great in the earth," and who is now, therefore, punishing us, in similar fashion, for "our much unnecessary work on Sundays, our general extravagance, particularly in drink and ladies' dress, our propensities for money-making, and our self-neglect." We are sorry to hear it. Still, as the voice proclaiming this dismal message is not "out of the whirlwind," but merely that of Mr. E. Butler, we may and must rebuke it, as an impious intrusion into the counsels of him whose doings, save as they are revealed to us in the unerring sequence of Cause and Effect which pervades and governs the Universe, are utterly beyond our human scrutiny. Our prophet, how-ever, is clearly not to be gainsaid. He believes, to use his own language, "that the united prayers of a Christian people *can set aside the order of nature*," and, accordingly, calls upon "the leading men, clerical and lay, of our Christian churches," since "the State rulers will not take counsel together," to abase themselves and, as far as possible, the community at large, before an offended God. And why not? The Church of England still retains in her liturgy forms of prayer for Rain and Fair Weather, nor is it for infidels like ourselves to regard them as mere withered branches of the liturgical tree. Why, then, between the flood of March 20 and that of April 26, or between the flood of this latter

date and that of May 12, was not a day of humiliation named? Or, failing a proclamation by His Excellency, why didn't Bishop Barker—we understand that Roman Catholics, much to their credit, do not countenance this wretched superstition—summon his suffragan bishops, the clergy and the laity, to prostrate themselves in solemn prayer and humiliation? Fancy the spectacle of them marching bareheaded through the pitiless rain—no umbrellas allowed, by way of enhancing the effect—to the Cathedral in George street, and dolefully chanting the *De Profundis* or the *Kyrie Eleison*! And then, when, as the result of their supplications, the clouds began to lift, and the sun to show his face again, imagine the big organ pealing forth its *Te Deum*, and the people greeting their cloud-dispelling bishop as the favourite of Heaven and the benefactor of his country! What an effect! The abolition of state-aid, indeed! Why, the paltry and dwindling £20,000, or whatever it is, would at the next meeting of Parliament—Mr. Buchanan himself acquiescing—have been doubled and tripled; while scoffers and unbelievers of every grade would have been silenced for ever. The hierarchy have indeed lost what Mr. Butler terms a "very rare opportunity."

THE newly-arrived Bishop of Bathurst enters upon the discharge of his functions under unusually favourable auspices. He seems to have been brought out under the especial patronage of that excellent churchman, Mr. John Campbell, who a few weeks ago braved the ridicule of his colleagues in the Legislative Council in defence of the Christian verities. We are assured also by the Bishop of Sydney that the previous training of the new prelate was of the right kind, and that his intellect is of such a high order that he stood twelfth in a competitive examination at Cambridge out of one hundred and twenty candidates, ill-health alone preventing him from probably eclipsing the eleven who were above him: a gratifying intimation, but unhappily not verified by the *Cambridge Calendar*, in which we can only discover his name as *one hundred and tenth* in a list of one hundred and thirty-nine. What, however, has mainly contributed to bring the not very exciting topic of a new colonial bishopric into prominent notice on this occasion, is the circumstance that Dr. Marsden is the grandson of a very eminent Australian clergyman, long since deceased, whose merits, we suspect, have been the stepping-stones of the new prelate to episcopal dignity. That excellent divine, whose praises have been sung so often within the last few weeks, has been described as "childlike in humility, angelic in vigour of mind and benevolence, full of enterprise for the good of mankind, and full of faith and reliance on the divine promises." It is melancholy to reflect, however, that in this world, the most immaculate purity of life, and the most self-sacrificing moral heroism are no safeguards against the tongue of the slanderer, or the sneers of the ungodly. It is bad enough that Mr. Wentworth should speak of him as a reverend hypocrite; a crafty, turbulent, and ambitious priest; rancorous and vindictive; one who systematically opposed the education of the poor, the institution of Sunday Schools, the civilisation of the aborigines, and every other philanthropic movement. But it is far worse that one of the most illustrious clergymen of his own church, Sydney Smith, should have been betrayed into picturing him, on the mere authority of Governor Macquarie's statements, as "a little merry bustling clergyman, largely concerned in the sale of rum, and brisk at a bargain for barley!"

THE "Life of the Rev. D. J. Draper" has been placed before the Australian Public, and the Rev. Dr. Cairns, of Melbourne, whom the *Herald* quotes in its Review of the work, is responsible for the statement that the deceased divine was placed on the *London* to sound the last notes of solemn warning in the ears of all in the doomed ship who had hitherto rejected mercy. We say responsible, unable as we are to regard such rash and preposterous decisions as to what Providence means by this or that event as other than a serious religious offence. Placed there by whom? we ask. And if by God, why did He, knowing what was about to happen, allow the *London* to commence her last voyage, or, at least, not move her commander, when the danger became imminent, to head back for Plymouth, instead of driving deeper and deeper into that fatal Atlantic tempest? unless, indeed, Mr. Draper was another Moses, and Captain Martin another Pharaoh, whose heart it was necessary to "harden" in order that the mission of his servant might be accomplished. Eloquent, too, is Dr. Cairns' account of Mr. Draper's demeanour when "in the memorable midnight prayer-meeting he spake a word in season now to one trembling creature, now to another, as he offered Christ to every one, and implored the Lord to convert them ere they passed to their last account." On the point thus mooted there is room, we conceive, for difference of opinion. For ourselves, we cannot help thinking that the presence of a man like Mr. Draper on a disabled and apparently-sinking ship is, to say the least of it, a very questionable advantage. His demeanour on the *London*, as a clergyman of strong evangelical tendencies, was exactly what might have been looked for; but we are not, we suspect, alone in our opinion that the fit of excitement which seized upon Mr. Draper during the last hours of his life was—to say nothing of its paralysing and demoralising effect upon passengers and crew—but a pitiful display of character as compared with that of the first officer, whose hands were on the donkey-engine when the ship gave her final lurch, or with that of the actor, G. V. Brooke, who contemplated the scene with a face full of resignation, and met his fate as a *man* should meet it. With all respect for the memory of the dead, we must venture for the sake of the living to question whether Mr. Draper was as well-prepared for his passage out of this world into the next as were many on the *London*, who, so far from needing his professional services, his offers of mercy and of Christ, must have regarded them as a profane

intrusion upon the solemnity of their last thoughts.

MR. Charles Matthews, of histrionic repute, can, when he likes, be excessively funny; but his humour will not prevent a man here and there, even in this mammon-worshipping community, from estimating his debasing cash-in-hand standard of human effort and achievement at its true worth. Such an ideal of life is bad enough in the young man who has a fair prospect of some day being in a position to "pull down his barns and build greater," but in the old man who, like Mr. Matthews, must, in the natural course of events, quit the *stage* of this world's affairs altogether, it is as sad as it is despicable. As a set-off, however, to his greed of gold we may give our visitor credit for his honesty of speech. Mr. Matthews plainly avows that he is in Australia to get what he can out of us; to make as big a "pile" as possible. But when a parson comes among us, always, of course, at an increased salary, be sure that, in nine cases out of ten, he will take the first opportunity of informing his new flock and the public generally, that he has experienced—to the serious impeachment, we think, of the Spirit, to whom such invitations are invariably attributed—a "call." The fibber!

WE have no desire to charge the reverend gentlemen and others who are promoters of the Servants' Training Institution with an attempt to obtain money on false pretences, but we cannot acquit them of singular carelessness in their mode of placing the scheme before the public. Let any one read the report in the *Herald* of the meeting held in the Masonic Hall on the 9th May, and he will fail to discover, either in the explanatory paper of Mr. Lee, or in the nine rules of the institution read by Mr. Webb, or in the addresses of the three other reverend speakers, the faintest intimation that the movement is to be limited within certain theological boundaries. We were, indeed, after a first glance at the report under the pleasant impression that the idea of a religious test had been abandoned. A careful perusal of Lord Belmore's opening speech, however, soon dispelled the illusion. His Excellency announced in unmistakeable terms that the institution would be "strictly Protestant." It may possibly be thought by some that this statement is more creditable to his lordship's candour than to his prudence or good taste. However this may be we think that he deserves the thanks of the promoters for placing them in a true position, and of the public generally for informing them what it is they are invited to support. Bid it not occur to the reverend philanthropists that if their statements were to go forth without qualification the money of benevolent Catholics might flow into their coffers? Surely it would not be honest to accept such money, although indeed, as we are not told that the man who fell among thieves was reprimanded for having availed himself of the Samaritan's benevolence when his own priests neglected him, so possibly, it may be thought that in the event of any lack of enthusiasm on the part of the children of light, the worldly wealth of the ungodly or unbeliever might fairly be accepted and applied to the spread of true religion. By the way, it would be interesting to know what precise meaning was attached by Lord Belmore and his friends at the Masonic Hall to the word "Protestant." Would, for instance, a subscriber to the most Protestant paper in Sydney, the *Free Religious Press*, be considered one of the fold?

LOOKING at the same matter from another point of view, it seems probable enough that many mistresses, if only from selfish motives, will be ready to support a scheme which promises them some measure of relief from a notoriously crying nuisance. We suspect, however, that their enthusiasm will suffer a chill as soon as they discover, as many of them must, that an annual subscription of a pound gives them only a fractional chance of getting not a servant but an apprentice, who, after all, may be an extra source of worry and annoyance. The difficulty, in truth, is an arithmetical one, and may be dealt with as such. Of one hundred girls taken in hand, how many will become cleanly and industrious domestics? Of those qualified by the Institution to act, how many will fall to the lot of mistresses qualified to teach and to rule? Of the child apprentices, how many will find their way into homes where they will receive due courtesy and befitting comforts in exchange for their modest manner and domestic usefulness? The scarcity of servants in any country where wages are high is inevitable, and some degree of unfitness in them must be looked for in a colony where the climate, and the disposition and habits induced thereby, are unfavourable to the old home ways. Where there is much gadding, lounging and listlessness in a family, it cannot be expected that the servants will be brisk and thorough. That Sydney is full of indifferent servants is neither to be denied nor wondered at, however much for the sake of society, high and low, it may be regretted. There are many combining causes for this state of things, and to the suggestion of remedies for it there is, of course, no end. But the only effectual and lasting remedy will be found in the cultivation of virtuous principles, settled habits and home-loving tastes, and in the revival of that old-fashioned housekeeping pride which is the root of incalculable happiness and the safeguard of much virtue.

WE observe with much satisfaction that another and, as we think, a far more excellent institution, the "Porter and Shoe-black Brigade," has not only been projected, but actually set afloat, and that in consequence there are at this moment some twenty or thirty boys earning a fair amount of money every day who a week ago came under the denomination of "City Arabs." These boys are not only afforded employment during the day, but are instructed every evening in reading, writing and arithmetic. It is really gratifying to find in these days of much talk and little work, that a number of persons can be found capable of organising and carrying into effect a purely philanthropic scheme; and it is none the less gratifying that all this has been done without aristocratic

patronage or ecclesiastical interference.

The Fall of Man and its Consequences.

THIS Earth, our dwelling place, was, according to the conceptions of the ancient Israelites, so firmly fixed, that it could not be moved (Psalms xciii. 1, civ. 5); above it was the firmament or strong-vault to divide the waters from the waters (Genesis i. 6); and in that firmament were set the Sun or greater light to rule the day, the Moon or lesser light to rule the night, and the stars. Earth, sun, moon and stars—such is the order in which they were ranked according to a Hebrew's estimate of their relative importance. It were futile to cavil at these simple and primitive notions. For how could men upon whom the light of Science had not yet dawned conclude otherwise? When David looked out upon the star-spangled sky at nightfall, what other idea could he form than that those brilliant points of light were made for the advantage and to excite the admiration of the dwellers upon earth? It is sometimes said that the present age has grown too materialistic, and that the progress of Science has divested Nature of all its poetry; others, again, affirming that the Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is required to give men adequate conceptions of God and of the Universe whereby we see him; the truth, however, is, that the revelations of modern Science are as much beyond the conceptions of the biblical writers as the genius of Sir Isaac Newton at the age of sixty was beyond the intelligence of the child Newton at six. For we know that the earth, whirled through space at the inconceivable velocity of 1,500,000 miles a day, is but one, and that by no means the largest of the planets revolving about the central body of our system, which we call the sun. We know, further, that the sun itself is but one of myriads of similar bodies dispersed through the immensity of space—each, probably, the centre, like our own luminary, of a system of revolving planets—which we call stars; the nearest of them being at a distance so vast, that the motion of our globe in its orbit, 185,000,000 miles in diameter, makes no perceptible difference in their relative positions towards each other as viewed by terrestrial observers. And, then, when we reflect that the pointing of a powerful telescope towards the heavens discloses everywhere new groups of stars, each group consisting in all probability of a countless multitude of solar systems, surely David had far less reason than we ourselves have to say, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handiwork!" or, again, "Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him!"

Upon this atom of a globe, then, there was placed, according to the common belief, about six thousand years ago, a human pair, from whom are descended all the men and women now in existence. The tradition is that they were created in perfect purity and happiness. But almost the first thing we read of Adam and Eve is, that they met with a clever-talking serpent, which beguiled them of their innocence and of their happiness at the same time, by exposing the weakness of their obedience to a divine command. Curious to think of, this. Is there, then, a man or woman, or even a child, that is not daily called upon to resist temptation, to put aside the suggestions of appetite, to practice in real earnest a virtue which, however contemptible in the eyes of theologians, is certainly stronger and truer than the alleged immaculate righteousness of the first human pair? A virtue which yields to the first attack is no virtue at all. A virtue that cannot be "carried of the spirit into grim solitudes, and there confronting the Tempter do grimdest battle with him; defiantly setting him at naught, till he yield and fly," is assuredly not that which nerved the souls of Paul, Socrates and Christ, and from which, in a word, humanity derives more than half its dignity and history all its power.

We have spoken of the Tempter of Adam and his partner as a clever-talking serpent; for it is clear that the Jews had for many generations no notion of the personage that figures so prominently in the Christian theology as the great enemy of souls, and whose machinations the modern preacher so readily turns to account in his raids on human nature. The word "devil" does not occur in the Old Testament; nor is there any mention from Genesis to Malachi of a rebellion among the Angels antecedent to the creation of man, made so familiar to us by the genius of Milton. And yet if English lawyers thought it right in drawing up an indictment against an accused person, to allege "the instigation of the devil" as an incentive to crime—as was the case in former times,—the author of the Pentateuch had ample reason for arraigning his satanic majesty had he suspected the existence of such a being. Murder and drunkenness, incest and adultery, crimes and misdemeanours, in fact, of every description, are scattered freely over the pages of the Old Testament; but it is not said or even hinted that the devil tempted Cain, or Lot's daughters, or Jacob, or Joseph's brethren. Nay, if a tempter is mentioned at all, it is Jehovah himself who is conceived of as hardening people in their evil courses. We read, it is true, of spirits whom wizards and witches could summon to their assistance; of spirits also who were commissioned by Jehovah to lead men like Ahab into mischief and precipitate their ruin. King Saul, too, is said to have been troubled by an evil spirit; but there are strong reasons for believing that the demon, in his case, belonged to the order of devils which we English anathematise as "blue," and our French friends as "ennui;" a form of demoniacal possession, by the way, from which none of us, perhaps, are altogether exempt. But of spirits in

open rebellion against God, trying to urge men to evil because it is contrary to his will, and exulting in it for that very reason, like the fiends portrayed by Milton, there is in the Old Testament no trace whatever. Twice only, in the English version, a personage is introduced to our notice under the name of "Satan," or "the adversary;" but in what capacity? In the book of Job he is exhibited not in the character of a rebellious angel, but rather as a cynical philosopher at the "Court of Jehovah, a sort of Sir Robert Walpole among the spirits, who has learned a thing or two in his time, and seen too deeply into the springs of human action to believe in disinterested piety: a point which he does not scruple to contest with Jehovah himself. His sarcastic inquiry, "Doth Job serve God for nought?" pointedly insinuates that Job's vaunted integrity is merely the feudal service due from a baron to his liege lord, the tenure by which he holds his lands. In the other passage (1 Chron. xxi. 1) "the adversary" is represented as urging David to number the people, by which proceeding the king is said to have incurred the anger of Jehovah. On referring, however, to the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiv. 1.), we find that the Lord himself was "the adversary" who impelled David to take the census. Indeed, the arbitrary manner in which the word "Satan" is translated in our English Version, sometimes as a general term, sometimes with a special meaning, is, in itself a striking example of the artifice with which theologians contrive to square their favourite dogmas with the biblical writings. We read, for example, in the story for Balaam, that the "Angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him;" but in this instance, it is not Satan but the Angel of the Lord that confronts the weak-minded and vacillating prophet.

But if the popular Christian theology has put an unwarrantable strain upon the biblical narrative as it stands, by greatly distorting its account of the moral condition of the first human pair, and by linking with it a conception—the conception of a Devil—of which the Jews for centuries after the time of Moses knew nothing whatever, it has done a still greater injustice to the scriptural account of the fall of man, and the consequences thereof. Milton, indeed, represents all nature as having felt a pang at the moment of the fatal transgression; but the narrative in Genesis gives us no hint of this remarkable disturbance. True, the earth is so far cursed that it is destined to bear thorns and thistles; and man so far degraded that he is doomed to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow; *i.e.*, to work for an honest living. It so happens, however, that the earth abounds in localities, chiefly in tropical climates, where men, despite the primeval curse, can get food and raiment in abundance without turning a sod. Perhaps there is no district so nearly approaching our conceptions of Eden as that of the Fiji group and other islands of the Southern Seas, as, on the other hand, there is no district more unlike the traditional Paradise than that of "Caledonia stern and wild." Must we go, then, to the Fijis to find our highest type of man and to Scotland for our lowest? If not, if on the contrary Scotchmen are amongst the most enterprising and energetic of men, and the Fijians as much the reverse, what is there to prevent us from concluding that the curse said to have been pronounced upon Adam and his descendants was in reality the choicest of blessings in disguise? As for that part of the curse which particularly concerned Eve and her daughters, the pains of child-birth, it is sufficient to remark that the women of savage tribes are next to exempt from them; so that we must either believe that the curse at some time ceased to operate, or that some races of mankind derive their origin from a different pair of progenitors.

But the curse as it stands portrayed in the biblical narrative is far too light for orthodox theologians. It is their wont to represent mankind as being reduced by that one act of disobedience to a state of total depravity, "an infection of nature, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to do evil." If, however, we cast aside the creeds and take a rational view of the history and constitution of human nature, we find no proof of this innate and insurmountable tendency to evil. It is all pure assumption to suit a theory. Without committing ourselves to the details of Phrenology, we strongly incline to the science on the strength of its main principle that none of our mental or moral propensities are essentially or primarily corrupt. The greatest criminal that ever astonished mankind by his enormities is only an example of the preponderance of propensities which, when subordinated to reason and conscience, are not merely allowable, but good and necessary to the full development of human nature. Obstinacy, cruelty, deceit and lust we call vices; modified by reason and conscience, the same qualities become firmness, courage, sagacity and love. Too much self-esteem degenerates into pride; too little self-esteem sinks into weakness and irresolution. And when we consider the ignorance of parents and the neglect of society, it is not to be wondered at that a large proportion of mankind, accustomed to live as mere animals, struggling for existence and for the gratification of their animal appetites, should break through the restraints of law, for which they have no innate regard, and become criminals. Nay, if man by the fall became utterly depraved, it is indeed strange that nations like the ancient Greeks and Romans, or the modern Japanese and Chinese, left so long to themselves, unaided by that Revelation which is regarded by most Christians as the be-all and end-all of religion and morality, should not have lapsed into the lowest depths of iniquity. But orthodoxy spares neither youth nor age; and nowhere does Original Sin show its peculiar hideousness than in the doom which it coolly contemplates as awaiting unbaptised infants. It is hard to prove *rationaly* that the world is a wreck, quite put out of gear by the supposed fall of man, and it is hard to prove that man is naturally incapable of good; but what rational proof can be

adduced in favour of the dogma that pure and innocent buds of humanity are by nature "children of wrath?" Truly is this the choicest product of the theological tree. Jesus, indeed, could reflect that a mother forgetteth all her pains for joy that a child is born into the world; but theology would have her tremble with fear and anxiety for that her darling is born under a curse, and unless brought immediately within the pale of grace by the magical rite of baptism has no security against the wrath of God. What else is implied in the Anglican Rubric when it affirms "that children *which are baptised* dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved?" What of those which are *not baptised*?

Here we pause. We have not spoken so strongly as we might against the figments we have been considering. They seem to us so monstrous as merely to require stating broadly in their naked repulsiveness in order to excite the disgust and horror of unsophisticated minds. We of the present age sometimes look back with astonishment at the doings and beliefs of our ancestors. Although quite willing to allow that there lived in those olden times a host of men and women kind and honest, truth-loving and virtuous, we can but wonder so much the more at their coarse and brutal amusements,—bull-baiting, cock-fighting, bear-baiting, duelling, prizefighting, and similar sports. But we may be sure that years hence posterity will marvel how the kind, honest, truth-loving and virtuous folk of the present era could have believed, or professed to believe, in an everlasting fiery hell, presided over by a rebellious spirit, and stocked with countless millions of his human victims, including some of the wisest and best of mankind, and little infants whom the priest did not sprinkle. Most of all they will wonder that these astounding doctrines should have been foisted upon mankind as the religion of the benevolent Jesus of Nazareth; that they should have been propagated as a divine revelation of good tidings to humanity; and that the supposed origin of these doctrines should have been celebrated by a great annual festival, with ringing of bells, and with public and private congratulations.

Scorpio.

Horse-Racing and Betting.

"We are in a high degree a cricketing, horse-racing, theatre-going, frivolous community,"—DR. LANG.

THIRTY years ago we were universally spoken of as, par excellence, a criminal community. A great change for the better has taken place since then, (attributable, in a great measure, no doubt, to the character of our arrivals and *departures*,) but not to such an extent as to render our old reputation altogether inapplicable to us. Sydney, more particularly, would gain nothing by comparing with towns in England of the same amount of population as herself; but would suffer terribly from contrast. Here a hundred policemen find ample and arduous employment, whilst in England half that number of these conservators of the peace would deal with an equally populous community, and from the sinecure would inevitably subside into a state of pinguidity that would render them peculiarly acceptable to our Polynesian anthropophagi. It will be some time before we are purged of that old leaven of unrighteousness, the criminal element, and this in connection with our universal sporting proclivities, will prevent us, for years to come, from being favourably classed with communities of average respectability.

Dr. Lang's apparent censure is by far too complimentary if applied to the whole community. Doubtless we have frivolous people amongst us, and in no very limited number; but the criminal section of the community cannot with any propriety be placed in this category. The persistent law-breaker is anything but frivolous: on the contrary, he is by far too earnest in his wrong doing, and would unquestionably gladly plead guilty to the minor charge, if, by so doing, he might escape the greater indictment.

We are not prepared to condemn horse-racing *per se*, because it may be (as we are often assured that it is,) that horse-racing is an institution absolutely necessary to the successful testing of the efforts of the breeders of this animal to improve the stock. But, be this as it may, horse-racing appears to be necessarily associated with some very objectionable adjuncts. The racecourse appears to be the natural arena of the cardsharp, the thimble-rigger, the pickpocket, and the dishonest of every shade down to the very lowest scum of thieftom. But with these, just now, we have nothing to do beyond remarking, that the dishonest may be divided into two classes: one, comprising those who ply their vocation in violation of the laws of the land; the other, those who so trim their boat as to sail with the wind, or, in less metaphorical language, who never operate in opposition to, or in violation of, the strict letter of the law, but always with it. The former, of course, are amenable to the criminal law, and have to digest its awards with all the philosophy they may be able to command; the other, subject to public opinion alone, invariably escape the meshes of the legal net that so disconcert and inconvenience the common thief.

It is not our intention to class the whole of the bookmaking and betting fraternity connected with horse-racing, with either the thieves who operate in violation of the law, or with those who give the law a wide berth; although we venture to opine that many of them might be so located without doing them any violent

injustice. The law of the land declines to recognise the merely betting man in any way whatever. It refuses to assist him in the recovery of a betting debt, and the judge invariably discharges the jury from giving a verdict whenever any such case is submitted to their consideration. At the same time, he does not invite the applicant to take a place in the criminal dock, although he reveals just so much of the cold shoulder as to render it unmistakeably clear that he declines the honour of further acquaintance.

It is our purpose briefly to show that these betting operations of the race course, although according with, or, at any rate, not opposed to the law of the land, are inconsistent with sound morality, and in direct opposition to that royal law, as James styles it, that prescribes, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It would puzzle any one, we think, to discover in the operations of the betting man anything remarkably neighbourly—anything like that brotherly kindness that ought to influence the intercourse of men acknowledging allegiance to Christian ethics. To warn our neighbour against evil, rather than to seduce him into it, is certainly more the part of a Christian; but the offer to bet implies the desire of the better to transfer a sum of money from the pocket of his neighbour to his own, without the slightest equivalent for the same, his only apology for the offer being his willingness to expose to a similar chance a like sum of his own. The offer nevertheless can only be characterised as an act of pure and unwarrantable selfishness. Nor is the character of the transaction at all improved by the fact that the party addressed accepts the bet, as this only shows that there are two instead of one, willing to do the unneighbourly. The interest taken in the bet is the gauge of the folly of the parties to it, and the bitterness and inconvenience felt by the loser ought to reveal to him his moral delinquency in staking his means that might be better employed, and that probably he could ill afford to lose, on the hazard of a chance. Doubtless in many cases, an inconvenient loss operates beneficially, and prevents further mischief; but unhappily, it too often leads to utter recklessness that results in the utter ruin of the infatuated fool, and all connected with him. In a connection of our own, the senior partner of a firm that was doing a very good business, took it into his head to pay more attention to horse-racing than to his own business, although two large families were dependent on his and his partner's exertions. Betting in moderate sums at first, a tip (we believe it called) induced him to bet five hundred pounds on one event, which he lost, and this was the first serious gradation on the road to ruin. His recklessness very rapidly completed his destruction, and both himself and partner, who deserved a better fate, were declared insolvent. The man in business who degenerates into a sporting character, loses not only his money, but what is, or ought to be of equal value to him, character and status. It is not to be expected that the man who hazards his own means will be particularly careful of the property of other people, and under this view of the matter, credit is out of the question.

Two clerks in merchant's offices in Sydney, prompted by their losses in betting, helped themselves to a pile of certificates of bonded goods, in their respective offices. One, a married man, obtained an advance to the extent of some hundreds of pounds on his plunder, and has thereby been the cause of a law suit that will cost somebody more than the amount of the robbery. Now here was a man with a salary adequate to the maintenance of himself, his wife and family in respectability, exposing all to the hazard of a chance, to the irrevocable ruin of himself and those belonging to him. The other hands a bundle of certificates to a broker with instruction to sell them, but laughably enough, the broker, before any harm was done, offers them for sale to the very man to whom they belonged. Of course, the game, under these circumstances, was very soon played out, but the young man was not punished. Only in his teens, the youngster was merely dismissed, and his father being sent for, he was in a Christianlike manner advised to place his son, in future, only in such a position as should be free from temptation. The advice was gratefully received, and honoured so far that the lad was placed in a banking-house of all the places in the world, as preeminently free of temptation; and, as might be expected, the young gentleman availed himself of the first fair opportunity to help himself to a hatful of bank notes; his propensity for betting proving the means of discovering both the plunder and the thief. He too is in prison, with ample time and opportunity to cogitate on the felicities that encompass the sporting man's career. It is true that the parties to a bet are on the same level, and both encounter the same risk of losing; but this rarely reaches to the dignity of a palliation. Duellists meet on equal terms, but the law, nevertheless, when one falls, pronounces the survivor a murderer, and justly so too: for no civilised government will allow their subjects to avenge their personal injuries after that lethal fashion. But the bookmaker, we are told, so skilfully manages his betting that he invariably falls on his feet, and but rarely is a loser, the chances being so much in his favor, that he comes out a considerable winner. How this is to be accomplished without any violation of the rules of fair play, we do not pretend to say, for we have not penetrated the *arcana* of this mystery of iniquity, nor have we the slightest inclination so to do. On the contrary we sincerely adjure our juvenile readers more particularly to avoid all dalliance with betting, either as regards horse-racing or any other sport; and invariably reply to any and every offer of a bet,—I do not want your money, and I will take care that you do not get mine.

A Scotchman may be forgiven a little heresy on the subject of cricket of which he knows nothing; although it is a fact that the most enthusiastic admirer of the game that ever we met was a North Briton. But when Dr. Lang placed cricket amongst the frivolities of the time, we beg to assure him, and we do so without apology,

that never in the whole course of his long and useful career did he perpetrate a more decided mistake. No man ought to be satisfied with anything less than good, sound, vigorous health—he ought not to be "amongst the middlings"—and vigorous health he will have if to temperance he adds the *quantum sufficit* of vigorous exercise, provided chronic disorder does not interpose a cruel negative. And for healthy and agreeable and vigorous exercise, the gymnasium of either ancient or modern times has nothing that for a moment can be compared to it. And this fact is anything but frivolous to the Englishman whose country appears to be the head quarters of incurable pulmonary consumption. Nevertheless, our experience leads us to conjecture that, were the game universally played at home, accidental consumption would be completely arrested, and that hereditary consumption, if not extirpated, would at any rate be very much modified, and reduced within more moderate limits than it unhappily obtains at the present time.

Where is the game or sport that so equally taxes every portion of the system? The lungs are fully inflated, the whole muscular system is called into vigorous exercise, and the circulation is driven to the extremities with an impetus that converts the human microcosm into a magazine of salubrity. And as an interesting spectacle, where is there anything to compare with a well played cricket match by A1 players? The gratification is intense to the adequately informed spectator, and is as continuous as it is intense. Different from the horse race, where the lengthy intervals allow the introduction of every abomination under the sun, the game with its varying fortunes, agreeably taxes the attention all day long, from the first delivery of the flying ball till the last man is placed *hors de combat*. Dr. Lang is fond of quoting Johnny Gilpin. He will forgive us then if in the same interest we say—

"And the very next time a game is played

May we both be there to see"

With regard to theatricals, we conceive that the play may be fairly placed in the same category as the novel. The incidents in both may be fictitious, but we insist that both shall be true to nature, and, failing this, we visit them with our indignant criticism. Both however may be estimated as legitimate sources of amusement, gratification and instruction, and should not, in our opinion, be ranked amongst the frivolities of the day.

It is many years since we visited a theatre, and whenever we did so, we generally came away about as much offended as gratified. A postprandial entertainment we could never find that part of the house where the audience were not much more intent on hearing themselves rather than the performers. The last time we visited the theatre, a returned digger, as we took him to be, placed himself by our side. After contemplating the performance very earnestly for a few minutes, he remarked in our hearing, "Oh! hang it. I didn't expect to see any rubbish like this." Why! what did you expect to see? we asked. "Oh!" said he, "give me a man that can take a good jump, or lift a great weight." He remained a few minutes longer, then jumped up in a fury, and, declaring that the whole concern was a swindle, made his exit; and probably by this time the reader has come to the conclusion that we ought to follow the digger's example.

Libra.

The Atonement.

THERE is no article of the Christian faith supposed to be more distinctive than the Atonement, and no body of believers however isolated from the rest but gives it a foremost place in its theological scheme. Judged by the universality of its reception it must needs be a truth self-evident and simple. Judged by its universal importance it ought to be easy of apprehension and of exposition. Yet while the theory of the Atonement has had various phases in the course of centuries and remains undetermined to this day, the general consent under which it maintains its supreme position establishes nothing beyond the fact that the world can appreciate what it considers a blessing without knowing in what way or to what extent it operates.

If the speculations of divines have failed to establish a unanimous exposition, it is fruitless to expect that the unscholastic multitude will have any clear understanding of so subtle a question. It is, indeed, in whatever shape, a metaphysical theorem, incapable of absolute demonstration, and not likely therefore to be apprehended by the mass who take their creeds upon trust without adequate ideas to support them. Still, so largely is Christendom affected by the vague comfort of the Atonement, to which the educated and the ignorant cling in the critical emergencies of their spiritual life, that it may be interesting and profitable to consider one or two of the popular theories held, or presumably held, among church-going people. There is necessarily a difficulty in thus attributing to any class the repute of holding opinions in a general way, owing to the absence of direct and producible evidence, but if the following comments are based on any misconception let it be said beforehand that the error is not the result of any wilful prejudice. And let it be said also that to disturb opinions which give comfort must never be considered a wanton act when a desire to investigate truth is the compelling motive, for surely no one would maintain that error, however agreeable for the while, can be permanently associated with

happiness.

The orthodox conception of the Atonement is based on the orthodox idea of Sin, and we have to consider whence this last-mentioned idea itself comes. In all the churches the masterminds have been men of strong emotions. They could not otherwise have had spiritual power over generations of mankind; but when they expressed their personal needs in litanies and psalms of titanic grandeur they stereotyped for the use of ages a phraseology concerning sin which assuredly does not represent the spontaneous feeling of one man in a thousand. No one with the least spiritual sensibility can speak lightly or think carelessly about sin, either as to its character or its consequences; but it may be questioned whether that mind speaks unaffected truth which asserts that sin is the essence of its every thought. Such a declaration may be the native, unfeigned utterances of a great soul, self-abased in its approach to God. To human eyes magnitude is proportionate not actual, and sinfulness is magnified by comparison with the Infinite Holiness. In a state of ecstasy the soul is overwhelmed with the thought of the Divine perfection, and imagines everything human to be sinful and worthless. From such a doctrine of sin, the Atonement is a corollary. Man, if he cannot by possibility please God, requires a mediator, who must of necessity possess divine power and human sympathy. Such is the easy gradation to the orthodox idea which, when it takes its rise in sincere personal experience and remains an abstract speculation, cannot be argued against. But when it assumes concrete shape in the assertion that Jesus was an atonement by virtue of his double nature, it can be disputed and, as many believe, disproved. Still, the fact that men may come to think themselves hopelessly lost unless a satisfaction is made on their behalf is so indubitably substantiated, that to deny it would be to discredit all human statement, and the same may be said of the wonderful vitalising power which often accompanies the gratitude for redemption. What then? Do the longings of the soul necessarily confirm the truth of the beliefs which embody them? If so, it might be said that the natural superstition which comes with darkness is an evidence of the truth of a million legends about ghosts; or that the instinct of immortality confirms the visionary heaven of the Apocalypse. Admitting that the constraining love of God in Christ is an influence too well established to be denied, and, perhaps, too beneficial to be quibbled at, what we do protest against is the blindness and partiality of theological tyranny which would force the standard doctrine of Atonement upon the human mind as if it were indisputable truth, and an essential preliminary to salvation.

Let us reflect for a moment on the position of the man who has never heard the name of Christ. Does the inevitable inflexibility of the Divine justice shut out such a man from any chance of mercy? Logically, it must do so. It is not to the point to quote the apostolic assertion that they who have sinned without law shall be judged without law, for the question is not whether the trial and the judgment shall be under any particular code, but whether Perfect Justice can possibly forgive under any condition than a perfect satisfaction. A man having committed a wrong cannot possibly undo it. It has passed forth and cannot be recalled. All subsequent acts of virtue stand for themselves alone. The man henceforth, doing merely what it is his duty to do, can have no superfluity of excellence to cover the demerits of the past. This is the unelastic logic under which the whole world, heathen or Christian, is found guilty. But our noblest feelings resent the conclusion. We cannot believe in God as a heartless judge, and even in those transient moods when sin appears to us most detestable, if asked what we think will be the doom of the sinner, can only answer—God is merciful; we cannot say.

According to that better and truer faith, by which we daily think and act, and hold communion with our fellows, we are not accustomed to be much cast down by the thought that the innumerable millions of human beings are, by the conditions of their lot, inevitably excluded from mercy. Inside a church, we despair of the unconverted; outside, we breathe the air of heaven and believe in the goodness of the Creator. In our human intercourse it never occurs to us that the friend whom we take by the hand can ever be cast off by God for honest doubts however broad. If under any temper of our faith we dare not positively say that one who is ignorant of, or who rejects, the Atonement will not have his sins forgiven, how can we assert as though it were indisputable that the Atonement will alone absolve our sin. No doubt among the numerous expositions which mitigate the harshness, while they destroy the consistency, of established dogmas, there may be found some which ascribe to the Atonement an instantaneous virtue in removing guilt; but obviously such views are tender for tenderness' sake, and disregard the theory of inexorable justice, demanding perfect obedience from first to last, which is at the base of the current doctrine of the sacrifice on Calvary.

Or does the foundation of the popular acceptance of the Atonement lie in the gratitude which is felt towards God who withheld not his own Son for our salvation? Is it possible that so unspiritual, so irreverent a conception of the Deity continues to have influence? In mediæval times when the most sacred ideas were presented in coarse material form adapted to the brute understandings of the multitude, it is likely enough that the surrender by the Almighty Father of a dear and only son was an image calculated to excite grateful emotion in breasts which, though rude, yet knew the meaning of paternal love. But in these days of religious enlightenment, must we not think for the credit of the popular mind that old expressions are retained and permitted to have some mystical sense not definite enough to excite an idea, yet forcible enough to stir the

religious affections? Should not a perfect devotion pray with the heart and with the understanding also?

Let the assumed Atonement be in its essence what it may, it must clearly save us with our volition or without it. If without it, it is needless to inquire into its character or our duty in respect of it. If with it, we must need accept the salvation by some act of ours. What is that act? Most people say an act of faith; but how can one have faith in what he does not comprehend? Faith that God saves us through some incomprehensible potency in the death of Christ is quite intelligible, but this means that the faith is in God, not in the sacrifice; and if a man from his heart believes in God's goodness displayed in the universe; if he believes that in God he lives, and moves, and has his being; that he came from God and will go to Him; that all his life is due in grateful obedience to the Being who has given him his powers of sense and soul; who has furnished an education for his faculties in this wonderful world; and who has imbued him with love, reverence and all spiritual capabilities; we are ready to hope that such faith carried into a godly life will find as much acceptance in the sight of the great Creator as a so-called faith in the doctrine of the Atonement. For, let it be understood, we do not say that a faith can be explained, but it can surely be expressed so that others may understand what is believed. A man has faith in miracles; he cannot explain the *modus operandi*, but he can express the result. A man has faith in the Trinity; he cannot explain its nature, but he can express his conception of it, otherwise his faith is in mere words without ideas. Let a dozen orthodox people express their conception of the Trinity and they will discover how much their conceptions differ, and may learn to be charitable towards those who do not profess to believe in a Trinity of any kind. In the same way let a dozen orthodox people express their conception of the Atonement and they will doubtless find so much disagreement, and in their individual statements so much confusion and indistinctness as to induce them to modify their dislike to people who, unwilling to assume a virtue if they have it not, cannot pretend to be subject to influences which hitherto have not affected them.

Our limited space will not permit us to propose further objections, nor to establish the important point that the universal attestation to such facts as the justice of God, the sinfulness of man, and the death of Christ, is no proof of the correctness of any theory as to their relationship. The current theory is no fair deduction from the facts, but a mere ecclesiastical misconstruction of them. Nor can we refer to the judicious expositions of the apostolic language concerning Christ, by scholars not unknown, which do no violence to apostolic notions or to modern thought. We have room only to express the hope that if our comments should lead any to ponder the foundations of their faith, the result may be a more settled trust in what is true, combined with a scrupulous regard for the conscientious opinions of their neighbours.
Spes.

Miracles.

The legendary literature of *every* nation upon earth tells the same stories of prodigies and wonders, of the appearances of gods upon the earth, and of their intercourse with men.

The lives of the Saints of the Catholic Church from the time of the Apostles to the present day are a complete tissue of miracles resembling and rivalling those of the Gospels. Some of these stories are romantic and imaginative; some clear, literal, and prosaic; some rest on mere tradition; some on the sworn testimony of eye-witnesses; some are obvious fables; some are as well authenticated as facts of such a kind can be authenticated at all.

The Protestant Christian rejects every one of them—rejects them without inquiry—involves those for which there is good authority and those for which there is none or little in one absolute, contemptuous and sweeping denial. The Protestant Christian feels it more likely, in the words of Hume, that men should deceive or be deceived, than that the laws of nature should be violated.

The Bible is equally a record of miracles; but as from other histories we reject miracles without hesitation so of those in the Bible we insist on the universal acceptance; the former are all false, the latter are all true. It is evident that, in forming conclusions so sweeping as these we cannot even suppose that we are being guided by what is called historical evidence. Were it admitted that, as a whole, the miracles of the Bible are better authenticated than the miracles of the saints we should be far removed still from any large inference that in the one set there is no room for falsehood, in the other no room for truth.

In many instances the authors of the lives of the Saints were their companions and friends. Why do we feel so sure that what we are told of Elijah or Elisha took place exactly as we read it? Why do we reject the account of St. Columba or St. Martin as a tissue of idle fable? Why should not God give a power to the saint which He had given to the prophet? We can produce no reason from the nature of things, for we know not what the nature of things is; and if down to the death of the Apostles the ministers of religion were allowed to prove their commission by working miracles, what right have we, on grounds either of history or philosophy, to draw a

clear line at the death of St. John—to say that before that time all such stories were true, and after it all were false?

There is no point on which Protestant controversialists evade the real question more habitually than on that of miracles. They accuse those who withhold that unreserved and absolute belief which they require for all which they accept themselves, of denying that miracles are possible. They assume this to be the position taken up by the objector, and proceed easily to argue that man is no judge of the power of God. Of course he is not. No sane man ever raised his narrow understanding into a measure of the possibilities of the universe.

But the question about miracles is simply one of evidence—whether in any given case the proof is so strong that no room is left for mistake, exaggeration, or illusion, while more evidence is required to establish a fact antecedently improbable than is sufficient for a common occurrence.

"Let a worker of miracles," says Renan, "come forward to-morrow with pretensions serious enough to deserve examination. Let us suppose him to announce that he is able to raise a dead man to life. What would be done? A committee would be appointed composed of physiologists, physicians, chemists and persons accustomed to exact investigation; a body would then be selected which the committee would assure itself was really dead; and a place would be chosen where the experiment was to take place. Every precaution would be taken to leave no opening for uncertainty; and if under these conditions, the restoration to life was effected, a probability would be arrived at which would be almost equal to certainty. An experiment, however, should always admit of being repeated. What a man has done once, he should be able to do again, and in miracles there can be no question of ease or difficulty. The performer should be requested to repeat the operation under other circumstances upon other bodies; and if he succeeded on every occasion, two points would be established: first, that there may be in this world such things as supernatural operations; and, secondly, that the power to perform them is delegated to, or belongs to, particular persons. But who does not perceive that no miracle was ever performed under such conditions as these? but that always hitherto the performer has chosen the subject of the experiment, chosen the spot, chosen the public; that, besides, the people themselves—most commonly in consequence of the invincible want to see something divine in great events and great men—create the marvellous legends afterwards? Until a new order of things prevails, we shall maintain, then, this principle of historical criticism—that a supernatural account cannot be admitted as such, that it always implies credulity or imposture, that the duty of the historian is to explain it, and to seek to ascertain what share of truth, or of error, it may conceal."—*J. A. Fronde*.

Stuff.

THE Sunday after my arrival in Sydney, I for the first, time since leaving England, went to church. It was so curious: just like being metamorphosed backwards into a previous state of existence. Everything was exactly what I had been accustomed to at home. The women in their smartest silks rustling into their little rectangular boxes of pews: the men in what a back-woodsman would call their "Sunday go-to-meeting trouserloons," putting their faces into the hats out of which they had just taken their heads; the flutter of leaves, the murmur of responses, the glib routine assent to incomprehensible dogmas, the rapid transition from the utterances of sorrow and contrition to those of joy and peace; the sitting, standing and kneeling, everything was so absurdly identical that I felt myself expanding into an all-pervading smile at the ludicrous accuracy of the imitation. Being one of the principal churches in Sydney, it was not unnatural to look for some degree of intelligence in the preaching department. It was thoughtless of me, I own, but until I heard that sermon I had failed to realise the vastness of the gulf that separates me from my former self. That simple utterance of woe, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me," the preacher—a pleasant, though delicate and sentimental-looking young fellow—told us incontrovertibly established the existence of a future life, and David's belief in it. It proved also that our faculty of recognising those whom we have loved and lost on earth would be greatly increased there. "For David evidently looked forward to seeing his child in heaven; but the changes that would be made in its appearance by its transition from the royal nursery to the society of glorified angels, would prevent his recognising it unless his faculties were greatly improved; especially as old men do not generally take notice of infants so as to know them apart." I assure you, upon my honour, that this is, as nearly as I can remember it, word for word what the preacher said. And when on coming out of the church I looked round among the congregation for expressions of indignation at his daring to talk such nonsense to grown up men and women, I actually saw people turn up their eyes and exclaim "What a lovely discourse." For myself, I shall not trust myself to go again. It irritates me.

In the pew with me was a young lady who, when the service had been going on for some time, perceived my lack of a prayer-book, and lent me one; but after several vain attempts to find the places I laid it down. The air of mingled wonderment and amusement with which she regarded me showed that she took me for a sort of

white savage. But seeing, I suppose, that I did not look dangerous, she very good-naturedly found all the places for me. Her veil prevented me from seeing her face very distinctly, but the tall graceful figure, and the rich auburn hair, lying on the back of her neck, and, above all, the voice, when joining in the singing, a voice so rich and full of feeling, and, rarest of all qualities, so capable of making others feel, convinced me that she must be both beautiful and good. Her manner, when finding the places for me, was almost motherly, indicating no self-consciousness, but only anxiety to do a service. But, whether beautiful or not, I must own that her presence diffused a sort of charm around, which you will doubtless ascribe to the fact that I am an uncivilised gold-digger, and she a woman (though not necessarily *the* woman).

During the sermon I detected myself indignantly uttering the word "stuff." I did not know I had done so audibly until I saw her start and look towards me, as if roused from a reverie. She then seemed to listen a few moments, when I am almost certain I heard her say to herself, "Why so it is."—*The Pilgrim and the Shrine*.

The Personal Nature of Sin.

THOSE who teach that guilt and merit, with their penalties and rewards, can be transferred, deny in the directest way the personal nature of Sin. That men should find a foreign remedy for their perpetrated wickedness, is not less shocking than that they should trace it to a foreign source. If they know what it is at all, they feel it to be inalienably their own; which none could give them and which none can take away. And nothing is more amazing than that good Christians, who seem truly cast down in humiliation, oppressed with the sense of their short-comings, penetrated with the sadness of baffled aspiration,—and who, therefore, one would think, must really have a consciousness of the personality of sin, and know how it is chargeable only on their individual will,—can yet obtain relief by flying, as it is said, to the cross, and persuading themselves that the evil has been stayed and cured by transactions wholly outside themselves, and belonging to the history of another being. What can possibly be meant by the statement that Christ has borne the punishment some eighteen hundred years ago, of your sins and mine—of people non-existent then, and therefore non-sinful? Can the punishment precede the sin? Can it be inflicted and gone through before it is even determined whether the sin will be perpetrated at all? Or can merely potential sin, which may never become actual, be dealt with at ages distant, and its accounts be settled ere it arise? If so, what is the death of Christ but the provisory accumulation of a fund beforehand, ready to be drawn upon as the everlasting "treasure of the church" for the free discharge of guilty debts and the release of Divine obligations? And in what respect does this differ from the Roman Catholic doctrine—except that the treasure is at the discretion of no chartered sacerdotal company, but is open on more popular and looser terms?

Moral relations, by their very nature, exclude all vicarious agency; you cannot fall, you cannot recover by deputy: the ill that haunts you is the insult you have put on the divine spirit in your heart, and it is as if you were alone with God. An interposing medium can as little divert the retribution, as it can intercept the complacency of the Infinite and Holy Mind. What more fearful charge could you bring against any government, than to say that its penalties may be bought off?

A judge who accepts the voluntary sufferings of innocence in acquittance of the liabilities of guilt, shocks every sentiment of justice, and does that which the most judicial caprice would never dare to imitate. A law that does not care whether the right person feels its retribution, provided it gets an equivalent suffering elsewhere, is an affront to the most elementary notion of right. And an offender who can welcome his escape by such device, permits his moral perceptions to be blinded by personal gratitude, and is content to profit by a transaction which it would fill him with remorse to repeat upon his own children.—*James Martineau*.

Death.

THE great mistake about the two modes of *being* which death parts or divides, I take to be the notion of their entire dissimilarity. Hence the fears of devout minds and the confidence of superstitious ones; and from its absence the courage of those who have been engaged in some great and good work, and the dignity of superior intellects, whatever their opinions. The great question is, what is man's mental and moral condition? That which is the record of the past is also the presage of the future. in what *he is now* we best trace what *he has been* and what he shall be; for on every reasonable and religious ground we must (or should) anticipate the continuance of a being essentially the same, however progressive—indeinitely progressive it may be—in its powers and faculties. Instead, then, of vainly struggling after a luminous-ness which cannot be obtained, we should rather endeavour to condense, each for himself, the light that does exist. In our moral being (or nature) we see the rudiments of what we shall be; and if we cannot define to ourselves what "strange thoughts" may

"arise in our minds" when death is known to be near, or "when we have shuffled off this mortal coil," we may, at least, approximate thereto; and by some moments, taken as opportunity serves, of introspection and reflectiveness, attain to portions even of prophetic truth. And if in such moments the importance of many objects and occupations undergo a change in its relative proportions; if mountains sink and valleys rise; if interests dwindle into insignificance, and victories seem but vanities;— while the realities of thought and of affection, which had been regarded as incidentals of existence, grow more and more distinct to the mind, and more and more beautiful as they become more distinct, like soft music heard at night when the din of day has subsided into silence;—and if then a plan of life, simpler and purer than what may have been actually followed, but yet capable of accomplishment and of exerting its influences upon years, unfold itself to the mind, I think this may be received as a revelation and a guidance—as something of the light of eternity thrown upon the things of time—as spiritual truth apprehended by the soul when contemplating the world, whether consciously or unconsciously, by the sense of its own immortal nature.—*W. J. Fox.*

Domestic Life.

LET us remember that a house should bear witness in all its economy that human culture is the end for which it is built and garnished. It stands there under the sun and moon to ends analogous, and not less noble than theirs. It is not for festivity, it is not for sleep; but the pine and the oak shall gladly descend from the mountains to uphold the roof of men as faithful and necessary as themselves; to be the shelter always open to the good and the true. A hall which shines with sincerity, brows ever tranquil, and a demeanour impossible to disconcert. Whose inmates know what they want, who do not ask your house how theirs shall be kept. The diet of the house does not create its order, but knowledge, character, action, absorb so much life and yield so much entertainment, that the refectory has ceased to be curiously studied. With a change of aim has followed a change of the whole scale, by which men and things were wont to be measured. Wealth and poverty are seen for what they are. It begins to be seen that the poor are only they who feel poor, and that poverty alone consists in feeling poor.—*Emerson.*

Saying and Doing.

THE same spirit which teaches Christians that those who have no earthly friend have specially a friend above to care for and avenge them, taught the Greeks a proverb which appears again and again in Homer, that the stranger and the poor man are the patrimony of God; and it taught them also, that sometimes men entertained the Immortals unawares. It was a faith too which was more than words with them; for we hear of no vagrant acts, or alien acts, and it was sacrilege to turn away from the gate whoever asked its hospitality. Times are changed. The world was not so crowded as it is now, and perhaps rogues were less abundant; but at any rate those antique Greeks *did* what they said. We say what they said, while in the same breath we say, too, that it is impossible to do it.—*J. A. Froude.*

Intelligence.

CASTLEMAINE: VICTORIA.—We note with unfeigned satisfaction that Mr. G. C. Leech, barrister, of Castlemaine, has entered the field of usefulness as an earnest and scholarly advocate of free thought and unfettered speech on all matters pertaining to religion, and is doing a work in his district which has already borne handsome fruit. It will interest our readers to know that Mr. Leech conducts a religious service every Sunday evening in the Castlemaine Mechanics' Institute, and that the thoughts he utters on these occasions are usually reproduced in the columns of the *Castlemaine Representative*. From Mr. Leech's lecture of May 15, as reported in that journal, we gladly subjoin an extract or two.

"Long before Abraham left his father's home in Ur of the Chaldees under a strong conviction that there was no hope for his posterity retaining their faith entire in a land of idolatrous tribes, there were men who had exalted notions of a Supreme Almighty Omnipresent Being who is without variableness or shadow of turning; who is above passions of all kinds; too good to err, and too perfect to repent. But among the polytheistic multitudes, these few were lost, and their more correct ideas were carried away in the flood of superstition and error. The God of the Hebrews was the purest representation of divine perfection in those early times, but in that representation there was a great amount of human weakness and even folly. The great law, which seemed inevitable, came to pass, that wherever man made a god he invested that god with his own attributes. The god

of the Hebrews was a Majestic Being, but we cannot avoid the momentous conclusion that the All Perfect God, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, whom we believe to be without variableness or shadow of turning, who is above all wrath and jealousy, was not depicted by the Hebrews, although their representation approached more nearly to divine perfection than that of any other people. I speak not of the opening pages of Genesis, where, if we accept literally the story of the fall of man, and do not take it in its allegorical and historical sense, but take it in the orthodox manner, we are led to the strange and startling conclusion that the Almighty Creator placed our first parents in the world pure indeed in the first instance, but with proclivities in their nature to sin; that with a knowledge of those proclivities He placed them in temptation when He had a foreknowledge they would yield to that temptation, and drag not only themselves down to ruin but millions also of their posterity! That not only did He place our first parents in the scene of temptation, foreknowing they would yield to that temptation, but that He also knew and predestined a portion of Adam's posterity to be saved and a portion to be lost. This creed is taught and believed in by a large portion of the Protestant Church, and has, indeed, ever since the Great Reformation of Luther—the same theology in fact as was taught by Augustine of Hippo. The catechism of the Church of Scotland runs somewhat thus:—"That whereas all children were made liable to damnation, nevertheless, some were to be saved by the blood of Jesus Christ. "This was the Augustinian faith, and it is now the faith of the Church of Scotland, to a large extent of the Congregationalists, and, in a modified form, of the Anglican Church. I will not waste your time as reasonable and intelligent men by meeting such a proposition with argument. You must see at once that the almighty, wise and just God would not place his creatures in temptation, foreknowing that they would yield to that temptation, and by yielding be damned. I say that such a theory is God-dishonouring in the extreme, and the most horrid libel ever perpetrated on divine justice, for a God that could so act would not be a God but a fiend. Missionaries are sent into foreign lands to teach this doctrine. I am bold to say that in Africa, with all its darkness and superstition, or any other heathen land, there never was a more diabolical faith propagated. The Arminian creed is more merciful, for it tells us that all men may be saved, but it also tells us that God foreknows all things, and that many will be damned. So that a man without being consulted, or his consent being asked, is launched into this world with those inward proclivities which lead him to commit sin—we are told there is no good thing in him—and that God knows beforehand that he will yield to sin and be for ever lost Now, I ask you, when you recoil from these and kindred ideas, to do so without being afraid to examine them by the light of reason. He not be afraid though there may be a shrug of the shoulder and a leer of the eye, marking you for a time as an outcast from Society. Do not be afraid for the truth must in the end prevail. Investigate, examine and judge for yourselves, and if you believe in the ideas and dogmas laid down by the orthodox party, in the name of God adhere and act up to them. But if not, act otherwise by the light God has given you. Do not be afraid to judge for yourselves, because a God has been set up in olden time, surrounded by inconsistent attributes, which attributes, though inconsistent with the true character of Divine perfection, have been rendered sacred by superstition and reverence. When Protestantism was preached in England, Henry the VIII. sent commissioners round to investigate certain statues and images, by which it was said several miracles had been effected. The devotees were in great trepidation lest some great calamity should befall them for the desecration of their images. There was in one place an image of the Virgin Mary, which it was alleged sometimes wept. By and by, when this was examined, it was found that a recess made in the head, and filled with water, was so cut that on a trembling motion being imparted to the figure, the water flowed in drops, and had the appearance of tears. Many were the like discoveries made. If you honestly investigate and determine for yourselves you will be wiser and better men, and in the name of everything that is honouring to God and man, I ask you which is the most likely to be true—that God intended all His creatures should eventually be happy, or that at the great winding-up of affairs a large proportion of screaming, shivering, helpless souls should be sent to everlasting damnation? Judge between the two, and may God guide you to choose the truth. Now, men and brethren, all things are intended to develope and advance—is religion alone to stand still? Many, many years ago, the Chaldean shepherd began to observe that the starry heavens were not one unalterable wall of spangled lights. He marked that some of the objects were planetary, and that the world itself did move. The solar system was developed, and then the more extended science of astronomy, as now understood, by which it is known that our earth, instead of being the centre of the universe, is only a poor unit in boundless space! So also has the art of healing advanced. At one time a broken limb could not be set or removed. When it advanced a stage the severed limb was thrust into hot pitch to prevent the patient bleeding to death. Now the patient is relieved of all pain by the use of anæsthetics, so that he arises from a painful operation as from a slightly disturbed slumber. The art of chemistry has made alike strides. Shall then the faith of barbarians of 500 years back satisfy our advanced intellects? It is true that God is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But His creatures, who have kept His word, have not been the same. All the cruel restrictions in law have been removed. Men shrink from taking life, even for murder. Shall love and mercy move onward in all channels but one, and this the noblest of all—the River of God? I do not believe the religion of God will go backwards. I dare say that if Pharaoh had seen the cradle of Moses he would have laughed to scorn the idea that

the being who occupied that cradle was destined to do such a mighty work. And the pagans of old never dreamed of wonders to be wrought by the religion of the Babe of Bethlehem."

Judging from these quotations, Mr. Leech's theological stand-point is much the same as our own. We at any rate hail him as a right valuable addition to the ranks of those who regard the intimations of reason and conscience as of incomparably higher authority than the commandments and traditions of men, and wish him our heartiest god-speed.

SYDNEY: NEW SOUTH WALES.—On Monday evening, April 4, the members of the Unitarian congregation in this city met in Macquarie Street Church for the annual election of officers and the transaction of other business. The Secretary, Mr. H. Gale, presented a hopeful report containing many indications of the Church's progress, and the Treasurer, Mr. W. Shaw, produced a favourable balance sheet. The President of the Congregation, Mr. A. M. àBeckett, in the course of his address, said :—"We know that many very well-meaning persons think our opinions (at least so far as they understand them) extremely shocking, and that they are perfectly sincere in the expression of their regret that we should adhere to them; such persons, however, should remember that these opinions, or rather convictions are, to us, truths, and that if we were to abandon or sacrifice them, we should truly *be* what we are often falsely *called*, infidels.

We freely admit that, in common with all other human beings, we may be in error, and we moreover know that our shortcomings are neither few nor small, but we can at least affirm that we have not yet sunk into so debased a condition as to forsake what we believe to be true and acceptable to our Heavenly Father, to embrace what we feel to be false, merely to secure the favour of men, who might forward our worldly position, and endorse our spurious respectability.

Modest as may seem this small pretension to righteousness, and vile as would be considered any who openly acted in opposition to it, it must be, I think, admitted that even this very obvious path of rectitude is by no means universally trodden. Let us, therefore, be steadfast to our convictions, and without ostentatiously parading, be prepared to assert and maintain them on all suitable occasions, endeavouring to let them have their full influence on our lives and actions. We may thus, perhaps, exert proportionately as great an influence for good as some other churches, many of whose most pious and thoughtful members are themselves often heard to complain, that the true spirit of Christianity is nearly extinguished by the empty forms and ceremonial practices by which it is surrounded and oppressed.

To follow the light that is within us on matters of religion, seems so palpable and inevitable a duty, that of all recorded miracles and strange incongruities of human action, nothing seems more inexplicable or incredible than that any intelligent being having a belief in the existence of a God and a life beyond the grave, should so disgrace his humanity, to say nothing of imperilling his soul, as to use any dissimulation on so solemn a subject as his relation to God and to Eternity."

Poetry.

THE Old Man is up, he is up and away!
At twilight I saw him, at break of the day:
I saw him at noon, and I saw him at night,
O'er all the wide world still urging his flight;
Old Temples, old Towers, and every old thing—
He gave them a flap of his cold leaden wing:
And he sang his old song as still onward he flew—
"I pull down the old things to build up the new."

He flew to the East, to the West, South and North,
He stopped not for genius, or beauty, or worth;
No flattery soothed him, no sceptre could sway—
No mandate of kings, or soft minstrelsy's lay!
The hours on the fleet clouds around him set sail:
Day and night flew along on the wings of the gale;
On whirlwinds the Seasons kept spinning apace;

And Ages on Ages rushed on the race!

Up, up, Child of Freedom! Rise up in the light!
'Tis the race of true reason, religion, and right!
Let the bigoted tyrants of body and mind,
With their minions of darkness still loiter behind:
Be they State obscurantists or pietist knaves,
In high or low places, they'll perish like slaves,
Trampled down in the dust as Old Time rushes on
In the race never ending and ever begun!

ANON.

Correspondence.

The Bible and the Miraculous.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In your reply to Bishop Perry's pamphlet you give a list of mirac-ulous occurrences (p. 71) to which you challenge the assent of rational readers. But I observe that these miracles are nearly all on one side, if I may use the expression; they were all performed by accredited agents of Jehovah, by men "approved of God by miracles and signs and wonders." (Acts ii. 22), and therefore will be regarded by those who have no insuperable objections to the miraculous as regular credentials of God's ministers. But there is another side to the miraculous; there were wonders wrought by the enemies of God; running through the whole of the Bible there is a rich vein of prodigies, which the champions of literal interpretation are bound also to accept, and into this it may be worth while to examine. Throughout the whole history of the Israelites, magicians, wizards, witches and familiar spirits are mentioned as commonly as thieves and burglars in modern times. Thus (Gen. xli. 8) Pharaoh called in the magicians to interpret his dream before he had recourse to Joseph. Again (Exodus vii. 10), when Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh and it became a serpent, the magicians cast down their rods and they also became serpents: Aaron's rod-serpent, however, showing its superiority by swallowing their rod-serpents and afterwards resuming its original form. The magicians, moreover, imitated the genuine prophet in making the Nile to become blood (Exodus vii. 22), and in calling up frogs (Exodus viii. 7), but they were not able to turn dust into lice (Exodus viii. 18), and therefore accepted this prodigy as the work of God. Passing on to the Levitical law we find several enactments against wizards and necromancers (Exodus xxii. 8, Lev. xix 26-31, xx. 6-27, and Deut. xxiii. 10). Such were not to be allowed to live; they were to be stoned to death. More than this, there are directions given to meet the case of false prophets (Deut. xviii. 20), and of prophets who, being real wonderworkers, should use their influences for a bad purpose (Deut. xiii. 1). As we reach the era of Saul, the first Hebrew monarch, we find him troubled with an evil spirit (1 Sam. xvi 23), which, however, is subdued by a few airs upon a harp. But when Saul was approaching the end of his career, having slaughtered the priests contrary to law (1 Sam. xxii. 18), and exterminated all the witches according to law (1 Sam. xxviii. 3), the gloomy monarch in his desire to learn his fate was glad to seek the aid of a woman of the very class that he had put to death. And then we have a circumstantial account of the apparition of Samuel summoned from the land of shades to inform Saul of his impending fate. We hear again of wizards being consulted by King Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 6), and being extirpated by King Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 24). Enough of this subject for the Old Testament. Turning to the New, we find Jesus (Matt. xii. 27) observing, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" clearly showing that the power to cast out devils was in those days regarded as nothing remarkable. One passage may very well be quoted to show how the mind of a Jew was familiarised to the notion of miracles (John vii. 31), "When Christ cometh will he do *more* miracles than these which this man hath done?" In the book of Acts we find repeated mention of sorcerers—(viii. 9) of Simon Magus, (xiii. 6) of Elymas or Barjesus, (xvi. 16) of a certain damsel having a spirit of divination, (xix. 13) of certain vagabond Jews, exorcists, who attempted to cast out a devil and failed miserably. And, finally, in the

Epistle of Jude (v. 9) we are informed that the Archangel Michael had a dispute with the devil about the body of Moses, and used no strong language, not even calling his opponent a "moral leper"—more courtesy than has been shown by Dean McNeile to Bishop Temple.

Now, having gone through all this at the risk of being tedious, I ask the believers in the whole Bible, from cover to cover, do they accept it all? are they prepared to maintain, not merely that certain persons specially favoured of God might have worked wonders, but that this power should have been given to hundreds of persons, scattered up and down the history of the Israelites, from the time of the Patriarchs to the destruction of Jerusalem? e.g., that a great prophet should have been called back again to earth by a bad woman, directly against the Divine law, to foretell the fate of a bad man? If not, what becomes of the infallibility of the English Bible?

Savonarola.

Hymns and Hymnology.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Having occasion the other day to look over one of our popular Hymn Books, I was led into a mental commentary on its contents, and on laying it aside could not help scribbling a thought or two, which I now place at your service.

To any one not acquainted with orthodox writers, it seems surprising that such a vast number of hymns has been produced from such a slender stock of materials; one liymnologist having composed no fewer than 850 hymns; another 745; another 504; and several others from 200 to 400 each.

The Collection to which I have referred contains nearly a thousand hymns, and it seems truly marvellous that with only about ten or twelve Calvinistic dogmas to work upon such a quantity of versification could have been elaborated. But the marvel diminishes when they are inspected. Such endless repetitions clothed in such doggerel might easily be extended from thousands to tens of thousands. This, however, may be considered a mere matter of taste. Not so the language used; and here we cannot too strongly express our unmitigated disgust and even horror. We are told, for example, in reference to the Crucifixion, that

*"Earth's profoundest centre quakes,
The great JEHOVAH dies."*

What a monstrous idea that Almighty God should be nailed to a cross! I once heard a good man say, "Well, you affirm that Jehovah died; I want to know who took the reins of government in hand until he rose again from the dead." No doubt a question to the point. But the following verses arc, if possible, more monstrous still.

"Dies the glorious Cause of all!
The true eternal PAN;
Falls, to raise us from our fall,
To ransom sinful man!
Well may SOL withdraw his light,
With the Sufferer sympathise,
Leave the world in sudden night,
While the Creator dies!"

What strange language these good people use. Here we have the names of a couple of Pagan gods associated with Jehovah himself. One verse of another hymn is of such a mysterious character that we acknowledge our inability to understand it.

"Jesus, at thy command,
We know it shall be done;
Take the two sticks into thy hand,
The two shall then be one."

But it seems that scarcely any language can be too coarse or too contradictory if employed in the support of Calvinism. Even the Trinity is not always sufficient, as may be gleaned from the following:—

"The Father shining on his throne,
The glorious co-eternal Son,
The Spirit, one and seven,
Conspire our rapture to complete."

What are we to understand by this strange language? The writer seems rather fond of it, for in another hymn we have the same idea.

"Let the Spirit before his throne,
Mysterious One and Seven."

The Trinity now seems to be insufficient, for the number "Seven" is added! What a strange confusion of ideas respecting the Divine Being we find in these orthodox writers. The amiable Dr. Watts, whose name ever deserves to be spoken of with love and affection, could, in his early days, pen such awful language as this:—

"God the Mighty Maker died
For man the creature's sin."

It is generally believed, however, that the good Doctor took a very different view of these matters before he left this world.

Now, if we reflect for a moment that the whole Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, bears the most emphatic testimony to the Unity of the Divine Being, it seems truly marvellous that writers should indulge in such strange ideas as the above, and expect congregations to sing them as part of their public worship. Senex.

Income and Expenditure.

To the Editor.

SIR,—To make income tally with expenditure is surely one of the golden rules of life. And if so, how does it so frequently come to pass that while the precept is held to be incumbent on the individual, its potency is well-nigh set at naught by almost every State and public body? That it is thus ignored, will, we think, be conceded by all who will give themselves the trouble to examine a State budget, a Municipal Corporation or a Parochial Trust. In all three cases, nine times out of ten, responsibility is shifted from the present to the future, and that with a glibness and *insouciance* that might well excite a smile if the impulse were not superseded by sheer astonishment. So the thing goes on; and but for the now and then faint expostulation of some uninitiated and simple Corydon, either in the Legislative body, the Municipal council or the Parish meeting, we might almost be led to infer that debt was rather honourable than otherwise, and gradual increasing embarrassment a subject for jest.

Year after year this country has been going more deeply into debt, and no real effort made to extricate it. On the contrary, the ordinary tone of what has been frequently styled the "fourth estate" of the realm is and has been only of that feeble, apathetic and lazy kind, whose very rebuke is but encouragement in disguise. Is it not so? Of what conceivable benefit is it to adopt periodically a spasmodic tone, now and then diversified with querulous warning, or with an ominous Lord Burleigh-like shake of the head? All this and much more of the same kind may be ineffably respectable, but it does no good. An ulcer is eating deep into the flesh, and it needs a ready lance to probe it. The danger is imminent and calls for a champion of undoubted patriotism and of unsullied integrity. These are not times when we should be asked, "Where does the money go?" but; rather when we should compel ourselves to demand, "Whence does it come?" The obvious reply should teach economy to a money-voting Senate, and prompt them to advocate that healthy parsimony in the public purse which common sense and reflection (not to say honesty) prompt the private individual to exercise at home. It is a mistake to suppose that the rules that hold good in private circles in no way apply to public bodies. We maintain that the principle involved is the same throughout—with this additional gravamen in the latter case, that as those likely to be injuriously affected will be, not a particular, but a great public family, so is the necessity of remedial measures proportionably urgent,—and so some legislative determination to ensure a more

healthy state of the body corporate widely called for and imperative.

At any rate, a fast accumulating debt must eventually become ungrateful; because, however plausible may be the policy that perpetuates it, the plea of necessity that urges it, or even the speech that would make its items rotund and palatable, the public mind will after all recur to some first principles of integrity, and come seriously to decide that the debt which is a disgrace to the individual can do the State small credit. We may group our items of expenditure together, and deliver ourselves, *ex cathedra*, of a running fiscal commentary, or we may attempt to touch the vanity of people, hinting at rival jealousies and colonial aggrandisement, and tempt to the repudiating colonial integrity by the indirect lure of grander surroundings. But proceedings of this kind are neither sound nor politic, and must sooner or later recoil on those who, with all their ability to direct, and the accident of position to control, have been hitherto so lacking in moral courage. It may be natural to emulate a sister colony, and imitate if we will, and can do it honestly, some of the expensive features of the old country. But we should not let the former so notoriously go-ahead and beat us in well-nigh every manufacture, from intricate machinery to toilet soap, while the latter of course leaves us so immeasurably behind as to render the very attempt ridiculous travesty.

Scilicet ut plausus quos fert Agrippa feras tu,
Astuta ingenium vulpes imitata leonem.

If being prepared for war is a guaranty of peace, so is a colony's solvency one of its surest, aye, and securest titles to consideration and neighbourly respect. The great human family extends far beyond the limits of New South Wales, and it behoves us, accordingly, to take care that our word be unimpeachable, and our credit as clear as the climate that commonly brightens around us.
Quilibet.

Editorial Notices.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription : Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—R. E. B.—Subscriber.—J. C.—Theist.—W. C.—received.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and
Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 420 George Street, Sydney, June 6, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 6. July 4, 1870.

Notes.

In his recent University Commemoration Address, Dr. Badham, commend-ably shelving his usual lively assault on the obtuse individuals who cannot see the all-importance of Greek and Latin studies as a department of Education, and assuming the for him somewhat novel character of an Evangelist, propounds with some boldness a new Gospel of *Taste*. This taste, or rather the education of it, which the Professor defines as the art of employing leisure, is, according to him, the principle to which we must look for the demolition of our many vices and stupidities, and for the arrest of "the encroachments of a barbarism that is visibly coming upon us." Society, in a word, is to be regenerated by it, and man promoted to the highest accessible pitch of moral and intellectual excellence. "Educate the taste," says Dr. Badham, "and you educate the feeling of reverence. . . . Educate the taste, and you educate humanity. . . . Educate the taste, and you educate candour, forbearance, gentleness, compassion—all the feelings which make one citizen a blessing to another, and the commonwealth

a blessing to us all." Something like a suspicion, it is true, appears to have entered the Professor's mind as to the consistency of his doctrine with the "higher sanctions of piety and morality," but these he dismisses with a polite nod of recognition, and, with greater assurance than ever, proclaims his message of good tidings for the benefit of such as may be disposed to give it credence. For ourselves, we shall take the liberty of dissenting from Dr. Badham in this matter, and of even pronouncing his doctrine the unsoundest that has come under our notice for some time. To talk of taste—defined as the "art of employing leisure"—as the moral upshot of human character, is, in our opinion, to talk very genuine nonsense. We do not need a University Professor to inform us that leisure puts the possessor of it under obligation to turn it to the best account; but are we to ignore the fact that the toiling myriads of mankind are absolutely without leisure to cultivate? that to the tradesman fatigued and harassed by the anxieties of business, or to the artisan or labourer returning from his long day's toil in the factory or the warehouse, life is little else than a stern sequence of duties with but an occasional relaxation at most. There may be something in this new and exquisite Gospel of Taste to commend it to our opera-lounging dilettanti and others, but it, assuredly, is no gospel for the millions of the human race who have to toil hard and unremittingly for their daily bread, and whose highest satisfaction is in the thought that the faithful and cheerful discharge of their daily work is in itself an offering of worship to the Supreme. How, too, about the great souls—the Christs, the Luthers, the Cromwells—to whom we are indebted for the great reforms and revolutions of history? Where was their taste? It is clear they were unacquainted with it, at least in the Badhamic sense of term. The nobility of these worthies was in their unswerving faithfulness to conviction, and in their resolute self-denying determination to do as much as possible, during their allotted span of existence, in the way of blessing and improving their fellow-creatures. Dr. Badham, as President of our University, naturally commands a wide and attentive audience, and it is, therefore, all the more to be regretted that the majority of his official utterances have been either so fantastic or so wild.

As the Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots, so neither, after a careful study of the style and opinions of the *Herald's* contributor, "Buttevant," can we resist the temptation to identify this writer with the scribe once so familiar to the readers of that journal by his second-preceded-by-the-last-letter-of-the-alphabet initials, and who was on one occasion so elegantly described by an eminent University Professor as constantly roaming about in society with his literary shillalegh deftly poised as if anxious for a *head*. And a head, sure enough, the redoubtable Buttevant has at length found in the attempt now being made in England to organise attractive and instructive Sunday evening services for those who have ceased to hold the orthodox creeds, and who do not, therefore, take any interest in the ordinary church services. In view of these proceedings, Buttevant is delighted to believe, on the testimony of "John Plummer," whose ignorance of the religious condition of English society is simply pitiable, that "the respectable artisans of the old country" are still free from "the pestilence of irreligion," still proof against "the vapid fallacies of the infidel,"—what wretched cant!—and still faithful to "the well-attested series of startling facts and phenomena which compose the evidence of Christianity." We cannot afford to waste our space in replying to these and other equally ridiculous assertions; but what can Buttevant be about, when, as the Christian minister we conjecture him to be, he goes on to sneer at the notion of religion without dogma, and to insist upon our acceptance of what he terms the "realities and verities of faith" as the sole condition of God's acceptance of us. Does Buttevant ever read his New Testament? Is he at all familiar with the story of the young man who on one occasion accosted Jesus, asking him what lie was to do to obtain eternal life? He is! Then let Buttevant mark the reply of Jesus to his interrogator. Does he tell him to study Moses and the Prophets, to make the Levitical code the law of his daily life, to believe this doctrine and observe that ceremony? Nothing of the sort. His advice to the young man is, that he should "keep the commandments," as embodied in the faithful discharge of his duty to his God and to his neighbour, and give proof of his sincerity by renouncing the avarice which was clearly his besetting sin. Now, had this young man been told to be punctilious in matters of ceremony and sound on points of doctrine, to repeat with solemn face the time-honoured shibboleths of his people, and to indulge his pride and prejudices by a little social persecution of those who differed from him, in a word, to be religious as the mass of orthodox Christians are religious, no doubt the result of his interview with Christ would have pleased him mightily. As it was, sorrow seized upon his soul, for that he had "great possessions," which, although striking at the moral roots of his manhood, he could not possibly renounce. Exactly so. Prescribe for men a religion of forms and doctrines—a religion, that is, which bids them be sound in the faith and leaves unassailed their besetting follies and sins, and they will unhesitatingly receive you as a teacher of the pure Gospel type; but demand of them morality, self-renunciation, purity of heart, warning them that without these their so-called religion is mere pretence, and they will instantly discard you as a messenger from the Pit. For ourselves, we have long since repudiated the childish anticipation of a final and formal division of mankind into heaven-deserving saints and hell-deserving sinners; but were such a separation at all possible or probable, there can be little question that the latter section would include not a few of our psalm-singing church-goers, while to the former would be referred the just, the generous, the pure, the

true-hearted, the noble-minded of every age and race. Buttevant, again, is dreadfully indignant that his dear creeds should have been associated by the promoters of the London Sunday evening services with the word "baneful." An epithet, in our opinion, too mild by half. Let Buttevant run his eye over the page of History and note the dismal slaughterings that have been perpetrated in the misused name of religion; let him think of the Vaudois, Albigeois, Huguenots, Catholics, Jews, Puritans and Covenanters who have been butchered or burnt, mutilated or murdered—for what? Simply for their creeds! Jesus, indeed, rebuking the pharisaical formalism of his age, could quote from one of the grand old Hebrew prophets the divine sentiment, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." But creed-bound and creed-binding Christians of the Buttevant School persistently read it backwards. *Their* motto is, "We will sacrifice our foes to our wrath, and we will have no mercy at all."

It is only natural that Protestants should watch with keen interest the proceedings of the (Ecumenical Council, and that the more bitter of them should exhibit their delight at the want of unanimity among its members upon the vexed question of Papal Infallibility. It is, no doubt, sufficiently monstrous that a number of fallible men, should propose to establish by a majority of votes so extravagant a theory as that of a divinely-appointed exemption from error on the part of a man no better or worse than themselves. But does it never occur to orthodox Protestants, thus making merry at the expense of Catholicism and its vaunted unanimity, that there is in their own system a hardly less monstrous incongruity. The most acrimonious Protestants are as a rule the most stalwart champions of the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, men who consider the distribution of that book "without note or comment" as an invaluable blessing to mankind, who frown at the bare suggestion of there being biblical inaccuracies, and who scowl at us as we laugh over such stories as that of Samson catching three hundred foxes and tying them together two and two by the tails. But the question naturally presents itself, who marked out the limits of this Infallible Book, deciding what should and what should not be included within the Canon of Scripture? The Canon was determined by men, fallible men, meeting in councils similar to that now sitting at Rome, and which is only the last of a long series. In vogue among the early Christians were Apocryphal Gospels containing stories about the infancy of Jesus, quite as absurd as the stories about Samson, but which, not being included in the Canon, the most devout Protestants are at liberty to criticise and even to ridicule. But what guarantees have we that the councils which established the Infallible Book were not as prone to err in their proposals and decisions, as the council now sitting at Rome? Indeed it is quite clear that some must have erred; for the council of Laodicea, A.D. 363, excluded the Apocalypse from the Canon; and, granting that that imaginative work has since been readmitted, how are simple men to know which council was right and which was wrong? But the most notable modification of the Canon of Scripture has been effected within the last half-century by a body having no ecclesiastical status whatever. The Church of England states (Article 6) of the other books (*i.e.* the Apocrypha), that "the Church doth read them for example of life and instruction in manners;" but the governing body of the British and Foreign Bible Society concluded that the Apocryphal writings should have no place in their issue of the Bible. At the present day a Bible including the Apocrypha is so rare, that many a paterfamilias who might wish to read Bel and the Dragon, or the Story of Susanna to his family for "their instruction in manners," would find himself nonplussed, unless, indeed,—awful thought!—the Douay Bible of a Catholic neighbour should be forthcoming. Which is right, the Bible Society or the sixth Article of the Church of England? For ourselves, we are as willing to believe that the infant Jesus made sparrows of clay and endowed them with life, as that Pharaoh's magicians turned their rods into serpents, and we find nothing more or less incredible in the existence of a supposed Infallible Book than in that of an Infallible Pope.

WE have nothing to say in disparagement of City Missions considered as an agency for assisting and improving the poorer and less-instructed inhabitants of populous communities; nor do we doubt that they are equal, when carried on by the right persons and in the right spirit, to the accomplishment of a vast amount of good. It is, however, impossible to peruse the recently published annual report of the Sydney City Mission without coming to the conclusion, that the promoters of this enterprise are sadly at sea both as regards their conception of the work to be done and their method of doing it. The Rev. W. Kelynack, in moving the adoption of the report, vividly described certain districts of Sydney where, as he says, "drink, licentiousness and devilism" are the order of the day. He had recently gone with one of the Society's missionaries on an "exploratory tour," and soon found himself in a "district which resembled a rabbit warren in its geography and a Gomorrah in its guilt." Then he visited a court that was "filthy and reeking with all noisome things," and another, where were found "four or five little cabins which might serve as a hiding-place for rats," but in which, nevertheless, were discovered "several souls fast bound by the fetters of sin, and led captive by the devil at his will;" while in one house, horrible to relate, was encountered "a lewd and brazen woman who boasted that she was going to hell herself and Was going to take all the inmates with her." And so on. Mr. Kelynack's portraiture may be over-coloured, but we shall not criticise it. The evil he deplors is, unquestionably, as crying as it is enormous, nor does any one doubt that it should be encountered with all the earnestness and sagacity of which good men are capable, and, if possible, to its speedy extinction. But we, in all seriousness, put it to our readers

whether this devoutly-to-be-wished-for end has any chance of being accomplished by the City Mission as at present conducted. The Sydney Society employs a number of missionaries, of assumed fitness for their work, who are expected to distribute during the year so many religious tracts (30,749 for 1869-70), to read and pray with so many families (6,929 for 1869-70), to hold meetings, to dispose of Bibles, and, in a word, to make themselves generally useful in promoting the objects contemplated by the Society. Indeed, the report for the past year is conclusive as to the well-intentioned zeal, the self-denial, the assiduity of the several missionaries in the discharge of their allotted tasks; and in view of which we can well afford to overlook their well-known practice of invading the home circle—as much, perhaps, for the sake of recording a "call" as for any good they may be able to effect—at times, and under circumstances, when their presence is anything but acceptable. But let that pass. What really perplexes us is this—that a number of men, as well-informed as they are, earnestly bent on benefiting their fellow creatures, should be found labouring under the delusion that the victims of poverty, intemperance, disease, deficient education, defective sanitary appliances and social neglect are to be delivered from the evils which beleaguer and oppress them, and so raised to positions of usefulness and respectability, by instrumentalities so glaringly inappropriate and inadequate as the wholesale distribution of religious tracts and the indefinite multiplication of pastoral visits. Obviously, the truth of the matter is, that in proportion as a sound and comprehensive system of education is brought within the reach of, and the application of it rendered obligatory upon, all classes of the people; in proportion as children are trained, under the influence of such an education, into men and women imbued with the sense of self-respect, superior to the rule of their baser appetites and passions; and practically impressed with the conviction that every violation of natural law is inevitably attended by its retributive penalty; in proportion, in a word, as governments, backed by rational organisations of philanthropy, become devoted to the moral, social and physical well-being of the communities they represent; so will our civilisation be freed from the intemperance, the destitution, the vice, the ignorance, the crime, which at present disfigure it. It may, indeed, be said, in answer to this, that the eternal affairs of the soul, to which the Mission movement is mainly meant to administer, are infinitely more pressing and important than the temporal affairs of the body. But this proposition we beg most emphatically to dispute. We say deliberately that the present and not the future world is the one with which we are most intimately concerned; and we say, further, that to offer a man bread for his soul when he is in want of bread for the body, or "point him to Jesus" when a destitute wife and children are confronting him at every turn, or to exhort him to flee from "the wrath to come" when he is in constant dread of a distress warrant from his impatient landlord, is to mock him most cruelly. We dissent, again, from Mr. Kelynack's conception as to the *spirit* in which a work of the kind under consideration should be undertaken. It is clear, painfully clear in fact, from this gentleman's speech, that his view of unfortunate or, as he, perhaps, would put it, *unregenerate* humanity, is strongly tinged with what the Master had in his mind's eye when he directed his rebuke against "certain who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others." Evidently to be poor, or reduced, no matter by what set of circumstances, to the lower end of the social scale is, in Mr. Kelynack's estimation, to be devil-possessed. What right has he to speak of people who have not had the same advantages as himself as necessarily "led captive by the devil at his will," and as being "fit only to become fuel for the flames of hell?" Had Mr. Kelynack gone on his "exploratory tour" in a somewhat more Christlike spirit, our impression, from personal experience, is, that he would have encountered an amount of self-denial, of really stalwart virtue and manful upstandingness in the presence of sore temptation, which would have administered a shock to his theological prepossession respecting the utterly lost and ruined condition of human nature. Anyhow, we would advise him, when next he makes a "tour," to turn his attention to circles of Sydney society where the people, in spite of their reputation for gentility and godliness, in spite of their pious pretensions and sanctified looks, may be found exhibiting a callous indifference to calls upon their self-denial, a viciousness in their attachment to low and degrading pursuits, an utter absence of principle and a heartless hypocrisy, which may furnish him with an abundance of the best sermon-matter for the next twelvemonth.

THE *Sydney Morning Herald* of June 13, announced in its leading columns a discovery of such overwhelming interest that words fail us in attempting to describe it. As far as we can gather, it is a solution of a mysterious problem concerning the future world. But let our readers judge for themselves. After commenting upon the delightfully anæsthetic properties of nitrous oxide (commonly called laughing gas), the writer proceeds thus :—"In passing, we may remark that there is one interesting reflection that must overtake the reader of Davy's researches. When we perceive how light a thing as the inhalation of a little impalpable gas produces the wonderful effects experienced and described by him, and transports us in a few moments from a state of suffering to one of ecstasy, it becomes less difficult to understand how some changes in the gases breathed by mankind may be all that is necessary, together with some moral transformations, to bring in a state of being to which sorrow and suffering shall be unknown." Intensely interesting as it is to be told something of the probable atmosphere of the future abode of saints, we confess to some disappointment at no hint having been given of what is in store (according to the popular theology) for the great bulk of the human race, and of

course for all readers of the *Free Religious Press*. What kind of air is there in the place paved with good intentions? While Lazarus is taking his fill of the nitrous oxide or some other pleasing chemical combination, what does Dives breathe? Not sulphuretted hydrogen, we trust. To have to inhale that or some such nasty compound, for a few millions of centuries, would surely be too great a punishment even for the hardened sinner who was fined a few days ago at the Central Police Court for laying down a drain on Sunday.

IN the interest of pure and undefiled religion we chronicle, with a word or two of comment, on the authority of a trustworthy correspondent, a little incident which recently occurred in a leading town of New South Wales. Some three or four weeks since, Mr.———, a squatter, died. Day was just dawning when the death-hour came upon him, and his wife, a pious Roman Catholic, anxious to perform over him to the best of her ability the last offices of religion, hastily sent for some holy water to the residence of a co-religionist, with whom, it seems, a supply of this article had been entrusted by the church authorities. At first the application was not acceded to, but, upon the urgency of the case being stated, a supply of the precious liquid was obtained and zealously applied to the face, hands and feet of the dying man. A number of articles were then arranged on the table in threes in recognition of the Trinity, and when, on the dislodgment of the spirit by death, a neighbour proposed that the body should receive the usual mortuary ablution, the relatives of the deceased earnestly requested that the operation might be delayed for an hour or so in order that the soul might have time to plead for mercy at the gate of Heaven. Whether these proceedings are in keeping with the recognised doctrines and usages of the Roman Catholic Church we cannot say, but they at all events conclusively show that irrational views of religion are often the cause of much mental suffering as well as of much moral evil; the suffering, indeed, usually being in proportion to the depth and sincerity of the faith. We may well smile over the notion that the destiny of a disembodied spirit can be affected by our manipulation of the tenement that once held it, but we can at the same time understand the distress which would have wrung the hearts of the friends of Mr.——— at the thought of purgatorial pains from which a trifling delay might have given him a chance of release. That the Church of Rome notably connives at and sanctions many foolish and hurtful superstitions of this class is not to be denied; but then, orthodox Protestantism is anything but guiltless in the matter, as when a Church of England minister refuses Christian burial to an unbaptised infant though the parents may entreat the consolation with tears; or when an evangelical mother, taking to heart the sweet counsels of last Sunday's sermon, has a misgiving that her son who died of cholera at Hongkong is eternally lost, because he was not washed with the blood of sprinkling.

So the Presbyterian clergy of Dunedin, Otago, New Zealand, have, it seems, been heartily anathematising the *Free Religious Press*, and formally placed it in their *Index Fxpurgatorius*. Good! But to the particulars. There is in that city, as some of our readers may be aware, a large and flourishing Mechanics' Institute, numbering seven hundred members and possessing a fine library and reading-room. On the "free table" of this Institution, reserved as it is for contributed periodicals, one of our Dunedin subscribers placed his opening numbers of the *Press*. Thereupon, the most popular and most liberal clergyman in Dunedin—the Rev. D. McStuart—took serious fright, solemnly informed his flock on the following Sunday of the fearful infidel publication that had made its appearance at the Institute, and finished his tirade by accusing the Committee of robbery (!) for allowing it to lie upon their tables, and within reach of the rising generation. Nor was the Rev. G. Sutherland—whose "Urgent Appeals" were reviewed in our May number—at all wanting on the occasion. This illustrious champion of orthodoxy fiercely inveighed against the rampant infidelity that was abroad, and had at last come to their very doors! He implored his hearers to guard as the apple of their eye the consoling reflection that nine-tenths of the human race are destined to burn for ever in a lake of fire and brimstone, and held out no prospect for such infidels as Huxley and Tyndall but "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation." It is satisfactory, however, to know that this outburst of clerical ire has had, as it could have, but one effect. It has brought the *Free Religious Press* fairly under the notice of the people of Dunedin, and increased our list of subscribers in that enterprising city. So it is that the wrath of men, even the wrath of parsons, is sometimes made to further the principles they would crush. Now let us hope that a candid perusal of the present and future numbers of the *Press* will have such an effect on the clergymen we have named, that they may, at no distant date, be found "clothed and in their right mind." Who knows but that our Periodical may some day supplant, in their estimation, the famous "Larger Catechism with proofs thereof from Scripture!"

THE conduct of brave men who risk their lives, as did the brave Harrison and the brave Bailey at the wreck of the *Walter Hood*, on the chance of snatching a fellow-creature from the jaws of death, has ever evoked, as it ever will evoke, the admiration of such as are capable of appreciating a noble action or a generous impulse. The meeting, therefore, so unostentatiously convened some three weeks since at Greville's Commercial Room was a becoming sequel to the late disaster in Jervis Bay; nor would we lose this opportunity of expressing our satisfaction at the form—that of a Medal for Bravery—under which the services of Messrs. Harrison and Bailey were on this occasion publicly recognised. We have our Cross for the soldier who distinguishes himself on the field of battle, and our Humane Society's medal for the man who is instrumental in saving or in attempting to

save a human life. Why should we not have our Cross or Medal for acts of physical or moral daring by whomsoever exhibited? We trust that Messrs. Harrison and Bailey will long live to wear their medals, and would even hope that the late meeting at the Commercial Room may prove the beginning of a new order of things among us in matters of this kind. Our practice hitherto, particularly in this colony, has been to estimate a noble action at its cash value, and then, under an originally-good but skockingly-prostituted impulse, to go about from house to house, on behalf of the doer of it, with a *hat*. To treat a high-minded or noble-hearted display of character in this way is simply to annul it.

The Church of England.

It is well known to students of history that the politico-ecclesiastical institution whose "Prayer Book is Popish, articles of faith Calvinistic, and clergy Arminian" owes its existence to a compromise. The Protestant feeling which arose in England during the reign of Henry the Eighth, strong as it was, would not have been sufficient in itself to upset the old faith. That autocrat who cared no more for the reformed religion than for any other, and whose faith was embodied in the words "Royal Supremacy," found it to his interest to enter into an alliance with the zealots who, except in regard to what constituted the one bond of sympathy, namely, a determination to banish Papal authority from England, were the opposites of their royal patron in every conceivable respect. Thus in the very infancy of the Established Church it was divided into two sections, mutually repulsive and irreconcilable; the Court party with its warm faith in hereditary monarchy, its dread of innovation, and its consequent leaning to the doctrines and rites of the ancient Church; and the Puritans, with their strong tendency to republicanism in the State, their stout assertion of the right of private judgment in matters spiritual, and their resolution to fight unto the death, armed with the sword of the Spirit, or, if necessary, a more carnal weapon, against the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities. That any link should have been found strong enough to hold together two such heterogeneous elements for three centuries seems even more wonderful than that the free and slave parties could have coexisted in America for nine decades. Yet, so inextinguishable was the Protestant spirit of the people on the one hand, and so deeply rooted was the conservative feeling of the ruling classes on the other, that the bitter persecutions of Mary, the thinly-disguised enmity of Elizabeth, and the frowns of that vulgar pedant, James the First, served only to intensify the one, while the democratic wave which swept over England about the middle of the seventeenth century failed so completely to affect the latent vitality of the other, that shortly after the Restoration the advocates of divine right and apostolic succession were in almost undisputed possession of the field. By espousing the cause of that most religious and gracious king, Charles the Second, and his courtiers, and by expelling two thousand of its very best ministers, the Church then purchased riches, power, and comparative peace. The old battle cry, however, "No Popery" on one side, and "Church and King" on the other were not by any means abandoned. The conforming Puritans, whose consciences were more elastic than those of the two thousand secessionists, have always, from that time to the present, formed a considerable party in the Church, doing battle for the faith behind the shield of the thirty-nine articles, under the name of Low Churchmen; whilst their opponents, the High Churchmen, holding steadily by the doctrines contained in the Liturgy, have been equally zealous in their defence of what are known as "sound church principles." For a long period, however, the clergy seemed to have fallen asleep, and sloth perhaps was the cause of the mutual forbearance which for a season the traditional enemies showed one another. It has been said that in the good old times of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers sermons were invariably either "high and dry" or "low and slow," and that one kind differed from the other only in the circumstance that the former abounded in such words as "church" and "sacraments," while the latter preferred the terms "gospel" and "saving faith." Whatever may have been the nature and duration of the armistice, however, it was finally brought to an end by Newman and Pusey. These champions of High Church principles threw down the gauntlet in publishing the Tracts for the Times, and thereby aroused the latent Protestantism of the country to an unexpected extent. To preach in the surplice was rank Popery. To teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which by the way is distinctly enunciated in the Prayer Book, was Romish heresy of the deepest dye. The battle threatened to rage with something like the old fury, when a new symptom appeared in the body ecclesiastic which caused both parties to pause.

For several generations the revelations of Science, and especially of Astronomy and Geology, had been slowly and silently, but surely, undermining the faith of educated men in the historical parts of the Old Testament, and developing a spirit of scepticism amongst even those of the clergy whose orthodoxy seemed to the casual observer unimpeachable. Thus, to take a single instance, the fact that intelligent people have ceased to believe in a personal devil is perhaps due more to the reverend author of the Ingoldsby Legends than to any direct assault upon the old superstition. The development of a rationalistic movement became then merely a question of time, for it was impossible that the national theology should permanently ignore national thought.

Accordingly we find that about twenty years ago a distinct party known by the title of "Broad Church," though at first numerically small, rapidly absorbed within it almost all the intellectual power of young English churchmen; and expanded so rapidly, not only in numbers but in creed also, that "Essays and Reviews" fell upon the horrified bishops like a thunderbolt. The puny attempt of these right reverend fathers to cope with the spirit of the age succeeded only in bringing ridicule upon themselves, and in further developing the sceptical spirit. Scarcely had the excitement caused by this episode passed away, when the orthodox were again startled by the appearance of Colenso's works, and the nation generally was edified by another exhibition of impotent rage on the part of his right reverend brethren. The spirit of free inquiry then grew so rapidly that the Voysey phase followed within three or four years, and this must surely have been the climax as far as the Church of England is concerned.

The position of the Established Church is, therefore, totally different now from what it ever has been. It may perhaps be best compared to a triangle, with Dr. Pusey in one corner, Dr. McNeile in another, and Mr. Voysey (or if he has been suppressed, one of his many sympathisers) in the third. Some "safe" man, say the Archbishop of York, might occupy the centre of gravity.

It is a matter of surprise to some that a church so fearfully divided against itself should have stood so long; a church too, which, although it has partaken so largely of the national wealth has egregiously failed in its national duties; which has for centuries allowed millions to grow up in ignorance and lead lives of practical atheism; which has been servile to the rich man and cold or contemptuous toward the poor; which has systematically held itself aloof from any movement for raising the social condition of the masses; and which rouses itself to political action only when its own interests seem to be threatened, as in the case of the recent abolition of the Irish Establishment. By what process of priestly jugglery, it is sometimes asked, can the English people have been imposed upon for three centuries?

The Church of England has maintained its hold, an apologist might say, by means of the incomparably beautiful and solemn language of its Prayer Book, the thorough self-devotion and Christlike life of many of its working clergy, and a kind of traditional and hereditary attachment on the part of its worshippers dating almost from infancy. There is unquestionably much force in this plea; but two additional reasons may be given, which are less sentimental but, perhaps, not less cogent. In the first place, all the great centres of education, Oxford, Cambridge, the great public schools, and nearly all the grammar schools through the country, were placed under the control of the Church. Fellowships, masterships, benefices, were open in almost every instance to clergymen only; and the same system prevails, with but slight modification, to the present day. By this clever artifice, the rising intellect of England has been in every succeeding generation literally bribed into conformity, real or pretended, and an effectual guarantee has been obtained that the heads of colleges and schools shall not encourage a spirit of inquiry amongst the young. Secondly, the Established Church has benefited enormously in point of influence and wealth on account of its social prestige. There was something "genteel" in being seen at church, something decidedly low in dissent. The parson would no more recognise as a social equal the independent minister than he would his footman. Accordingly the retired tradesman who had made a fortune and destined it to the purchase of a factitious position in society, found it necessary to turn his back upon his old fellow-worshippers at Little Bethel, and to secure a seat at the parish church as near as possible to the squire's. England is not the only part of the world in which snobs are to be found, and even in this colony, the parvenu who adopts episcopal orthodoxy as a means of elevating himself in the social scale is not altogether unknown. But in the mother country the effect of these defections from Puritanism upon the prosperity, or at least, the influence, of the Established Church, has been more marked. Many an old roundhead of the seventeenth century would, if he were now to revisit the earth, be dismayed to find his lineal descendant a tory squire, or possibly a peer, ardent in the defence of Church and State.

The causes thus indicated, although still in operation, are weakening year by year, and with increasing rapidity. The clergy of the Established Church begin to find it to their interest to adopt a more conciliatory and respectful tone towards non-conformists. The Bishop of Winchester, indeed, forgetting that times have vastly changed since he was a young man, asserted in public not very long ago that "beer-shops, over-crowded cottages and *dissent* were the great hindrances to religious education." The indignation expressed at this in the House of Commons, and the humiliation which the bishop had afterwards to undergo in offering a somewhat lame and undignified apology, may perhaps have the effect of preventing in future any similar exhibition of insolence and folly. It has been observed, moreover, for some years past, that the intellectual standard of the clergy has been rapidly degenerating. Since a large number of desirable offices in the civil service have been thrown open to public competition, many of the most gifted young men from the Universities have been diverted from seeking ordination, who a generation ago would have had no other resource than "the Church;" and in consequence the bishops have been compelled to fall back upon a class of men who may be very good Christians, but who in point of education and social bearing are certainly not likely to add much to the prestige of the Establishment. Independently of this, too, conscience is beginning at last to assert her rights. Scarce a

mail arrives from England without an account of some fresh triumph of intellect and honour over orthodox tyranny. One of the most recent instances is the open repudiation of the clerical office by Mr. Clark, the Public Orator at Cambridge, Vice-Principal of Trinity College, and one of the most distinguished scholars at the University. He remarks, in a letter to the bishop of his diocese, that to say "God spake these words," while he does not believe that God spake these words, is to lie to the congregation, and that this lie he will no longer utter. This event has attracted no great amount of notice, although if it had occurred ten years ago, the whole bench of bishops would have been up in arms, and both houses of Convocation would have petitioned the University to expel Mr. Clark as a corrupter of youth. But times have changed, and even bishops have learned a grain of common sense.

That a crisis is impending,—that the Church of England is tottering to her foundations, no well-informed man can doubt; but the precise direction in which (vents are tending we can but surmise. Sir J. D. Coleridge, the present Solicitor-General of England, has recently laid the case before his fellow-churchmen with judicial clearness and impartiality. In a lecture at Sion College, he pointed out that a national Church must cease to exist as such unless it keep pace with the times; that the old English standards of orthodoxy are worn out and fast falling into contempt; and that the consequence which painfully but distinctly presented itself to his mind was, that the almost immediate disestablishment of the Church of England could only be averted, not by yielding a few immaterial points to orthodox or semi-orthodox dissenters, but, as he significantly told his audience, by throwing open her portals *to a far wider extent than any of them dreamt of*. Of this we may be assured, that the time for compromise is past. When once the battle has begun there can be no permanent rest until the Church which owes its existence to an assertion of the right of private judgment shall either be swept away, or allow the right of private judgment to all;—in other words, until every symbol of spiritual bondage in the form of confessions of faith and tests of orthodoxy shall be consigned to the place whither the Inquisition has been sent long before it.

Sagitta.

The Irrationality of Creeds.

To attend service for ten consecutive Sundays in any orthodox Protestant church is almost certainly to hear—so formidable a foe to ecclesiastical Christianity has the spirit of free inquiry at length waxed—at least three or four hearty denunciations of an attribute of man, which, if it does not, as some think, distinguish him from the brutes, is at any rate among the highest and noblest of his endowments. And the method of this strange proceeding is as stereotyped as the occurrence of it is regular. At the least scent of what is termed unbelief, the Preacher, vociferating and attitudinising in his most impressive style, solemnly informs his hearers that their reasoning faculty, except when under the guidance of the priest and acquiescent with the revealed Word, is not to be trusted. You must not, says he, direct an earnest and independent thought at the great religious verities which have long since been accurately and authoritatively defined; or, to the peril of your salvation, you will find yourselves plunging deeper and deeper into doubt, and at last into the abyss of a soul-destroying rationalism. Stand you fast by the faith once delivered to the saints, and of which we, the priesthood, are the appointed guardians. Be warned, my beloved brethren and sisters, for the enemy, bold, skilful and insidious, is abroad, and is waiting to snatch you from the fold of true believers.

Now this antipathy of the orthodox ecclesiastical mind towards the intellectual side of human nature is assuredly not a matter of accident; and, perhaps, on looking into the matter, we shall find that the doctrines usually promulgated from pulpits are in themselves so essentially unreasonable, as to readily explain the antagonism to which we allude. Nor is it necessary in an investigation of this kind to select the more abstruse or metaphysical of the Christian doctrines; doctrines which by the open confession of the defenders of them are so mysterious and incomprehensible, as to involve a complete prostration of the reasoning faculty as an indispensable preliminary to their acceptance. Our purpose will be best served by the selection of a dogma, the character and bearing of which are apparent to even humble intellects, and which, moreover, may be considered to exert an important influence on human life and conduct. The doctrine we refer to is that of the destiny of mankind in a future state of existence. Most Protestant Christians believe that every human being is, at the moment of death, irrevocably doomed either to an eternity of unbroken bliss or to an eternity of unmitigated misery. What an absurdity! What a libel upon the wisdom, upon the justice of the Eternal! What an impossible division of mankind, if one would but give the matter a thought! Fancy some dispassionate philosopher emerging from his cell and hearing of this monstrous figment of the theological imagination for the first time! Drawing his conclusions of men from a calm survey of them as they really are, what would the doctrine in question lead him to expect? Why, he would expect to find some very high and attractive characters, paragons of virtue, sullied by no vice, disfigured by no meanness or folly, and, on the other hand, some very low and

repulsive natures, graced by no virtues, redeemed by no trace of chivalry or love; but of the half-and-half characters, mere creatures of circumstance who are led into good or evil as the impulse of the moment urges, or the influence of society inclines, them,—such characters, in truth, being, on the popular theory, neither good enough for the one H nor bad enough for the other,—our philosopher would not expect to find a single specimen. The conception, therefore, of mankind as being divided or even divisible into sheep and goats, heaven-deserving saints and hell-deserving sinners, is as false as it is crude, it would be much nearer the truth to say that of the best men there are none who are not tainted with some vice or folly, that of the worst men there are none who are wholly and irredeemably corrupt, while a large proportion of the human race is precisely of that mediocre stamp which is not good enough for the heaven of the saints nor bad enough for the hell of the sinners. Illustrative instances present themselves in any number and from all quarters. Perhaps there are few men who stand higher in the ranks of British literati, or who have exerted a greater fascination over the human mind, than Robert Burns, Lord Byron and Thomas Moore. Were these men saints of the orthodox pattern? Assuredly not. Were they saints at all? Not without a very liberal allowance for the infirmities of human nature. Were they hell-doomed sinners, then? They were, says the theologian; but his dismal and lying squeak is instantly silenced by a loud thundering No direct from the heart of humanity. Then, if we cross from Britain to France, what shall be said of such men as Voltaire and Rousseau? Between the philosophers who hail them as chiefs in the republic of letters, and the clergy who would consign them to the hottest corner of their seething caldron, we find ourselves beset by a similar difficulty as to their true place in the scale of moral ranks, and the same difficulty, insuperable as it is, will beleaguer and confound us, until we drop the foolish notion that humanity is a pair of well defined halves, instead of an indeterminately graduated moral unity.

Hard, however, as it is to discover suitable candidates for the orthodox heaven,—unless, indeed, we sanction, as we certainly do not sanction, the claims of those vapid, tame and uninteresting personages who are the subjects of religious biographies,—it is even more difficult to find suitable victims from among men as they actually are, for the orthodox hell. For the governors of our prisons and penitentiaries will testify that even in the most degraded natures redeeming points of character are always to be found, as manifested, for example, in their oft-expressed desire that a child or some youthful relative may be so reared as to avoid reaping their own guilt and misery. Nor again, when some fearful crime has been committed, is the perpetrator of it allowed to go without hope or consolation to his appointed place. In the interval between sentence and execution he is handed over to his spiritual advisers, who, like physicians in a desperate case, work with such energy and assiduity, that the culprit, on reaching the scaffold is usually no longer a hell-bound sinner steeped in crime, but a saint exulting in the prospect of impending heavenly bliss. So forcibly does the cant that is uttered on these occasions show how the instincts of human nature will recoil from the creeds which are uttered by human lips.

Proceeding now to a more comprehensive view of mankind we are brought face to face with the important fact that Christianity in the largest sense is known only to a minority of the human race at present existing; and that in the past it was absolutely unknown to men whose writings have had a quite incalculable influence on the intellectual development of every nation of Europe. In those early times there were multitudes of men and women, who strove to the best of their knowledge and moral development to do their duty in their respective spheres of action, and to train their children after them to do the same. What will be their destiny in a future life? What will be the fate of Cicero, Cato, Seneca? of Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, and of countless others occupying niches in the Temple of Fame? Of the illustrious Socrates it may be fairly said that he enunciated doctrines generally supposed to be peculiar to Christianity. While the Jews were upholding the *lex talionis*, or right of retaliation, in all its barbarous severity, Socrates was labouring to impress the minds of his countrymen with the principle that they ought not to return injury for injury, and when urged by his friends to escape, in the interval between his conviction and execution, his argument was that as the laws had always given him protection and security, so it would be base ingratitude on his part to break the laws because they had been prostituted to his unjust condemnation. What would the philosopher before alluded to, guided by common sense, say of these ancient worthies? Surely that men who, without having heard of Christianity, acted as men should act, by the light of their own consciences, were worthy of heaven; and, further, that those who, like Socrates, could attain to Christian morality, untaught and unassisted, were morally higher than those whose Christianity grounds itself on the life and teachings of Jesus. But then our philosopher learns to his astonishment, from the Articles of the Church of England, that men (Art. xviii.) cannot be saved by the light of Nature, and that works (Art. xiii.) if not done through faith in Jesus Christ have the nature of sin. Alas, then, poor Cicero! poor Socrates!

* * * *"if this be true indeed,*

Some Christians have a comfortable creed."

We were wrong, however, in asserting, as we did just now, that it was hard to find victims for the ecclesiastical hell. In fact, we were quite wrong. There will be victims enough; and they will be men whose names are "familiar in our ears as household words." Did we write from a Catholic point of view, we might

quote the names of Martin Luther, John Knox, John Calvin and others; as it is we may just name a few men whom Protestants, with ludicrous inconsistency, condemn for having diverged from Protestantism, just as they themselves diverged from Catholicity. Gibbon, Hume, Bolingbroke, Volney, Rousseau, Voltaire—these are the men who, because they dared to use their minds, and, in doing so, to arrive at conclusions not sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, are occasionally referred to by good churchmen as expiating their crimes in hell. These same good churchmen, indeed, will sometimes argue—"If we are wrong, and you sceptics are right, we have only been living under a harmless delusion; but if we are right and you are wrong how disastrous will be your fate." An argument, in truth, which tells quite as strongly in favour of Catholics against Protestants, as in favour of Protestants against sceptics. But valid as it may be in matters of practice, it assuredly is not so in matters of belief. If a man is going on a journey and is not sure whether he will require £5 or £6, he will do wisely to take £7. Again, if a man is in doubt of the seaworthiness of a ship by which he purposes to send certain goods, he had better pay more for freight and send them by a better ship. So if a man rejects the ordinary creeds for no better reason than to enjoy the pleasures of sin unchecked and uncontrolled, the above argument undoubtedly tells against him. But who will venture to say that sceptics are as a class less virtuous than the orthodox? Who will venture to impeach the high character of such men as Channing and Parker? The fact is that the points on which sceptics differ from believers are mere intellectual problems. One man is deeply read in science and, having strong convictions of the universality of law, finds no trace of a miracle in nature. Another is ignorant of science but deeply read in ancient legends, and full of poetical fancies. If the first, upon examination, rejects the credibility of miracles, while the other admits it, what moral guilt will attach to one more than to the other? As the world goes we find that men of cultivated intellect and of high honour differ about politics, and no one imputes blame to them. They may differ on matters of law or of commerce, about questions of art and of literature, and no fault is found. But on questions concerning the credibility of miracles, the authenticity of certain remnants of Hebrew literature, or the origin of the human race—on these points, if creeds are to be trusted, it is dangerous to differ, unless the differences are kept within certain lines of demarcation laid down some centuries ago, and beyond which we cannot go without risking the salvation of our souls. Surely this is the crowning absurdity of all.

Scorpio.

Pensions.

PENSIONS! the very word itself seems as it were to hang in the throat, and to present some difficulty of articulation. To the resident of an old country where the institutions are time-honoured, even what may be often objectionable to us as individuals becomes merged in the feeling of political expediency or a sober patriotism. We look back on the past, its achievements and its glory, and the momentary grudge towards the pensioned statesman or warrior subsides before a more generous impulse of national honour. And beside this, when we look at the vast resources of the mother country, and the noble spirits that from time to time have helped to place her in so exalted a position among nations, there exists scarcely any comparison with a colony not yet a century old, but whose reckless expenditure and generous-before-just sense of action would lead a stranger to infer that its history must be as eventful as its wealth must be inexhaustible. How surprised would he be to hear that we scarcely manage to make both ends meet! While ready enough and vain enough to ape in a small way the lavish grants of the mother country, to perpetuate, as it were, her accidental abuses, we show ourselves ridiculously incompetent to carry out the one, and may we not say morally criminal in introducing the other. Our Pension list in fact is beginning to assume respectable proportions; and if our legislators do vote away the money that does not belong to them, we must perforce suppose the people outside are amply gratified in the length of the list being in ratio inverse to the length of the purse.

We are led to make these few remarks from noticing a case recently before the Legislature. We shall invade the sanctity of no private position. We shall simply deal with the principle of Pensions as it comes before us, and with the singularly alleged claims that are now and then put forward to support them.

When Mr. Parkes a few weeks since introduced the case of the late Honorable John Hubert Plunkett, praying for a pension of £200 to his surviving widow, the tenor of his address fully evinced the difficulty of his task. His speech throughout is rather the *argumentum ad misericordiam* than that of an advocate strong in his position, and arguing confidently on the justice of his claim. Being himself behind the scenes, knowing the ins and outs of parliamentary action, well aware of the pulse of the chamber, and the now heard though somewhat tardy mutterings of an economising section, he knew there was need of the utmost caution. And he laboured on where we have no design to follow him further than by saying his entire address was a fallacy, and his oratory mere special pleading. No doubt the Chamber does possess the right to vote away the public money, but only for a just and sufficient cause. And in the case brought forward we emphatically deny its existence. We care for

no precedents; we shall not wander among a maze of argument where no thread of reason is perceptible. The extremity of the case is quoted, and deemed amply sufficient to cover claims however illegitimate. Sentiment was to rule the Chamber, and such an every day matter as pounds, shillings and pence to be utterly ignored. The *ad captandum* burst of religious tolerance which closes the oratory of the honourable member, is not the least singular part of the whole proceeding. Mr. Parkes may, ostrich-like, bury his head in the sand and fancy no one sees his body. *Sed nescit vox missa reverti*; and the worthy senator's Catholic compliments have scarcely yet sunk in the Lethe of the past.

It is unnecessary to examine the peculiar opinions of each speaker on this question. Even Mr. Buchanan, with all the uncompromising expression of his views, enters on no remedy, suggests no expedient for staying this political cancer that is eating into the very vitals of the country. Each member avoids touching on any remedial measure as though he were fingering hot iron, and as for hinting at the annihilation of Pensions, the idea might be thought excessively shocking. And yet it is the only one that commends itself in our eyes. We hold Mr. Plunkett's case a fair one to deal with. The honourable gentleman had filled certain very important offices in the colony. During the labours of office he had been for a lengthened period in the enjoyment of £1500 per annum, and on his retirement received a pension of £1200. But in the face of this liberal acknowledgment of his political services,—services which however considerable appear to us to have been fully met by this handsome pecuniary grant,—Parliament is, on his decease, called upon to extend its further aid to those whom his improvidence had left in depressed circumstances. Now it is here that without any circumlocution we take our stand, and would endeavour to show the inadvisability of the Pension system, and to suggest a, to us, apparently ready remedy for a fast increasing abuse. As we have before remarked, we shall invade no privacy in our pages, or by the tenor of our reflections be instrumental in causing individual pain. We would only briefly remark that this recorded case is by no means the first in which, on the decease of the bread winner, an appeal has been made to the public pocket. Now we say, unreservedly, this must be put an end to. Because, beside the principle itself being bad, the colony is by no means in such a prosperous state as to be enabled to meet such unreasonable claims. It is all very well for a member to get up periodically in the House and pray for certain Pensions to be put upon the Estimates. It has a bad effect out of doors. I do not say such would be the case under a more happy pecuniary condition of the colony, because then, people here, as in the old country, would be perhaps apt to overlook any little extra pull upon their purse in the satisfactory sense of individual advancement. But failing to show that this is the case—indeed, bound as we are rather to admit that the colony of New South Wales has seldom been found in a more depressed state—it seems not only suicidal to persist in a course of policy that is supporting family after family out of the public funds, but also unfair to remunerate twice over those for whom a once public bounty should have been all-sufficient.

We have never yet, we confess it, been able to see why (as a remedy to this growing evil) the State should not confer on those whom it delights to honour a lump sum on their retirement. We have no disposition to ignore State services; far from it. The intelligent and brainworked professional man while employed in the service of his country, contributing to her success, and expending may be his best years in her labour, is not to be cast aside in the gloom of fast coming years like a broken bow or a squeezed orange. Let him enjoy his merited reward, his otium, and every blessing that can result from a well-grounded consciousness of unswerving rectitude and honour. Let his country be liberal to him while alive, and by no means forgetful of him when passed away, providing the circumstances of the case justify any after exercise of its liberality. And this is the point in question, in so far as Government recognises no after claim on the part of those who have been fairly dealt with during life. Exceptional cases must be supposed to hinge on some peculiar feature that may call for a further manifestation of aid from the State. Whether such cases as those recently before the public eye come under this category is a matter that need scarcely engage us when we know how individual opinion is often biassed by the smallest incident, and by the crudest idea of what is wise and proportionate.

But reverting briefly to what has already been said, we cannot see why, if the State determine to hold out aid to the family of a deceased benefactor, any impediment should present itself against the presentation of a sum in complete discharge of the implied debt. Feelings and considerations that are wont to influence private families or even private societies, are not likely to influence a government. What difference can it make if a certain amount be paid by way of principal, and the claim got rid of for once and for ever? If it should be a mere matter of debtor and creditor, where steady services have been ever acknowledged by a government as steady pay—why then, the State servant's decease will close all connection between employer and employed, and so all mutual interest is equally at an end. But finally, should a case arise where ample government acknowledgment has been made for acknowledged State service, with no understanding or even expectation of any further government notice on the death of recipient, then let it be clearly understood as a fixed principle of law that no case however specious, no interest however suborned, shall be able to upset a resolve to deal as honestly towards the living, the great body of the public, as the State has dealt towards the individual while enjoying the benefits of office. Unless some stand of this kind is made, things are too likely to go on in a

haphazard sort of way, the policy and action of the Government being founded on no reliable basis, and, therefore, calculated to breed nothing but complaint and uncertainty. Quilibet.

King Pope.

WHEN Mr. Brougham, in 1830, was canvassing the West Riding of Yorkshire, with a view to its representation in parliament, we heard him say, in reference to the *coup d'etat*. that filled up the measure of Charles the Tenth's abominable rule in France, news of which had just then reached England,—“Had the unhappy man made the experiment in England instead of France, his head would have rolled in the dust before sundown.” But the miserable records of Bourbon misrule present nothing to compare with the execrable despotism that oppresses the territory over which the Pope exercises sovereign power. Hitherto, we have spoken of the Pope as a priest,—the head of a Church: we now claim attention to the same magnate as a temporal prince,—the head of a kingdom. In an eminent degree—*par excellence*—the representative of “the Prince of Peace” he is in a chronic state of war with his own subjects; and only wears the crown that sits tottering on his head in virtue of the acute points of foreign bayonets.

A few years ago, some two or three hundred Irish Catholics, having determined to aid the Pope against his temporal and political enemies, quitted the Emerald Isle for a campaign in Romagna. The consideration for this martial assistance was understood to be two shillings a day, and “the hoight of tratement.” But when it was found that the Pope's coin was lodged in the innermost recesses of a *non est inventus*, unavailable and invisible, and that “the hoight of tratement” implied far less consideration than is usually bestowed on Hibernian pigs, the Irishman determined that his campaign should be a short one, and he soon returned, if not a wiser, certainly not a more foolish man than when he started on his bootless expedition.

The Irish Catholics, according to their own account, have many grievances to complain of; and as Mr. Gladstone appears to be indisposed to traverse the allegation, we do not see why we should do so. Admitting, therefore, that the complainants have genuine grievances to complain of, it must also be admitted that they possess the privilege of enunciating their hardships as often as they think proper, and when and where they list—a privilege, it is superfluous to add, that is not likely to rust for want of use. Of course, no reasonable man who has the advantage of acquaintance with Hibernian Catholics, will ever think of making them amenable to reason; but the ineffable stupidity of their invasion of the Papal territories in the interest of despotism fairly defies comprehension. They consented to leave their own country, to shoot at their fellow creatures, and to be shot at, in support of a power that is ten thousand times more oppressive than the British Government ever knew how to be, and that denies to the oppressed the poor privilege of giving utterance to their wrongs, either orally or scriptorily, at the peril of their lives. In Great Britain and Ireland a man's house is his castle; but in the Papal States neither house nor escritoire is sacred against the priestly emissary. The unwelcome domiciliary visit is of common occurrence; the writing desk is forced if need be; and woe to the unfortunate recipient whose correspondent shall have employed language susceptible of an interpretation unfavorable to Papal government. He is hauled off to the dungeons of a fetid prison as the initiatory step of what, ten to one, will have a tragical consummation.

In illustration, we shall have to lead out some very respectable men to execution; and, for the information of our Catholic friends, we may inform them, that the sufferers were good Catholics as themselves, good Christians, and beloved and honoured by their neighbours and friends, as we shall undeniably show; and we cannot help thinking that the account which we have to submit clearly proves, that if, in Rome, O'Connell, *mutato nomine*, had dared to utter against the Papal Government one hundredth part of the invectives levelled by him against the British Government, he would have been spared the trouble of dying a natural death.

Our extract has reference to times antecedent to Pius the Ninth, but still within the last half century, being in the year 1828. Let Irish Catholics read it carefully, and felicitate themselves, if they can, on the chivalrous spirit that prompted them to fight for a government that slaughtered their co-religionists because they were only suspected (for it was never proved) of entertaining sentiments hostile to the Papal authorities. In the memoirs of Angelo Frignani we read:—

“Various and alarming rumours reached the Judges. They were puzzled how to act. The populace, so it was said, were swarming angrily into the streets and public ways, whispering and clasping hands, as if in the act of taking an oath; the soldiers looking on sadly and silently.

The inhabitants of Ravenna were not however meditating rebellion, but they were saying one to another: ‘If indeed we must endure the death of these five fellow-citizens, let us at least hasten away from hence; let us get beyond the walls, that, the world may know, that if impotent to prevent the shedding of the blood of our brothers, at least we fled from the horrible sight.’ This being the universal feeling, multitudes issued forth on the

morning of the 13th May. Whole families and groups of friends passed simultaneously through the six gates of the city. Some took the road to the valleys; some to the sea coasts, spreading themselves through the country: a pitiable sight indeed. Ever since the time of the last invasion of the French, the guillotine had been substituted for the gallows. Now, to strike new terror into the hearts of his subjects, the Pope had ordered that the five condemned prisoners should be hanged, and the corpses left exposed for a whole day. One of those incidents occurred at this execution which send terror into the hearts of the most unbelieving. A certain Spadini, a miller by trade, who had been a notorious brigand in the time of the Cisalpine Republic, either to curry favour with the Government, or from natural ferocity of disposition, mounted on the wall, close to which the gibbet was erected, and there sitting astride, he went on unchecked the whole day, reviling and jeering the wretched victims. Four were hanged at eight in the morning, but the fifth did not appear. . . . The sun was setting when Spadini, still astride on the wall, where he had remained for ten hours, in the hope of seeing Rambelli executed also, shouted, 'Here he is, here he is, a little late perhaps, but time enough;' then to Rambelli, 'Good fellow, why have you made us yawn so much? You will be one of the finest fruits this tree ever bore—(Rambelli was a tall, well-made, handsome man,)—but that is no reason why you should be so coy, and keep us on tenter-hooks from morning till evening!' Some days after these executions I was transferred from my own cell to the neighbouring one. I found there a strangely-fashioned wooden machine, with long pieces of leather nailed to the various parts of it. It looked like an instrument of torture, but I never ascertained its use. Over the door was traced in large letters, 'Luigi Zanolì was executed 13th May, 1828.'

The author of the work from which the above extracts are taken, escaped the gallows by feigning madness. It appears he was called upon to answer for some ambiguous expressions in some letters of Farina's addressed to himself. Farina was the author of the *Life of Rousignore*, the Bishop of Faenza; he had likewise printed a translation of some sermons of St. Augustine, in which the vices of ecclesiastics were severely handled. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ!*

But a scrap (found in the handwriting of the unlucky author) of some former essay, or harangue, appears to have been greatly assistant to his conviction. "Some years previously," he says, "while I was going through my course of rhetoric, our professor gave the students, as a theme for composition, the appeal which Cola di Rienzi might have been supposed to make to the Romans in behalf of freedom, when urging them to throw off their allegiance to the Pope—who, as every one knows, in Rienzi's time, had his residence at Avignon." A portion of this old theme, it appears, got into the hands of his judges, and operated to his condemnation. But what a precious government to live under! What a government to fight for! A school-boy's theme (none of his own choosing either) is made the apology for taking away the life of the man!

Recent mail news leads us to suppose that the Ultramontanes or Jesuits will be able to carry the infallibility of the Pope; but it is still doubtful whether the Pope, taking into consideration the vigorous opposition of the minority, will venture to submit the question to the test of numbers. We sincerely hope that he will do so, and quite as sincerely trust that it may be carried. *Quem deus vult perdere, prius dementat*; and surely no better evidence of the demented state of both Pope and Council could be offered than the proposed blasphemously-intimate association of the Deity with such a piece of old mortality as Pius the Ninth.

We have only to add a chronological bulletin from that portion of the Church militant over which the Pope presides, with the view of showing the nature of the connection between that potentate and his unhappy subjects. We will, however, first quote a text of Scripture; and we trust that our readers will find in the sequent to it, a commentary of more than ordinary significance." Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."

Bulletin:—The Regnant Pope, Pius IX. The Imperial city garrisoned by foreign troops. The Pope witnessed a revolution when Count Rossi, his prime minister, was assassinated.—Nov. 15th, 1848.

The people demanded a democratic ministry; the Pope delayed to reply; the Romans surrounded the palace, when a conflict ensued between the papal and civic guard. The troops surrounded the Quirinal, and placed cannon against the entrance; and the Pope was forced to accept a popular ministry, Nov. 16th, 1848. Cardinal Palma, the Pope's secretary, shot in the conflict.

The Pope escaped in disguise from Rome to Gaeta, Nov. 24th, 1848.

M. de Corcelles left Paris for Rome, a French armed expedition having preceded him to afford protection to the Pope, Nov. 27th, 1848.

A constituent assembly met at Rome, Feb. 5th, 1849.

The Roman National Assembly declared the Pope divested of all temporal power, and adopted the republican form of government, Feb. 8th, 1849.

The republican flag hoisted on the tower of the Capitol, Feb. 14th, 1849.

The Pope protested against the decree for his dethronement, Feb. 14th, 1849.

His Holiness appealed to the great Roman Catholic powers for an armed interference in his behalf, Feb. 18th, 1849.

A small French force repulsed from Rome, April 30th, 1849. In this action the French were driven back from the city with the loss of about 700 men.

Engagement between the Romans and Neapolitans; the former capture 60 prisoners and 400 muskets, May 5th, 1849.

The French under Marshal Oudinot commenced an attack on Rome, June 3rd, 1849. They made a breach in the walls, June 21st, 1849. The French sent storming parties through the breaches in the walls, June 21st, 1849. A deputation sent to Marshal Oudinot, to treat for a surrender, and they eventually capitulated to the French army, June 30th, 1849. The Roman Assembly dissolved, July 4th, 1849. The re-establishment of the Pope's authority proclaimed, July 15th, 1849. The Pope left Portici for Rome, where he arrived, April 12th, 1850.

So that the French after deposing the Pope's very best friends and most zealous supporters, their own Bourbon princes in both branches, denied to their weaker neighbours the privilege of a voice in their own government. But a sovereign who can maintain his throne only through foreign intervention is less of a king than King Stork or King Log, and, whatever effect it may have on his Holiness, we beg to say, at the risk of an anathema, that we cannot conscientiously rank him amongst the legitimate and constitutional sovereigns of Europe.

Libra.

Sincerity of Conviction the Great Thing.

FIRST among the duties of the preacher is that of proclaiming the supreme value in the sight of God of genuine, earnest piety, and of declaring that mere views and opinions, however new, however old, however true they may be, have no power in themselves to bring us near to God or to improve our lives; that to bring us into the state in which we ought to be, something far higher is needed than mere correctness in religious opinion, and an intelligent perception of the errors in the creeds of others. In a certain sense it does not matter one straw what our religious belief may be, if our hearts are not earnestly seeking to know God and to do His will. I would therefore especially press on the consideration of those who do not agree with me this deep conviction of my heart, that whether the truth lies with me or with them, neither I nor they stand nearer to God on that account. We are all near to God or far from Him only in proportion to our earnestness and sincerity—to our purity of motive, and our loyalty to God's will. In this sense it does not signify what a man's creed may be, whether he accepts the whole Bible as God's written word, or rejects a considerable portion of it as untrue; whether he believes in a ruined and lost world, and worships a Divine Redeemer of himself and of the elect, or believes that the world has been ever nursed in the arms of an Almighty and Loving Father; whether he attributes the phenomena of pain and sin to the agency of a personal devil, or regards these causes of shame and sorrow as the agencies of a Holy God who is making all things work together for good; whether he prays to God trusting in the mediation of Jesus Christ as the only condition on which God will hear his prayer, or prays without mediation as Jesus taught us to pray; whether he believes that the death of Christ on the cross was the one act which enables God to forgive us our sins, and to save us from endless torment, or believes that God forgives sin when repented of simply out of His own great love and justice, and saves all men from endless suffering, because all men are His children—whatever be a man's creed, I say, let it be Romanist, Protestant, Hindoo, Buddhist, Mahomedan, Unitarian or Theist, he is in every case in the path of safety, in the road which leads him to God, if only he be earnest and sincere—upright in motive and loyal to duty. The Bible itself says as much in many places. "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth Him (*i.e.*, reverences God) and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."—*Voysey*.

False Estimates of Human Nature.

THERE is no more mischievous falsehood than to persist in railing at man's nature, as if it were all vile together, as if the best and the worst which comes of it were in God's sight equally without worth. These denunciations tend too fatally to realise themselves. Tell a man that no good which he can do is of any value and depend upon it he will take you at your word—most especially will the wealthy, comfortable, luxurious man, just the man who has the most means to do good, and whom of all things it is most necessary to stimulate to it. Surely we should not be afraid; the instincts which God has placed in our hearts are too mighty for us to be able to extinguish them with doctrinal sophistry. If true at all, there is no truth in heaven or earth of deeper practical importance to us.—*J. A. Froude*.

Men Wanted.

THE great want of this age is men. Men who are not for sale. Men who are honest, sound from centre to circumference, true to the heart's core. Men who will condemn wrong in friend or foe, in themselves as well as others. Men whose consciences are as steady as the needle to the pole. Men who will stand for the right if the heavens totter and the earth reels. Men who can tell the truth and look the world and the devil right in the eye. Men that neither brag nor run. Men that neither flag nor flinch. Men who can have courage without shouting to it. Men in whom the courage of everlasting life runs still, deep and strong. Men too large for sectarian bonds. Men who do not cry nor cause their voices to be heard in the streets, but will not fail nor be discouraged till judgment be set in the earth. Men who know their message and tell it. Men who know their places and fill them. Men who will not lie. Men who are not too lazy to work, nor too proud to be poor. Men who are willing to eat what they have earned, and wear what they have paid for.—*Anon.*

Verbal Inspiration.

IN the matter of creed and doctrine, there are two or three articles of Faith which have more than any other stood in the way of the cordial and grateful reception of Ecclesiastical Christianity by the most pure and honest minds—those whose instincts of justice were truest and strongest—those whose conceptions of the Deity were the most lofty and consistent. These are the doctrines of Vicarious Punishment, of Salvation by Belief, and of Eternal Damnation. Of these doctrines—as *now 'promulgated and maintained'*—three things may in our judgment be confidently asserted—that they were undreamed of by Christ; that they never can be otherwise than revolting and inadmissible to all whose intuitive moral sense has not been warped by a regular course of ecclesiastical sophistry; and that no Christian or sensible divine would think of preaching them were they not inculcated, or supposed to be cultivated, by isolated texts of Scripture; and were it not held that every text of Scripture is authentic, authoritative, indisputably true, and in some sense or other, inspired and divine. We are driven, therefore, to the conclusion that this proposition, or theory, or dogma—whichever we may please to call it—of verbal inspiration is mischievous and hostile to the pure religion of Jesus in two ways: it deters thoughtful and sincere minds from receiving it, and it corrupts and complicates and stains it to those who have received it, by mingling with it incongruous and deteriorating accretions. To destroy this dogma, therefore, to demonstrate its untenability, to shake its hold on both the teacher and the taught, is, we maintain, the most signal and the most needed service which a good and pious man can render to the sacred cause of Christianity and Truth.—*W. R. Greg.*

Intelligence.

CASTLEMAINE: VICTORIA.—At a meeting of the Universalists, held at the Criterion Hall, Castlemaine, on Wednesday, 1st June, 1870, the usual routine business having been disposed of, Mr. Leech said :—"Men and Brethren,—I some time since put into a short and concise form those truths which, at more length, I have been enunciating in my public discourses. This I did, not with the slightest intention of imposing upon others my own belief, but merely that you might have at hand a brief answer, when strangers inquired of you as to what was the nature of my teachings. I submit this form to you to-night, not for your adoption, but merely that you may decide whether it is advisable that it should be printed. Should you come to the conclusion that it would be well thus to deal with the paragraphs in question, it will by no means follow that your individual consciences will be held bound by them. Think not for a moment, I beseech of you, that they are intended as a Creed. No one will be asked to subscribe to them as a test of membership. All will be welcome who have a desire to love God with all their souls and their neighbours as themselves, for it is through these qualities, altogether irrespective of creed, or sect, or nation, that men will begin to enjoy eternal happiness. The moral precepts of all religions inculcate this truth in one form or another, indicating thus a common origin from the Universal and Beneficent Parent." He then read the subjoined statement:—"The following 'Declaration of Principles' is set forth as a general expression of the Teachings of the Universalist Body of Castlemaine, but they are to be interpreted as embodying the opinions of those only who individually accept them :—

First—That there is one God, the Infinite Father of all.

Second—That man, as the offspring of this Infinite Parent, is His highest representative on earth: that Jesus of Nazareth, having fully lived out the divine elements of our humanity, was the most complete embodiment of

the Father's goodness which we can contemplate: that each man has, by virtue of God's parentage, within him, an element of divinity, which is ever prompting him to do right, and which will ultimately free him from all imperfections incident to the rudimental or earthly condition.

Third—That man, as a spirit, is immortal: that death is but the birth into another condition of life, where the soul retains its experiences of the past, and where development or progression is its endless destiny.

Fourth—That the spiritual world is not far off, but is near to, and encompasses us in our present existence.

Fifth—That he who loves the Infinite Father with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself, has begun to enjoy eternal happiness, whatever may be his race, or whatsoever kind may be his religious opinions.

Sixth—That what is called 'evil' is but the corruption of that which was originally good, the latter becoming perverted by our material nature not being sufficiently under the control and guidance of the soul.

Seventh—That the excessive yielding to the material nature is, for the most part, punished in this life, though the soul, after the physical change called 'death,' also suffers therefrom, but these sufferings are not eternal.

Eighth—That Divine inspiration, or the promptings to the human soul from the Infinite Parent, is not a miracle of past ages, but a perpetual fact.

Ninth—That the the Creator in the beginning made natural laws for the government of our world, and these laws have never since been varied, altered, or departed from."

After some discussion this Declaration of Principles was adopted.

WELLINGTON: NEW ZEALAND.—A report has reached us of a speech delivered by Mr. J. E. Fitzgerald, on Monday, June 15th, at the opening of the new Presbyterian Sunday School in Willis Street. We gather from this speech that Mr. Fitzgerald is not a Presbyterian by profession, but it assuredly speaks well for the liberality and good sense of this section of the Christian Church in Wellington that they should have invited so advanced a religious thinker, as Mr. Fitzgerald evidently is, to address them on the occasion referred to. A short extract from his really admirable address is all that we can quote. "Formalism," he observed, "is not the only danger to the church of these times. There seems to me to be a spirit of superstition—a spirit of what I call fetish worship, in which all sections of the Christian community are too apt to indulge. I mean the worship of their own special dogmas, or particular forms of expressing and interpreting truth. If Galileo was compelled by the Papal Church to recant, as false, his great discoveries in the motions of the heavenly bodies, as heresy against the faith of the church, have I not seen many a good and pious man in these days set his face hard against the discoveries of modern science, because they seemed to disturb his own peculiar views of the meaning of revealed truth. Geology has had to fight its way against the superstition of the Protestant world, as astronomy of old had to struggle against the ecclesiastical authority of Rome. And now we see the same old spirit evoked to crush the researches in that new science which has made such marvellous strides in our day—I mean the science of philological criticism—a science closely akin to that of geology, because it evokes out of the ruins and relics of the dead and forgotten languages of former ages, evidences of the past history of mankind, just as geology elicits out of the crumbling rocks and broken stones, the physical history of the world which that man has inhabited. I ask not that we shall hastily or rashly accept the conclusions offered to us by modern criticism. I say not that so far as my humble powers extend—and very humble indeed they are—to understand such inquiries, I say not that I accept myself all the conclusions at which these critics have arrived. But I do claim—in the spirit and in the exercise of the same right for which our fathers fought and died at the Reformation, and which they have bequeathed to us—the right of private judgment and of free inquiry—I do claim that scientific research shall not be stifled by, or placed under ban by the lingering superstition of modern Protestantism, any more than by the senile anathemas of Rome. When I have seen how texts of Scripture, strangely misunderstood, have been wrenched from their context, and hurled at the head of approaching criticism, I sometimes feel as if there were a tendency on the part of Protestants to make a fetish, as it were, of the very Bible itself—and to bestow upon the human words and syllables—those mechanical contrivances which are after all only the vehicle of communicating the will of God to mankind—to bestow upon those mechanical contrivances that reverence which is only due to the truths which those words were intended to convey; a tendency, in one word, to worship the book itself more than the truths which it reveals, or the God who inspired it." Is there a Presbyterian church in Sydney where the foregoing utterances could receive a patient hearing? Hardly, we think.

Poetry.

The wisdom of mankind creeps slowly on,
Subject to every doubt that can retard,
Or fling it back upon an earlier time;
So timid are man's footsteps in the dark,
But blindest those who have no inward light.
One mind perchance in every age contains
The sum of all before and much to come;
Much that's far distant still; but that full mind,
Companioned oft by others of like scope,
Belief, and tendency, and anxious will,
A circle small transpierces and illumines:
Expanding, soon its subtle radiance
Falls blunted from the mass of flesh and bone.
The man who for his race might supersede
The work of ages dies worn out not used,
And in his track disciples onward strive,
Some hair-breadths only from his starting point:
Yet lives he not in vain; for if his soul
Hath entered others though imperfectly,
The circle widens as the world spins round—
His sold works on while he sleeps 'neath the grass.
So let the firm Philosopher renew
His wasting lamp—the lamp wastes not in vain,
Though he no mirror for its rays may see,
Nor trace them through the darkness; let the Hand
Which feels primeval impulses, direct
A forthright plough, and make his furrow broad,
With heart untiring while one field remains;
So let the herald Poet shed his thoughts,
Like seeds that seem but lost upon the wind.
Work in the night thou Sage, while Mammon's brain
Teems with low visions on his couch of down;
Break thou the clods, while high-throned Vanity
Midst glaring lights and trumpets holds its Court;—
Then stand apart obscure to man with God.

—*R.H.Horne.*

Correspondence.

Popular Delusions.

To the Editor.

SIR,—The last English Mail brought the account of a charge brought against a man named John Baker, of having neglected to provide necessary medical aid for his child Jesse Baker, who, it was presumed, had been allowed to die without any medical assistance. The defendant who belongs to a sect very numerous in Essex, calling themselves the "Peculiar People," said that he had acted according to the Word of God, which tells him to pray, and that if any are sick, let him send for the church to anoint the sick with oil and pray over him. The words, however, are explicit of a recent statute, which enacts, that where parents cause their children to die without medical aid, they shall be liable to six months imprisonment, and the defendant was committed accordingly: the magistrates, however, exercised a power given them to discharge him, on his own recognizances, to come up for sentence when called upon. On reflecting upon the above case, the question at once suggests itself, why should these simple but ignorant people be more severely dealt with than another

class of persons, who, labouring under the delusion of the fanatic Hahnemann and his followers, neglect to provide necessary medical aid for *their* children? The principle of action influencing the former class, however dangerous in its results, is, at least, distinct and intelligible, and is one professed by a large number of persons who, in theory at least, take the literal words of the so-called inspired volume as their guide. The mental condition of the latter class can be neither defined nor understood. When persons of fair average education (in the common acceptance of the term) are heard complacently talking of their patronage of the "new system," and are seen demurely dispensing amongst their good natured friends and acquaintances, small saccharine spheroids ("hundreds and thousands") whilst they talk dogmatically and confidently on the principles of a science respecting which they cannot possibly possess the slightest knowledge, one can only look on in blank amazement.

The deplorable disasters that have occurred under the operation of both these "systems" seem to justify the interference of the law, for it is certain that neither reason nor argument can reach the followers of either, who each present to the ordinary intelligence of sane observers a special type of lunatic, and in neither case one of the most harmless kind.

F.R.C.S., England.

The Efficacy of Prayer.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Many, no doubt, have been induced by your Periodical to adopt more rational views of religion, and to no longer place implicit and blind faith in the Bible as a Revelation from God, without reading books on *both* sides of the question.

But, Sir, although the *Free Religious Press* is so zealous in exposing what may be error, it does nothing (in my opinion) to put us out of the distress of mind it is calculated in some cases to produce. If the only result from reading it is to unsettle one's mind and cause doubt of one's religion, it clearly does harm.

To one truly in earnest in a matter of this kind, the desire for help from God immediately suggests itself. The spontaneous prayer of his soul is to Him for assistance in obtaining truth whatever truth may be. He prays with his whole soul, but doubt enters even here; for although he may know from personal experience that prayer has an effect in enabling him to resist sin in its many forms, yet uncertainty seizes upon him as to whether God will, in direct answer to his prayer, render the much-needed help, or whether prayer only operates by introducing proper thoughts, affections and actions. An article in your Paper on "The Efficacy of Prayer" would, I think, be highly acceptable to many others as well as to A Reader of "More Light."

[Our Correspondent does not quite see that the mental distress of which he speaks, or the pain, in other words, which the mind feels when surrendering its hold upon venerated convictions without as yet seeing how they are to be replaced, is an essential characteristic of all genuine doubt. We counsel him to put implicit and unswerving trust in Reason and Conscience, and to shake off his misgivings as to whither they will lead him. The primary work of the *Free Religious Press* is not to unsettle the religious faith of its readers, but to fix and strengthen it. With regard to "Prayer, its nature, and principle of operation," it is more than likely that an article on this subject will appear in the *Press* at an early date.—ED. A.F.R.P.]

Science in the Pulpit.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Something like a stir has recently been created in our usually dull little town (Liverpool) by the delivery of a lecture in the Presbyterian Church, on "The Origin and Destiny of Man." The lecturer, the Rev. E. Holland, may be known to some of your readers by his contributions to the *Herald* and other journals on sugar growing. On this subject the Rev. gentleman is doubtless *au fait*, but as much cannot be said of his acquaintance with the speculations of Lyell and Darwin, as I shall presently aim to show.

Being one of those poor demented individuals who are continually clamouring for More Light, it struck me that I might get from Mr. Holland's lecture a ray or two of the much coveted article. Accordingly, I found myself, at the appointed hour, within the precincts of the Kirk—for the first time.

After the usual devotional preliminaries, the lecturer dashed with some vigour into his subject. He commented on the researches of eminent scientific men, appearing, as it seemed to me, to agree with them. But this was not to last. For the lecturer, warming to his work, wished his audience to believe that there was ample space of time between the date of the creation of Adam and Eve and the present era—*i.e.* during the old

traditional six thousand years—for all the changes that had taken place in the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms. And this was followed by the like audacious assertion that none of the discoveries of the geologist or paleontologist tended to show that human beings were in existence at a remoter period than six thousand years. Now, if these statements are correct, then there is nothing for it but to scout the teachers whose text-books on these subjects are considered authoritative as a set of ignoramuses, or, worse than this, as a set of deliberate liars. Professor Agassiz has shown—to take a single instance—that the Florida reefs must, at their present rate of formation, be at least 135,000 years old; and in respect of the antiquity of the human race, the deltas of such rivers as the Nile and the Mississippi, and the flint weapons that are occasionally brought to light, indisputably prove that human beings subject to a certain degree of civilisation existed at least ten thousand years antecedent to the date when God, as the popular theory teaches, formed the first man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Either Mr. Holland is not familiar with his subject, or, being so, he counts it no breach of modesty to oppose his comparatively worthless opinion to that of the greatest scientific authorities of the age.

Waxing still warmer, the lecturer sternly rebuked the infidel and atheistic writers who, adopting the principle of natural selection, traced back man's origin to some such ancestor as the Crab, or, still worse, the Cabbage. Who are these writers? It is quite clear that Darwin does not teach this doctrine, nor is he an atheist, except indeed in Mr. Holland's abusive sense of the term. To be an atheist in the eyes of the majority of professing Christians, one has only to announce his dissent from their particular dogmas.

The lecturer next referred to the Arabs of the present day as being nearest in colour, features and habits to the first human sojourners on this earth. It may be so; but, granting the truth of the popular theory as to man's origin, it does seem strange that these dark gentlemen of the long and respectable pedigree, instead of occupying their proper position among civilised peoples should be the lazy, marauding set of cut-throats they notoriously are.

To sum up, it affords me regret to say that I can only speak of Mr. Holland's lecture as what the vulgar would term—a sell. His theological bias and incapacity for looking at his subject from an independent standpoint were apparent from the onset, nor am I the only one in Liverpool who returned from the Kirk with the conviction that such pulpit performances are a very serious detriment to the cause of true religion. A Searcher after Truth.

The Late Rev. Samuel Marsden.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In your issue of the month of June, you have revived the scandalous charges made against the late Rev. Samuel Marsden by Mr. C. Wentworth and Governor Macquarie, and that when at a recent Public Meeting in Parramatta many of the speakers, highly respectable from position, and who had been associated with the Rev. Gentleman, spoke of him, as became living witnesses to his character, in terms of respect and esteem. Besides this, however, there is documentary evidence in abundance in refutation of these charges, which you might and should have perused before publishing the article in question, so painful to the feelings of three widowed daughters, his numerous grand-children and his surviving friends.

There is a brief memoir of his life, containing extracts from authorities which will furnish you with some important information as to the history of these proceedings of the past, and give you some insight into the character of the deceased even now vilified in his grave, and, I trust, lead you to do justice to his memory.

Beside the said memoir there are his pamphlets, published during the life time of the late Dr. Douglass, Governor Macquarie and Mr. Wentworth, and widely circulated, in refutation of these calumnies; also the official report of Mr. Bigge, the Commissioner of inquiry, who, at the pressing solicitation of Mr. Marsden, investigated these charges and pronounced judgment in favour of the deceased. To these I may add the inquiry of the Attorney-General (Bannister), the various addresses presented to him, the official dispatch of the Secretary of State, but, above all, the closing scene around his grave, where persons, who had been his opponents during life, came *uninvited* to pay a last tribute to his memory.

Men like Mr. Marsden (and few they be), who lived in despotic times and entered upon a wide sphere of activity, must expect obloquy, and he certainly had his share of it. He was a true Englishman in feeling, uncompromising in character, and thus was frequently brought into collision with the Governor and others of the day; a day of which you as a stranger can have no conception. As he corresponded with a wide circle of the most influential men in England, he was strongly suspected by the Governor of being the author of certain statements which were sent to the Home Government respecting acts which took place during the Governor's administration. He resisted some of the Governor's public orders; he took the depositions of three men who had been flogged without trial, which perhaps no other magistrate would have dared to do; and thus by his

independence exasperated the Governor against him, and excited his parasites to convey implications against his character. But he stood his ground, fought his way, and has left a testimony behind him, even that of Governor Macquarie himself (see Commissioner's report), which ought to silence the most shameless of his adversaries.

Mr. Marsden lived in no ordinary times and was no ordinary man. While discharging the duties of his clerical office and maturing his schemes of missionary enterprise, he conveyed to this colony, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands, many of the germs of civilisation, including manufactures, agriculture, horticulture and cattle-breeding, and was the promoter of several of our valuable institutions, often at his own personal cost and personal exertion.

As for Mr. Wentworth's vulgar charges, they were made when he was a young man, and he dared *not*, when called upon, acknowledge the authorship of them; a matter difficult to prove, as I believe the work was published in England. Thus from his concealment he cast filth upon a man he had not the manliness to meet face to face.

As the Editor of a periodical, you are no doubt responsible for such articles as reflect upon the character of individuals, and more especially of the dead. I must therefore leave it to your own sense of honour, as a Minister of Religion and as an Editor, whether, after a careful examination of the testimonies placed within your reach (including the Public Meeting at Parramatta), you will give insertion to this letter, and when you obtain "more light" and may be better instructed, do justice to the dead.

I confine myself entirely to the reputation of my deceased friend. The living bishop I know nothing of save as a boy. I have spoken, seeing that I should be acting unjustly both towards the deceased and to his family if I allowed the revivification of refuted calumnies, however unintentional of ill-will, to pass unnoticed. Richard Sadleir, R.N.

[Lieutenant Sadleir is welcome to the space we have accorded to his communication. He is wrong, however, in accusing us of having revived the imputations against the character of his deceased friend, which, as he says, were long ago conclusively disproved. For in the latest History of Australia published—that by Mr. S. Bennett—the charges in question are fully and, as we think, fairly discussed; the author's verdict being that the late Rev. S. Marsden "was neither such a saint as his friends painted him, nor such a sinner as his enemies professed to believe." This decision is, in our opinion, not very far from the truth. But whether it is or not, the friends of the new bishop were guilty of a very foolish thing in attempting to force him into notice by persistently trumpeting forth, irrespective of Dr. Marsden's own qualifications for the episcopal office, the problematical virtues of his ancestor. Our reflection, therefore, was not upon the memory of the dead, but upon the fawning sycophancy of the living. To any of the late Dr. Marsden's relatives, whom our remarks may have pained, we willingly tender our regrets.—ED. A. F. R. P.]

Editorial Notices.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—R. B.—Secularist.—Old Colonist.—received.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, July 4, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 8. September 5, 1870.

Notes.

At a time when every English homo mourns the loss of Charles Dickens, Sydney, we regret to say, has

acquired an unenviable singularity by the fact that her Anglican Bishop has, at a public meeting, thought fit to cast a sneer at the name of a man whom his queen desired to honour, whose memory is enshrined in the loving hearts of thousands, and whose mortal remains have, with the universal approval of his countrymen, been entombed in Westminster Abbey. Humiliating ourselves, as we must and do, under the disgrace which has thus befallen the community, we should yet make an effort "to look our children in the face" if only to remind them, from the proceeding we allude to, of the danger there exists of the heart becoming chilled, and the spirit of true Christianity extinguished, under the blighting influence of a sanctimonious but cold and narrow-minded bigotry. In our deep regard for the moral and religious influence diffused throughout the civilised world by the writings of Charles Dickens as sanctifying his intellect and his creed alike, we, therefore, take the liberty of informing Dr. Barker that in alluding to the great *litterateur* as a man of "unconsecrated intellect," he showed his ignorance of what truly constitutes a *consecrated* intellect, and committed himself to a statement which, he may rest assured, will neither consecrate nor render attractive the source from which it emanated. Our Bishop, in truth, would like us to believe that consecration of intellect, or the direction of the faculties of the intellect to high and sacred ends, is achievable by none but reputed saints, especially those who belong to the religious sect of which his lordship happens to be a titled representative. A miserable conceit, we must say, in any man, but provokingly so in one whose claim to consecration is promptly and even contemptuously disallowed by the largest and most influential section (the Roman Catholic) of the Christian Church. Apart from this consideration, however, how mean and stunted must be the mind that piously disowns fellowship with the glorious host of thinkers and doers who, without identifying themselves with any church, have earnestly and unceasingly laboured to elevate and bless their fellow-creatures. It is pleasing to find at least, one bishop recognising the services of such, and speaking of Dickens as one who "preached not in a church nor from a pulpit, but in a style and fashion of his own—a gospel, a cheery, joyous, gladsome message, which the people understood, and by which they could hardly help being bettered We might not," continued the Bishop of Manchester, "have been able to subscribe to the same creed in relation to God, but I think we should have subscribed to the same creed in relation to man. He who has taught us our duty to men better than we knew it before; who knew so well how to weep with them that weep and to rejoice with them that rejoice; who has shown, with all his knowledge of the dark corners of the earth, how much sunshine may rest on the lowliest lot; who had such evident sympathy with suffering, such a love of innocence, such a natural instinct of purity, that there is scarcely a page of the thousands he has written which might not be put into the hands of a little child, may be regarded by those who recognise the diversity of the gifts of the spirit as a teacher sent from God." More than this in defence, or rather in eulogy of Charles Dickens we need not attempt to say. But we may remind Dr. Barker how much he would add to his episcopal dignity by cordially joining the foremost of mankind in their crusade against human degradation in every shape, instead of sneering at them from his obscure corner of the vineyard of usefulness, simply because they do not flaunt the badge of his own or of any religious sect. Let him, turning his attention to the moral condition of the diocese over which he presides, but place himself in the van of those who would strike at the root of the vice and misery with which it undeniably abounds; let him address himself to the elevation and protection of the community by not only advocating the claims of a pure morality, but by trying to enforce them in the face of a corrupt and unprincipled though influential majority, and he will find himself engaged in a work which, if faithfully and heartily done, will abundantly consecrate the worker.

To the edification of the faithful and the signal discomfiture of unbelievers, Science, as we learn from a work by Dr. Mortimore, of America, entitled "The Spirit of God as Fire; the Globe within the Sun our Heaven," has once more confirmed, and this time in a very remarkable manner, the truths of Revelation. Foremost, for example, among these truths is the existence of a place where the souls of the lost, saturated with fire and brimstone, are to spend an eternity of woe, and of another place where the souls of the redeemed, immersed in delights of every kind and degree, are to enjoy never-ending bliss. Revelation, moreover, can be adduced in support of the notion that heaven and hell are separated by a "great gulf" across which the saved and the damned can not only see but actually converse, as did Abraham and the rich man, with each other. Hitherto, the most rigid scripturalists have been willing to regard this portraiture of the future state as mere allegory, but recent astronomical discoveries, it seems, have proved it true to the letter. Arming himself with Science in defence of Revelation, Dr. Mortimore points out that the hell of the lost must be the immense layer of burning gas or matter with which the sun is now known to be surrounded, and which as being capable of indefinite expansion will furnish ample accommodation for the myriads of reprobate spirits that are destined to occupy it. Heaven, on the other hand, is the inner globe of the sun, between which and the outer hell is the "great gulf" which, as being an excellent conductor of light and sound, will allow both saints and sinners to see and hear across it. Of course the celestial space is limited, but, allowing *twenty cubic feet* to each redeemed soul, Dr. Mortimore, after close calculation, finds there will be room for the ransomed, both from the earth and from the other planets of the solar system. The most alarming feature of this arrangement is, that the saints, in order to

get to heaven, must pass through hell, unless, indeed, the dark openings in the photosphere, generally known as the solar spots, may permit of their making the perilous transit without getting singed. Should it come to the worst, however, it is comforting to know, that as the passage of a soul from earth to heaven (over 90,000,000 miles) will be performed in about *five minutes*, so its momentary flight through a few hundred thousand miles of flame will not be more hazardous than the passage of one's finger through the flame of a candle. But we refrain from giving further details; enough having probably been said to convince the most sceptical of our readers that the God whom Jesus portrays as loving the sinner to the utmost, and even Moses can speak of as "merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness," is after all a consuming or rather *unconsuming* fire.

CONSISTENTLY with his denominational predilections, Mr. John Campbell proposed the other day, in the Upper House, the exhibition of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer in every school-room in the colony. The proposition was treated with all the respect due to it—that is to say, it was declined. For ourselves, we do not share Mr. Campbell's anxiety in this matter; yet, as a sort of consolation to the disappointed legislator, we would suggest that both the Credo and the Prayer be exhibited as prominently as possible in Campbell's Bonded Warehouse, and for the following reasons:—the *Merwanjee Framjee*, Captain Bidwell, from Liverpool, is now discharging at Campbell's Wharf; and Messrs. Campbell and Co.—of which respectable firm Mr. John Campbell is the honoured head—have, or had, on board fifty hogsheads of rum, which they are bonding in their own warehouse for sale to any who have no scruples in distributing the maddening beverage. Now, the Lord's Prayer solicits God not to lead us into temptation; but we apprehend that there is an awful amount of temptation in fifty hogsheads of rum, as well as an awful amount of potential madness, distress and ruin. We, therefore, further propose that every cask on leaving the warehouse shall be ornamented with the Apostles' Creed nailed on to it at one end, and the Lord's Prayer at the other, merely for the purpose of counteracting in some degree the mischief-making properties of the liquor, and of showing also that piety and patriotism do not at all times harmonise quite so much as is desirable.

THE Bishops in Convocation having unanimously decided that our authorised version of the Bible shall undergo revision, and the "Companies" selected for the task, one for the revision of the Old Testament and the other for that of the New, having commenced operations, we shall, barring mishaps, soon be in possession of a Bible which, without receiving the sanction of Parliament, or supplanting the edition of 1611 as that "appointed to be read in Churches," will assuredly commend itself to the largo and increasing number of English-speaking people who are so far emancipated from bibliolatry, as to perceive that the value of the Bible will be greatly enhanced by the application of modern scholarship to a notoriously vicious rendering of its original text. That the mass of Christians should take this view of the matter is, of course, not to be expected. Trained, as they have been, to regard the very letter of the Bible as the actual word of God, and to appeal to it as determining, by a phrase or a word as it may be, the gravest questions of religious controversy, it will scarcely accord with their feelings to find that some favourite text or other belongs to an interpolated passage, or to one, the canonical genuineness of which is very doubtful. Strange as it may appear, it will not, we think, be questioned that the mass of Christians have yet to realise the fact that our Bible is a translation into English from other languages, effected by scholars whose erudition was not of the highest, and whose materials for the work of a good translation were notoriously deficient; one result of this ignorance being that scholars, in venturing to point out some of the thousands of inaccuracies that are known to disfigure the authorised version, have hitherto been shunned and scouted as infidels. There is reason to believe that the publication of the Convocation Bible will greatly help to dispel this popular delusion, and also to prepare the minds of men for the fact that besides these inaccuracies there are in the Bible interpolated passages and even interpolated books, which need not necessarily be expunged, but the true character of which the wayfaring man has a right to know. Why should ninety-nine out of every hundred readers of the Bible be allowed to believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or that the Book of Daniel was written by the prophet of that name who lived during the Captivity, or that John the disciple wrote *both* the fourth gospel and the Apocalypse—when these and other questions of the kind are answered by scholars in the negative? What we want is not so much a new Bible as a little "more light" thrown upon the one we have.

As our readers may have noticed, the question of Biblical Revision has brought that stern and uncompromising champion of undefiled orthodoxy, Archdeacon Denison, once more to the front. Regarding the proposed revision as in itself a calamity of no small dimensions, what shocks and pains him to the utmost is, that the Bishops should have so far forgotten themselves as to decide upon inviting "the co-operation of any persons eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong." In the debate, accordingly, which took place upon this clause in the Lower House of Convocation, the Archdeacon moved as an amendment that Jews and all who did not believe in the divinity of Christ should be excluded from taking part in the revision. The impudence of this proposal was sufficient to secure its rejection. The Jews, for whom the insult was specially intended, were warmly defended by Dean Alford and others as a people worthy of all

respect, and as the "inheritors of a great position." But, apart from this, who so qualified, or who so entitled, to have a hand in translating and in determining the drift of the Hebrew Scriptures as educated members of the race by whom and for whom they were written? True, the Jews, in common with many Christians, deny the divinity of the founder of Christianity; and this it is which arouses the Archdeacon's alarm, and evokes his indignant repudiation of any such heathenish assistance in the work of translating the Old Testament. He knows, well enough, that of the many allusions to Christ in the chapter headings—allusions for the most part as utterly false as they are ridiculously far-fetched—not one, under the application of a fair and honourable criticism, would be permitted to stand. To say nothing of the chapter headings to the Psalms and the Prophetic books, how can we address ourselves, without being angry, to the moral taste and critical discrimination which could find in the Song of Solomon—an amatory ode from an oriental prince to his mistress not untarnished by lewdness—"*the mutual love of Christ and his Church!*" The lady of this love-song, in describing her lover, is made to say: "My beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand. His head is as the most fine gold, his locks are bushy and black as a raven. His eyes are as the eyes of doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk and fitly set. His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers: his lips like lilies, dropping sweet smelling myrrh." But who but the translators of the Bible would have discovered or dreamt of discovering in this amatorial outburst "*a description of Christ by his graces.*" Or what man in his senses would suspect that the statement "We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts: what shall we do for our sister in the day when she shall be spoken for?" referred to "*the calling of the Gentiles!*" In a word, this absurd and unwarrantable introduction into the chapter headings of evangelical comments upon statements which, with equal fairness, might be referred to Luther or Washington as to Jesus, is an abuse and, to some extent, an imposture which cries aloud for rectification; and we do but hope that some member of the revising companies will have the courage and the honesty to call attention to it.

WE have a considerable liking for the Rev. Thomas Smith, of St. Barnabas' Church, both as a man and as a preacher; nor, but for this, should we trouble ourselves to remind him that a good cause like that which he undoubtedly has at heart can hardly be served by methods of raising money which, however consistent with the jesuitical principle that the end justifies the means, are anything but reputable when looked at from a high moral stand-point. For the furtherance of religious enterprise money must, of course, be forthcoming; but we are quite sure that a man of Mr. Smith's tact, ability and perseverance, has resources at his command for raising what he requires without descending to appeals such as the one he made the other night to the members of his church. "You must clear off to-night that little church-debt of four hundred odd," said Mr. Smith at the festive gathering held in honour of his return from England, "or I shall be unable to go on with the work of 'winning souls for Christ,'" an appeal which, without forcing an interpretation, we take to mean—"Come, down with the cash, my beloved brethren, or to not a soul of you can I promise salvation." The response of the flock to their pastor was, naturally enough, a large sum of money subscribed by persons of for the most part very slender means, and who, but for this adroit but, in our opinion, discreditable manipulation of their hopes and fears, would probably and properly have refrained from giving what they were not in a position to give. Mr. Smith, again, may be able to call to mind the fierce rebuke we once heard him administer to those who, in view of the "collection," turned their shillings into sixpences or even threepenny pieces, thinking that the Lord would be satisfied with the smaller coin when they might have given him the larger. We refuse, however, to believe that the Lord is of the same money-grasping turn as the mass of his accredited servants, or that the lesson which Jesus drew from the poor woman and her two mites has ceased to be morally significant. Mr. Smith is often alluded to as the poor man's preacher. Let him, then, respect the feelings of the poor; not forgetting that a missed but cheerfully-given sixpence is a much more acceptable offering to the Lord than any unmissed and grudgingly-given pound. As a "winner of souls for Christ," he will also do well not to parade his calling so much. We can assure him that sensible men are heartily sick of such canting utterances, and are often moved by them to withhold what would otherwise have been a helping hand.

POPE Pius the Ninth having, by the promulgation of the dogma of Infallibility, been pronounced incapable of error, the next move, we presume, will be the promulgation of another dogma affirming the exemption of his Holiness from disease and death. The latter proclamation, in truth, would be not a whit less absurd than the former; and for ourselves, we must say that, in view of the outrageous silliness of the Infallibility dogma, we find a difficulty in understanding the great religious stir it has created. Because five or six hundred elderly gentlemen, after a considerable spell of genuine cackle, choose to vote and proclaim one of their number incapable of making mistakes, is it, therefore, so? Is their *placet hoc omnibus* of the slightest weight when poised against a grain of common sense? Is it of the slightest authority when measured against the moral and mental forces which in these days make and influence public opinion? We trow not. There was no occasion, therefore, for the Protestant hubbub that has arisen. Romanism, being in her dotage, is consequently garrulous, and may surely be allowed the privilege of talking, in consideration of the fact that her talk will soon be over. Protestantism, moreover, as we often take occasion to point out, has a pet little infallibility of her own, which,

although of ancient standing, is quite as much opposed to reason and the spirit of the age as is the infallibility with which the (Ecumenical Council has just invested the Pope. Bible-worship, we take it, is just as indefensible as Church-worship or Pope-worship, and as for the blasphemy involved in such proceedings, we are bold to say the oracularising of a body of tradition, however valuable in itself, at the expense and to the dethronement of the living oracles of reason and the conscience is by far the greater blasphemy of the two.

THANKS to the eloquence of that rising barrister-at-law, Mr. David Buchanan, and the discernment of the jury who were impannelled to try the Anatomical Museum case, Sydney, more fortunate than Melbourne, has been left in possession of a Temple of Science and Morality, the closing of which would, as Mr. Buchanan forcibly and patriotically pointed out, have been a serious, if not an irreparable, loss to the community. How near this calamity was befalling us may be inferred from the fact that several medical practitioners of high standing and eminent ministers of the gospel—all good but obviously mistaken men—gave it as their opinion that the Museum was bad both in character and in tendency, and that its high-minded proprietor had other and less unselfish ends to serve than the moral and intellectual elevation of the people. Mr. Buchanan, however, quickly demolishing these frivolous objections, found no difficulty in convincing the jury that every town should have its Anatomical Museum, where the young, taking counsel from displays of retributive disease, may learn wisdom betimes, and be deterred from falling into mischief. How, indeed, should it be otherwise? How better apprise the nose of the deleterious effects of disgusting stinks than by bringing that organ into close contact with them? or wean off our young men from the bestialising effects of intemperance than by letting them spend an hour occasionally in some low tap-room? It is clear, therefore, that the thanks of the community are due to Mr. Buchanan for pointing out, so *convincingly* as he has done, the *deterrent* character of a class of exhibitions which have hitherto been shunned by squeamish and would-be-virtuous people as; dens of imposture and nastiness; and under these circumstances it is of course our duty, notwithstanding that one reverend gentleman's visit to the Pitt Street Institute made him "quite ill for hours afterwards," to advise our readers to go there without delay, especially as the proprietor, disgusted no doubt at our thickheadedness and ingratitude, is threatening us with only another week of it.

Endless Punishment.

IN the few remarks we are about to offer on this subject we shall refrain from disputing with those who claim for the dogma of the eternity of future suffering the sanction of Scripture. It will, we think, be conceded, by all candid and discerning minds, that the Bible, in many passages, distinctly affirms the existence of a place of excruciating torment, where the souls of sinners are destined to suffer everlastingly for sins done in the body; so that, if the Bible is to be regarded as a supreme and final authority in such matters, there is nothing for it but to consider the question of the probability of Endless Punishment as authoritatively settled in the affirmative. There is, however, in the present day, a large and increasing class of thinkers to whom this arbitrary and off-hand manner of dealing with theological difficulties is an insuperable stumbling-block. Men are at length beginning to see that, in determining the deepest problems of thought and the gravest issues of human destiny, Reason and Nature are not thus to be ousted from their legitimate seat by an assumed infallible standard of opinion, of which no stronger defence is offered than that those concerned in the framing of it "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Any Revelation, we say it advisedly, which professes to transcend Nature, instead of reverently interpreting what she has to say to us, is both a solecism and a snare.

To establish, then, the probability of the eternity of future punishment from something analagous in the system of nature, what kind of evidence should we require? Clearly the infliction upon sentient beings of endless and irremediable pain. Pain of one kind or another is, of course, to be met with in abundance. It confronts us at every turn. Such palpable facts as that carnivorous animals prey upon other animals in obedience to a law of their organisation, and that some tribes of animated beings are by nature so prolific as to necessitate the thinning of their numbers by starvation or by violence, are in themselves sufficient to prove that pain, *per se*, is not incompatible with the supreme wisdom and benevolence. And the same may be said of the misery caused by the flood, the fire, the hurricane, the earthquake, and other such disaster-producing phenomena of nature. In either case, however, the pain inflicted is, as a rule, of the shortest duration. The antelope struck down by the spring of the lion, and the dove in the talons of the hawk, probably suffer very little pain. And as for disasters by flood, fire and tempest, they are no sooner over than Nature, like the spider whose web has been swept away, begins to rebuild and restore. So far, then, we find nothing in nature analagous to the hell of orthodox Christianity.

Of quite another order are the pains which men, as rational and responsible beings, bring upon themselves by their actions. And, as it happens, the ruin which pursues and crushes the bad man is the very illustration employed by Bishop Butler to prove the eternity of future punishment. After remarking how bad men,

despising remonstrance and entreaty, deliberately go on in their mad career from bad to worse, he says: "At length the bad consequences of their follies break in irresistibly like an armed force; repentance is too late to relieve, and can only serve to aggravate the distress; the case is become desperate; and poverty and sickness, remorse and anguish, infamy and death, overwhelm them beyond possibility of remedy or escape." It is curious that a reasoner so acute as the author of the *Analogy of Religion* should have failed to see how signally his argument fails in one point. He shows, what no one would deny, that misery may be irremediable; but that it is therefore endless is surely a palpable *non sequitur*. Even the hardened debauchee, in whom Nature's tendency to restoration is hopelessly counteracted by the virulence of disease, soon reaches the termination of his miserable course. He dies, and to all appearance his pain is over. What comes after death we cannot say; but the point to be remembered is, that to establish anything like an analogy between the pains of this life and those of the next, there must be produced the impossible case of one, the virulence of whose physical sufferings forces him to long for death without permitting him to die. Nor, as we may show by an illustration, is it otherwise with nations. The ancient Roman, in the palmiest days of the Republic, was, perhaps, the superb specimen of the fighting man the world has ever seen. Proud and self-possessed, taking temporary defeat as only an incentive to greater exertion, with an inborn love of order and great aptitude for organisation, he went forth conquering and to conquer. Extension of conquest, however, only served to corrupt and enervate the empire: what should have been the great middle class of its subjects died fighting in distant lands; while the upper-class Roman at home, enriched with the plunder of the conquered provinces, wholly surrendered himself to sleep, refection, and the arena. Of science he had none; of art and literature not much that was original; and his sports, as is well known, were replete with coarseness and brutality. Thanks to the law of progress which controls the affairs of our world, such a state of things was not permitted, as it never will be permitted, to last. Yet, when the mighty but debilitated empire of the Cæsars succumbed to the attacks of its barbarian assailants, what seemed complete and irremediable ruin was but the birth-hour of a civilisation to which, as represented by the leading nations of modern Europe, Rome never could have attained.

The moral growth of a man of high principle is of slow development. Accepting the guidance of reason and conscience, his path from clay to day grows smoother; self-denial loses its irksomeness; his animal appetites, habitually checked, grow less urgent; his mind and heart expand to the gradual suppression of foolish judgments and unworthy aims; until, like Paul, he can feel, in his declining years, that he has fought a good fight and finished his course. But, then, this moral progress may be reversed. A man, all his life long, may, consciously or unconsciously, be doing his utmost to smother the nobler impulses of his soul in sensual pleasure—sinking lower and lower in the rank of moral beings as the good man rises higher and higher. What, then, if the soul exhibiting this sad declension, this degrading disavowal of priceless rights and opportunities, should, like the withered kernel of a blighted nut, be fated to perish with the body, and lose the immortality which is its potential privilege. We shall not follow up this thought, at least beyond saying that we consider the doctrine which consigns the sinner to annihilation far preferable to that which affirms that conscience will be miraculously revived, too late for repentance and reformation, but not too late for remorse; and that the body, reconstituted and endowed with immortality, will be an instrument for the infliction of everlasting torture.

Punishment, we take it, may be regarded from one of three points of view. It may be *reformatory*—with a view to the well-being of the sinner himself; or *admonitive*—with a view to its effect upon others; or retributive—with a view to the law

"Which binds together guilt and pain,"

and, by an unerring sequence of cause and effect, afflicts the sinner to the full extent of his misdoings. That our human nature is a by no means uncertain reflection of this retributive principle is evinced by the satisfaction men feel in the "poetical justice" which, in the hands of the poet or dramatist, eventually discomfits the knave and brings the good man to the front, as well as by the summary justice which men, moved by sudden impulse, will at times inflict upon criminals of unusual atrocity. With punishment, however, of the retributive sort, judges, magistrates, and others, who are directly concerned in the maintenance of social order, have nothing whatever to do. We punish the offender, not for the sake of involving him in the retributive penalty of his sin, but in the hope of making him a better man and of deterring others from following his example. Now, to pass from this world to the next, it is clear that the rewards of heaven and the punishments of hell cannot be considered as tending either to reform or to deter; for with allotment of these at the judgment, as orthodoxy teaches, humanity will have ceased to exist. To the inhabitants of Mars or Jupiter—sinners, perhaps, like ourselves, and therefore doomed to destruction, unless rescued by a redeemer, an atonement, a justification by faith, and the rest of the theological apparatus—the spectacle of our naughty earth disclaiming its connection with the solar system and disappearing in a sudden outburst of flame, would, forsooth, did they but know the rights of it, be alarming and, perhaps, reformatory and admonitive in the extreme. We may rest assured, however, that as their ignorance of our affairs is at least as profound as our ignorance of what goes on in Mars or Jupiter, so the burning and dispersion of our planet, however interesting from a scientific point of view,

would not be invested by them with any *judicial* significance.

Shall we say, then, that future punishment is essentially and characteristically retributive? Let us think for a moment. Compensation, no doubt, is the law of the universe. To commit sin is to involve ourselves in suffering; nor can we hope—do what we may in the shape of penance, or receive what we may in the shape of absolution—to evade the consequences of our iniquities. They punish us here as, admitting the doctrine of a future life, they will assuredly punish us hereafter. But, surely, as a matter of justice, the retributive suffering should be proportionate, or at least not inconceivably disproportionate, to the sin which it follows. Suppose that at the formal apportioning of human lots which, as we are told, is to take place at the judgment there shall have existed three hundred generations of men, each generation consisting of a thousand millions, each individual living a hundred years,—we use round numbers for convenient calculation,—and that some great sinner who has been instrumental in blasting the happiness or in diminishing the usefulness of every member of the vast human family, is sentenced to suffer a hundred-fold the misery he has caused. His punishment would in that case extend over 3,000,000,000 millions of years! And yet this immense period is as nothing compared with the eternity during which God, as most Christians believe, will *compensate* Lazarus with unutterable bliss for his seventy years of poverty, and Dives with unutterable woe for his seventy years of comfortable ease! How people can entertain this conception of God, and refrain, in so doing, from regarding him as a hideous monster of injustice, we are unable to understand.

Nor can we fathom the state of mind that can adjust the doctrine of endless suffering to the tokens of boundless wisdom and goodness of which the universe is full. Great, no doubt, would be our amazement, if, after inspecting some splendid mansion, exhibiting the highest phases of art and refinement, we should suddenly discover, in some recess, a collection of rubbish displaying every stage of nastiness and putridity? Yet this is what theologians teach of the God whose universe, from the tiniest shell in the depths of the ocean to the vastest orb that rolls through space, teems with the evidences of divine love and goodness, but has, nevertheless, its *recess*, where the mass of his rational offspring are to be finally located, and the smoke of their torment is to go up for ever and ever. How, then, should we rejoice that this priestly blasphemy against the God of Justice and of Love is, with the progress of religious thought, about to disappear.

A writer says: "Had no other change taken place in theology than this, had we discarded no other ancient error, it would be enough to make our century blessed among the ages, that it has witnessed the last preaching of the doctrine of the eternal perdition of souls. No longer shall the spontaneous love of happy youth to the Giver of life's joy, the Maker of this beautiful universe, be checked and snapped like a flower in its bud by the threats of endless torture, to be inflicted by that same Being who is now shedding mercies like the sunbeams around. No more shall the heart of earnest manhood, and woman's sensitive conscience, shrink and tremble at the thought that perhaps No honesty of purpose, no carefulness of duty, may suffice to save from a doom which courage itself could not face nor piety endure. No more shall the student pursue his studies into the mysteries of God's glorious creation, as with the sword of Damocles over the book of Nature, ready to slay him if he find not in its pages the foregone conclusion of an obsolete philosophy. No more shall parent or wife, hanging over the grave of child or husband, feel that the agony of separation itself is but light in comparison of the yet darker terror that the soul so dear is gone to no happy realm where Death will yet re-unite the several links of love, but to a world of endless, remediless, unutterable woe. No more shall the aged, sinking slowly out of life, and feeling day by day the tide of strength go down, look forward fearfully and tremblingly to the inevitable future, like the prisoner whose iron cage closed hourly around him to crush him at last; and cry with failing breath, *not* the triumphant words meet for the close of a life of fidelity, 'God, I come to Thee!' but the wail of terror unassuaged, 'Oh, save me from the bitter pains of eternal death.'

Kings have ordered many a *Te Deum* for victory over their enemies. Had I my will, all the cathedrals of Christendom should resound with a thanksgiving for the conquest of faith and reason over the belief in Hell! No splendid discovery of distant clusters of suns by the astronomer, no revival of buried wilds by the geologist, no invention of steam or telegraphy, no political reform, no abolition of slavery, no change amid all the thousand changes of our day is truly greater or more blessed than this liberation of our souls. Now, at last, may we look beyond the grave to a world where, not we ourselves only, or only those who have shared our creed, but all men, all of every age and clime, all whom we have loved or honoured or pitied or mourned, shall sit down in the Kingdom of God, with *none* cast out. Now, at last, may we with our whole hearts love the Lord or God; and trust our souls, and all souls, fearlessly in His hand, whose universe may contain a million worlds of trial and joy, but never a world of Reprobation. *Sit laus Deo.*"

Scorpio.

Paradise Lost.

HERODOTUS informs us that Homer and Hesiod created the theogony of the Greeks, assigning to the gods their various titles, characters and forms. But in ancient times, every people, not absolutely barbarian, had a theogony and a cosmogony of their own. They made their own gods and created the world after their own peculiar fashion. Curiosity prompted invention, credulity encouraged it, and the awe-inspiring phenomena of nature, but little understood, were ruthlessly suggestive to poet and prophet alike. The thunderstorm evoked a Jupiter Tonans; and the fears, hopes and necessities of man would speedily fill a Pantheon of respectable dimensions. The seer or prophet, the universal genius, understood everything, would account for everything, and furnished the particulars of the world's creation and construction with an assurance and minuteness that would sanction the supposition that he was an eyewitness of the whole process.

The Hebrews have favoured the world with a cosmogony of their own, attributed to their lawgiver Moses, who is styled by Bacon—God's first pen. But notwithstanding the inspiration that is said to have instructed the writer of the Book of Genesis, we question if the writings of heathen cosmogonists contain anything more absurd than the narrative that introduces us to our first parents, Adam and Eve. Some people, it is said, are so crazily credulous as to believe the more readily *quia est impossibile*. We commend the cosmogony of Moses to their consideration as a rich pasture where they may luxuriate to their soul's content. Almost every statement involves a transparent impossibility, and can be accepted only by the inconsiderate, and by those to whom the impossible is no objection. What, for instance, can be more absurd than the rape of Adam's rib for the purpose of creating Eve? Was there such a penury of means with the Almighty that he must resort to such an outrageous and incredible operation as this to accomplish his purposes? But we will not trust ourselves to comment on this marvellous recital. We will, however, at the outset, take this opportunity to explain that if we sometimes smile at the Mosaic narrative, we have a sterner purpose in hand than merely the exposition of the ridiculous. It is not pretended that the events recited in connection with the fall of man are based on human testimony; but it is contended that they are true nevertheless, and have been communicated to the sacred historian by inspiration. We reject the claim to inspiration altogether, and if we succeed in showing that the details are childish, absurd, impossible, we eliminate inspiration, and reduce the narrative to a nullity. This is the task that we propose to ourselves, and trust that we shall make it manifest to our readers that we have undertaken that which involves no very serious difficulty.

Fortunately the claim to inspiration is placed in a very questionable position at the commencement of the story, thus: in the seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis we read, "And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so." The exigencies of our position compel us to incur the responsibility of meeting this statement with a decided contradiction, and we unhesitatingly maintain that it *was not so*, nor anything like it. The inspired penman really believed that heaven's cerulean was a solid firmament, above which he also imagined there was a reservoir; and that when the water descended therefrom in the form of rain, it was through the "windows of heaven," which were supposed to be openings or fissures in this said solid firmament. Surely it is unnecessary to say that this is nothing more nor less than pure chimera, and therefore unworthy of association with a divine afflatus. Ignorant of the true theory of the formation of rain, the inspired penman fabricated a hypothesis of his own, which we need scarcely say is perfectly gratuitous, untenable and ridiculous; and if his inspiration failed to preserve him from so calamitous a break down when dealing with the simplest phenomena of nature, what confidence can be placed in him when his theme is the great unknown, the immeasurable past.

The tree of Knowledge, which occupies a very prominent position in the Mosaic narrative, is brought on the *tapis* in the second chapter of Genesis, and does not harmonise with the first chapter of the same book. Indeed, had the first chapter been correct, man could not have fallen in the manner described. in Gen. i. 29, 30, we read, "And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so." But it *was not so*; for in Gen. ii. 16, 17, we read, "And the Lord God commanded the man saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Therefore, the former statement, namely, that man might freely eat of every tree was not correct; nor was the threat verified which implied the death of those who ate of the forbidden fruit on the very day that they did so eat, for Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years after his so-called disobedience. This discrepancy shows plainly that there must have been more than one writer engaged in framing the narrative, and there is no reason for believing that one writer was not quite as much inspired as the other. The former, however, with better taste, left out the wonderful tree of Knowledge, which the other introduced with such fatal effect for unhappy man.

Mr. Kreffit has offered ten pounds for the production of any serpent of colonial origin that measures twelve feet and upwards in length; and we may safely offer double that sum for the production of a snake (no matter

whence) that is well up in Hebrew, and that can chop logic through the medium of that language. The inspired narrative tells us that the serpent both talked and outreasoned the woman; but before we examine the staple of this rather unusual dialogue, let us ask how it was that the serpent became acquainted with the language of Adam and Eve in Paradise. Adam and Eve must have created the language in which they conversed by mutual agreement, and parties not cognisant of that agreement in all its parts, could never, for a single minute, have conversed with them—not even God himself. How, then, could the serpent converse with Adam and Eve, or Adam and Eve with the serpent?

Again, when some Grecian poetaster asserted that a stone statue had delivered a speech, it was at once objected that the gods themselves could not make a statue speak in the absence of the apparatus requisite for speech. But this wonderful serpent could both talk and reason too in the absence both of the speaking apparatus and the cerebral arrangement necessary to carry on the thinking process. Is it at all surprising that we never heard of the follow of this wonderful reptile? Like the tree of Knowledge, there was never more than one of the sort; and of the latter neither Linnæus nor Jussieu ever met with anything like it in the world's flora; and for the best of all reasons, namely, because it never had existence save and except in the fertile imagination of the inspired writer.

The tree of Knowledge! Why not the tree of Compound Multiplication? What is knowledge but ascertained truth registered by the memory under the direction of the intelligence through the medium of the senses? Where the senses, where the intelligence, where the memory of the vegetable world? The roots of this wonderful tree might possibly have imbibed a little geology, and the fruit might in consequence be flavoured with some information anticipatory of Hutton's theory; but on this subject Moses is silent as the grave.

To be candid, however, it must be admitted that the eating of this wonderful fruit by Adam and Eve was attended by the most felicitous effects to them in, at least, one respect. The increment to their knowledge, in consequence, was truly astonishing—nothing less than the discovery of the fact that they were naked. Why! in the name of common sense, were our respected progenitors such pitiable idiots before they ate the forbidden fruit as to imagine that they were clothed when they were as nude as the Apollo Belvedere?

But looking at the narrative divested of the childishness that makes it contemptible, we fail to detect anything like wilful criminality on the part of our first parents. They are naively represented as the victims of superior intelligence, although that intelligence happened to be housed in a talking snake. They were assured that they should not die, and it was further intimated to them that they were told so in the first-place to prevent them becoming as gods knowing good and evil. The woman, in her innocence (and innocence is ever unsuspecting), was satisfied that that was the genuine reason why the fruit was forbidden; and we all know how easily the judgment is influenced when our interest is allowed to get into the scale. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired *to make one wise*, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." Eve, it is clear, was engaged in the pursuit of knowledge under difficulties; but she acted to the best of her judgment, and decided as well as she knew how, although unfortunately. It was an error of judgment at the worst and nothing more; and to expel her and her husband from Paradise on that account, appears to us so harsh and unreasonable that we rejoice to feel assured that we are dealing with nothing more substantial than the shadow of a shade—a mere nullity. Nor will it mend matters to suppose that the serpent was inspired by the devil, or was the devil himself, admitting for the sake of argument the existence of such a being; for this may be urged as an additional point in favour of the woman. Who could expect any other result than the discomfiture of Eve when pitted against such a veteran and wily sinner as Satan?

But the whole affair is intrinsically beneath notice; and is of importance only as it forms the apology for another absurdity of about the same calibre, namely, the doctrine of the Atonement. Sin and death, we are told, entered the world by one man, and life and immortality have been secured by the death of another, Jesus Christ, the veritable Son of the living God by the Virgin Mary, and who suffered, we are further told, the just for the unjust. According to orthodox authority, nothing less than the sacrifice of the Son of God, who, according to the same authority, is God himself, would meet the necessities of the case, and therefore he died the death of the cross. The fact of the celestial origin of Jesus was not brought forward very prominently in his ministry, and he himself was assuredly ignorant of it. The Nestorians in the third century maintained that the union of God and Man in the manner contended for is impossible, and there are physical as well as moral considerations that oppose to it a decided negative. But these we cannot conveniently discuss in this article. The Eutychians in the fifth century maintained that the body of Christ, bearing in mind its reputed origin, differed in its nature from the rest of mankind; but Mary his mother, and Joseph his father, knew very well that there was no reason whatever for any difference in this respect. Mary, the very best authority on this subject, said to Jesus, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing." This was on the occasion of his remaining behind at Jerusalem to dispute with the doctors to the great distress of his parents, involving, in our opinion, an act of disobedience at least as culpable as that which expelled Adam and Eve from

Paradise. If the sorrow of Joseph was not purely paternal, we mistake it.

The Prayer Book tells us that the Father is God, that the Son is God, and, that the Holy Ghost is God, and yet they are not three Gods, but one God. It follows then, that what is achieved by either of the three is effected by God. Bearing this in mind, we then read in Matt. i. 18, 20, that the mother of Jesus was found with child by the Holy Ghost. These are Trinitarian premises, and pregnant, we contend, with the following conclusions:—That a man may have a son quite as old as his own father and a great deal older than his own mother, and, finally, that he is his own father by his own mother.

Libra.

Infallibility.

AMONG the recent items of a more than ordinary religious interest is the dogma of Infallibility just confirmed by the Roman Catholic Church. Now said Infallibility being a word of six syllables, and otherwise invested with a degree of notoriety, we should like to devote a moment to its explanation, and relieve it, it may be, of some of those erroneous conceits often unjustly fathered upon it. We constitute ourselves no apologists of the Church of Rome; we are not of her communion; and she can well fight her own battles like her sturdy bishops of old, giving and taking knocks with equal bravery. But she is apt at times, in zealously guarding her citadel, to be somewhat neglectful of her outworks; and seldom condescends, in the confidence of a secure position, to dwell on the materials of their structure. Some of her dogmas, we repeat it, are apt to be misconceived and to be charged with an interpretation they by no means carry with them. Among others is that of Infallibility. Nearly two hundred bishops sanctioned this tenet in the middle of the sixteenth century, and a still greater number the other day confirmed it by the *placet* of an Œcumenical Council. What is its meaning then, and its ordinarily supposed bearing on the conduct of those who are contented to abide by it?

Infallibility, fairly explained, means, we take it, incapability of error. This interpretation might be thought by many to set the whole question at rest; for, argues the ready disputant, surely some doctrines of Romanism are erroneous; Infallibility is a doctrine of Rome; *ergo*, &c., &c. Leaving the syllogism to fight its own way, and to do duty in the absence of anything better, we would still confine our observations to the more general intention of the word and not restrict it to a meaning that serves only as a bugbear to the mouthy roisterer, or a stalkinghorse to the platform orator. In the confirmation, then, of infallibility by the late (Œcumenical Council, we would suggest that the Church of Rome has only once more asserted a freedom from such error as shall tear her internal organisation to pieces, and leave her to exist, like Protestantism, the laughing-stock of the religious world. In solemnly announcing her incapability of error, she virtually directs our attention to her world-wide faith, seemingly saying to us in no empty words—*Si monumentum quæris, circumspice*. But as to error, what is it? Who shall define it? What else can our humanity do at best than ever to hold judgment in some degree of suspense, and, in the well-grounded conviction how closely truth and error trench on one another, to maintain such decent reserve as may possibly bring us no fame but commit us to no folly. When a church, that at least has the prestige of antiquity and oneness—a church invested with the charm of ancient memories, and for well nigh fifteen centuries the acknowledged sole depository of religious truth—when a church like this could evince such capacity for moulding multiform and scattered thought to her dominion, for so meeting the circumstances around her as to capture the very conqueror and make the civilised world her vassal, even as Greece did Rome in the contest of art and intelligence—an incapability of error may well be allowed, though reason may think fit to hold up an indignant hand and record its lordly veto. Is it to go for nothing her being declared age after age to be founded upon a rock and to be the sole guardian and nurse of human intelligence, until a period came that produced a sovereign to whom fallibility and infallibility were all one, if they either ran counter to his lusts or to that Tudor arrogance that would at any convenient moment as summarily violate a marriage tie as throw off all allegiance to a church, or bully a house of commons? For centuries past the church had encountered the turmoil and trouble that surged fearfully around her at intervals; but, based upon a rock, she was neither engulfed nor shattered by the rude hand of contending factions. The Reformation came; the rock was denominated a stone of stumbling, and what neither Lollards, Wycliffe, nor the burly monk of Eisleben could have brought about was to be achieved by the roving appetite of a royal sensualist. Infallibility had been virtually admitted until a political expediency thought fit to determine it. And so biblical interpretation went with the times. What had been formerly a ground of truth, now became a foundation of error. St. Peter was impoverished as well as snubbed, and Protestants were well content for at least three reigns to put on their religion as they would their breeches, and change it as often. National vanity had been egged on to fever heat; the monastic spoil lay ready for the rifling; and thousands recognised but too late how desperately they had sacrificed substance for shadow, and only played into the hands of that privileged and higher class of tender and conscientious souls who had, in vulgar parlance, swallowed the oyster and left them the shell. But in the

meantime what said our lady on the banks of the Tiber? Ever "*una et eadem*," she simply now enunciates what had before been tacitly allowed—her Infallibility. Even though some branches had been lopped off the parent stem, it stood erect, firm and undecaying. Professing to hold the keys of Heaven and of the gates of Hell, she withdraws no claims, admits no compromise.

"Quantum vertice ad auras

Ætherias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit."

A later intellect with its metaphysical acumen, and biassed by the complexion of surrounding events may babble if it will about the absurdity of infallibility, and busy itself in collecting proofs to gainsay it. But disdaining to tilt with so lightly armed an adversary, with one whose armour is as loose as his ideas, Rome points with no undue pride to that one undivided church that not only dares assert her privileges, but as resolutely maintains them, and so far differing, *toto cælo*, from that religious motley, that patchwork of Protestantism whose episcopal defenders are but so many dumb dogs, wont to flinch at any moment of trial, and seldom ready to give other than an ambiguous answer for the faith that is in them.

But let us, for a moment longer, crave our readers' patience. Who is it that impugns the dogma of Infallibility with most noticeable rancour—with an intolerance that would almost lead one to suppose the existence of some inward sense of spiritual dissolution? Who is it that urges on a strife with the rapture of the renegade who hates the cause he injures? Who is it so ready to adduce a thousand and one reasons to upset another's faith, when he cannot allege half a dozen to support his own? Who is it, in fine, that is the greatest scoffer at the infallibility of the Catholic Church, from an inward and scarcely self-admitted scorn of the manufacture of his own orthodoxy, and from a poorness of spirit and intellect that grovels in fear and inanition? Who else than our Protestant, with as many features as Proteus, and as slippery withal! And is it such a sciolist as this who takes upon him to throw the stone at Infallibility, or at any other dogma of the Church of Rome! *Proh divum numina sancta!* He had need have his own glass house secure and unassailable. But is it so? Ask him under whatever master in Israel he may sit, to demonstrate the object of his existence here—to tell us why evil should be and whence it originates—why he should rather credit something than nothing—why virtue itself is a real blessing independent of any consideration of a future state—why death should be viewed as a mere necessity of our common nature and not as a horror too terrible for contemplation. Ask him these or such other questions, as shall compel him to look within his breast and tumble up and down what he finds there, undeterred by the lazy influences that would shift on to another shoulder the allotted burden of his own. Will he do this, or something like it, or else reply, from inertness of intellect or unmanly shifting, that his teachers have settled all these points for him, vouching for their reality and truth. But go into the next street and you will both see and hear another phase and order of things; while under the respectable roof of the Establishment the whole *mise en scène* will be changed, parts and character to boot. Now, perhaps, the only conclusion we can safely arrive at is that all persuasions have their peculiar infallibilities or incapability of error; but why they should refuse the Church of Rome a liberty they assume themselves completely passes our comprehension. They profess to be shocked at an infallibility they are really exercising themselves—scandalised at the very notion of incapability of error when the daily increasing and not unreasonable call for a revision of the Liturgy and retranslation of the Bible, more consonant to the spirit of the age and to the progress of intelligence, are being viewed by those in authority with the greatest aversion. Do but hear these tender strainers at gnats and swallows of camels, and neither Liturgy, Bible nor Formularies require any emendation—in fact they are exempt from error, they are infallible. Blind of vision, warped in understanding, they shut their eyes to the world-wide benefits that a venerable and time-honoured church has conferred upon its children by constituting herself, and by her actions proving her- self too, sole depository of religious action and individual responsibility: yet all the while they are blowing their own little trumpets of uncertain sound, leaving the minds of thousands upon thousands a complete blank, and urging not a few in despair of all spiritual ease into the sombre depths of irreligion or atheism.

In resolutely maintaining Infallibility, and impressing it even in this nineteenth century with the sanction of an (Ecumenical Council, the Romish Church has done good service to Catholicism. Here, as throughout her eventful career, we cannot but notice with admiration how her instinct has ever led her patiently to watch the circumstances of the world, and while ever upholding her own independence of action, to offer, with a confidence in herself that helps to secure the confidence of her votary, a haven of rest and of guaranteed security within the precincts of holy church. Unconnected with her in any degree other than by the interests of a common humanity, we cannot for all that help regarding her as a motive power unspeakably important in this age of ours, going out, as she does, into the lanes and byways of the world inviting with gentle words and soothing influences those many waifs and strays of society who but for her might be for ever buffeted about on the storm-tossed waves of the religious world.

Quilibet.

Science and Revelation.

It is generally supposed that the educated members of those Christian sects who hold the doctrine of Scriptural Infallibility have so modified their opinions on the subject of the creation of the world as to make the Mosaic cosmogony harmonise with the teachings of modern science. This, however, is but partially true; as there are multitudes of good Christians for whom the discoveries of the last three centuries are naught, and who regard museums, laboratories and lectures as agencies of the Father, not of lights, but of lies.

That such views as these are not extinct, and that their expression is still acceptable to persons in other respects well-informed, is evinced by an article signed J. C. H. in the May number of the *Dublin University Magazine*, which is known to derive its inspiration from that fountain-head of Scriptural infallibility—Trinity College, Dublin. The title of the article in question is "The Book of Genesis in relation to Modern Science," and the writer of it boldly contends for an absolutely literal interpretation of what is said in the opening chapters of the Bible concerning the formation of the heavens and the earth, and the submergence of the latter beneath the waters of the Noachian deluge. He, in fact, surrenders his reason at the very commencement of the proposed inquiry, with what results it is the object of this paper briefly to point out.

After extolling the dignity and simplicity of the biblical narrative, which "will ever appear a monument of the grandeur and the immutability of truth—truth that has withstood, for almost numberless generations, the perpetual assaults of a long succession of adversaries," J. C. H. warns the "sceptic" against expecting new grounds for his unbelief in a revision of the authorised text. Any such revision, he assures us, will yield fresh proofs of the substantial accuracy of the present version, and therefore operate more than ever to the sceptic's discomfiture:

"The very simplicity of the Biblical narrative appals the sceptical philosopher, and intensifies his incredulity, and he will not have so unpretentious a revelation to rule over his mind. He returns to his unsatisfactory philosophy, and is soon again immersed in the ever-issuing mists of perhaps, peradventure, and probably. Not so the man who knows, by a faith that is the offspring and co-equal of knowledge, the unerring certainty of the word that was from the beginning. He remains unmoved by the shifting currents of opinion, and waits for the confirmation of what he has believed, in the establishment of the knowledge of God throughout the earth. In vain may the sceptic hope for a refuge in the verbosity, or even the exactitude of a new translation. The more exact and literal the translation, the more transparent will appear the fallacies of its opponents, the more futile their attempts to alter the signification that will be presented to their view. An infallible translation of the original manuscripts (which can only be expected from an inspired historian) would be a great boon unquestionably; but the result would prove the substantial accuracy of our present version, and the utter overthrow of the expectations of those who look forward to a mitigation of the inexorable oracularity of that Book, which has God for its real Author, and the Divine Spirit for its Upholder."

The dignity and simplicity are admitted; but the former is in good measure the translator's, while the latter is shared with those oriental cosmogonies that place the earth on the back of an elephant standing on the back of a tortoise, the latter animal resting on something else, and so on, *ad infinitum*. Further, there are good grounds for believing, in spite of J. C. H.'s assertion to the contrary, that those who would refute his opinions from his own authorities would find their position considerably strengthened by an accurate translation of the original Hebrew. But let that pass. What really confounds us is, that men, ostensibly searching for scientific truth, should, like J. C. H., deliberately retire from the Temple of Nature, where alone her laws are to be studied, and resort to the Bible for information on subjects concerning which it was never intended to afford instruction, and requiring to be investigated by methods of research, of which the biblical writers had no knowledge whatever.

But the "sceptic," it seems, is not the only sinner; the "philosopher" of the present day having, as J. C. H. avers, so far succumbed to the spirit of unbelief, as to deny that the earth was created in the manner described, and within the period named, by the "inspired" cosmogonist. Scornfully casting aside, therefore, the profoundest speculations of modern science, this sturdy champion of orthodoxy proceeds to affirm, on the authority of "one evidently acquainted with what he was writing about,"—a remark which makes us wish his commentator possessed the same qualification,—that the universe was redeemed in the space of six natural days, by the fiat of the Almighty, from a state of dark and weltering chaos to that of cosmic brightness and beauty:

"The notion that the earth was a molten mass of fire that gradually cooled down into a spherical body, is unsupported by any reliable evidence. The marks of vitrification that may appear in the primary rocks, may be accounted for by the fact that they were produced by that God, who appeared afterwards in Sinai as a consuming fire, and made the mountain tremble at His presence, and before whom the hills are said to "melt like wax." We may reasonably presume that the earth was not consolidated without the agency of fire. His word

is said to be as a fire that breaketh the rock in pieces, so sublimated is its essence, and so infinite its power."

Have we, then, no sufficiently reliable evidence of igneous agency in the formation of our earth in volcanic and seismic phenomena at the present time, and in the enormous mass of plutonic and metamorphic rocks, indicating how much more energetic and widespread it must have been in the past? Is it nothing to the purpose that the appearance of the moon, the only celestial body whose surface can be examined by the telescope, is, when so examined, that of a huge cinder? or that the sun, as shown by the spectroscopic analysis of his rays, is in so intensely heated a condition, that the heavy metals exist on or near his surface in the gaseous form? or that the fixed stars, differing as do their spectra from each other and from the solar spectrum, are themselves independent illuminating centres of incandescent material? It may be that we are not entitled to regard the igneous origin of our earth as an established scientific truth; but the facts and analogies which strongly favour this view are at any rate both numerous and striking. Nor is it likely that their weight will be diminished by the logical procedure of a controversialist who, after contending that the fiery origin of the earth is "unsupported by any reliable evidence," finds it necessary to admit that "the earth was not consolidated without the agency of fire," in order to account for certain "marks of vitrification" with which the Almighty arbitrarily impressed his handiwork, either, we presume, for variety's sake, or with a view to preparing for the sceptics and philosophers of these latter days a "strong delusion so that they should believe a lie."

We are next told that "the earth, then, was covered with water and darkness, and therefore must, at this period, have been perfectly unserviceable and barren; neither organic nor inorganic life could possibly exist." Now, although it is well known that so high an organisation as that of the fish is often found where rays of light never penetrate; yet it is very improbable that life existed before light, but not for the reasons assigned by J. C. H., who affirms that the sun is not the original source of the light we enjoy, but only perpetuates what was called into existence by the divine fiat prior to the creation of that luminary. He further affirms that vegetables are older than the stars, and after recounting and contending for the scientific validity of the successive acts of creation, as narrated in Genesis, coolly asks:

"What is there incredible in all this? Is it less credible than the monstrous inventions of the human imagination on this great subject? What ground is there for the "indefinite-period" theory, and the interpolation of ages of ages, assumed by some? We have seen included (as in a circle) the beginning and completion of the creation of God, the evolution of the matter of the earth, the firmament with its multitudinous clusters of planetary phenomena, and all tilings with which the earth was replenished and filled. All this was accomplished in six natural days, as declared in Genesis, and in the Decalogue."

What is there incredible in all this? As in the elements of mathematics, some things are so evident that they cannot be proved, so it is that logicians who are accustomed to dispute upon a reasonable basis find their ground cut from under them by those who admit nothing, and who, when pressed to their own first principles, solve all difficulties by assuming miraculous agency. What answer can be made to anyone who feels bound to recognise in Nature the operation of constant and immutable law, to those who assert that the "reign of law," occasionally interrupted, dates from a certain point, and that before this all was chaos and confusion? Those who think with J. C. H. will not be answered from the scientific stand-point; nor will they see what a consistent adherence to the literal interpretation of a statement like that in the opening chapters of Genesis really involves. For if the statement in question is to be trusted, then is the whole fabric of modern science a dangerous lie; the so-called fanatics who persecuted Galileo were after all in the right; and the apparent triumphs of modern intellectual research are but a snare of the devil to catch the souls of men by gratifying their vanity. Vain and presumptuous, too, are the aims of those who would mitigate the heavy-handed labours of man and the social disabilities of woman, seeing that these were determined and rendered perpetual by the primeval curse.

J. C. H.'s account of the condition of terrestrial affairs prior to the infliction of this "curse" is truly exhilarating:

"The beasts of the field lived together in perfect amity, the fishes of the sea performed their appointed part in undisturbed tranquility, the birds of the air mingled together in peaceful security; the whole animated world, from the largest leviathan to the tiniest minnow, from the shark to the trout, was bound together by the law of peace; and on the sixth day man and woman were created to preside gloriously over all, under the all-seeing, all-approving eye of the Father of the universe. Love and peace reigned alone. If, as has been averred, the animal world began as soon as they were made to slay and devour each other, what a tragic spectacle for the sinless Adam to behold! What a barbarous contradiction to the benevolence that declared all things to be very good! To make God delight in slaughter for the sake of slaughter, is marvellous presumption. The narrative affirms that vegetable and herbivorous productions alone were the allotted food of both men and animals—the vicious propensities that subsequently took possession of them were at this point unknown. To affirm that the peculiar conformation of the teeth, jaws, and claws, &c., of certain animals, and their adaptability for crushing, breaking, and tearing in pieces, is a proof that they were intended to, and did originally ravage and destroy, slay and eat their prey, is singularly illogical. It was the evil principle that was afterwards superadded

that gave scope for violence, and rendered those formidable weapons dangerous and destructive; but it was not long so from the beginning, ere sin, that originated the law of death, had entered the world, and changed the disposition of all flesh."

So that the huge saurians of the lias, though possessing conical teeth like the crocodile of the Ganges or the Nile, lived exclusively, in paradisaical times, upon a mild diet of sea-weed; while the pig of the period peacefully cropped the meadows or employed his formidable tusks in rooting up primeval potatoes. In a word, the claw, the beak, and the crushing jaw, were just as characteristic of the animals during the period of Adam's innocence as they are of existing carnivora; but, then, these instruments were not permitted to exhibit their normal functions, until sin, operating through the disobedience of the first human pair, "changed the disposition of all flesh." What a chimera!

Before Geology determined the true character of the petrified remains of plants and animals, speculation had suggested many curious explanations of their nature and origin. Fossils, especially when in a fragmentary condition, are, as a rule, not readily distinguishable; and such specimens as attracted notice by their resemblance to existing forms were usually regarded, during the infancy of geological science, as mere *lusus naturæ*. We question, however, whether J. C. H.'s prattle on this subject has ever been equalled either for its absurdity or its impudence:

"When God commanded the earth to bring forth abundantly the natural products of creation, what reason have we to imagine the work of creation was confined to the surface of the earth? In the prodigality of God's creative energy, the whole earth, within and without, may have been impregnated with organic phenomena, which, in due time, perished where they were created, even in the strata of the earth itself, in the crevices and vacuous recesses that everywhere interpenetrated the mass of universal matter. . . In like manner, when the mandate of the fifth day went forth, the whole of the animal world would not necessarily be restricted to the surface of the earth; but the inner recesses of nature, under the procreative energy of Omnipotence, might be made to produce monstrous creatures, and creatures of various kinds, which, perishing, and being excluded from the external air, wore preserved from putrefaction, and ultimately petrefied, or were chemically combined with earthy matter, till modern research brought them to the light of day."

Such is J. C. H.'s way of accounting, agreeably with his conception of Creation as recorded in Genesis, for "those gigantic creatures whose fossilised remains have astonished and delighted the *savants* of the present day." His theory is, perhaps, a little in advance of that propounded some time since, by an English journal of strong evangelical leanings, to the effect that Satan, when the Almighty was engaged in manufacturing our earth's crust, surreptitiously inserted, here and there, the fossilised remains in question, shrewdly foreseeing how that in the latter days they might be the means of turning many away from the truth. But let the reader mark what it supposes. It supposes the existence, at the time when our earth was made, of vast subterranean regions where a luxuriant vegetation flourished and tree-ferns attained prodigious dimensions; where rain fell, leaving its imprint on the soft sandy beaches of the seas that filled the depressions of this wonderful cavern; where animal life abounded in all its forms; and where stratified matter was arbitrarily and preternaturally aggregated, instead of regularly and naturally accumulating, through a long course of ages, upon the *surface* of the earth. With regard to the "crevices and vacuous recesses" where monsters, like the ichthyosaurus, were created merely to spend their term of existence and then perish, it is sufficient to remark that they were placed in situations where they could only exist by supernatural agency, and that, having no natural life or volition of their own, they could never have performed such acts as the prehension and deglutition of food. What follows? Simply this—that the undigested bones of small animals which have been found occupying the position of the stomach in some of these extinct carnivora must—climax of absurdity!—have been created *in situ*!

So confident is J. C. H. that Science will eventually succumb to Revelation, that he would have us prepare ourselves for the overthrow, at any moment, of the apparently well-established but antisciptural, and therefore untenable, doctrines of the Astronomer and the Geologist. He asserts that the alleged motion of the earth is beginning to be seriously questioned (can any of our readers inform us by whom?)—the science of the Bible being opposed to it, not only in Genesis, but in the book of Joshua, and in the Psalms. And as for Geology:

"In vain docs she exercise her ingenuity to impose on mankind a mere fiction of the brain; in vain does she pretend to see evidence of super-immense, pre-adamite antiquity in the petrified organisms of a by-gone age. What evidence does she produce in support of such fallacious statements? Something which she metaphorically entitles the stone-book, that can neither see, nor hear, nor speak. For this dumb prodigy we are called upon to put away Moses and his declarations, which commend themselves to the reason and understanding of all men. The existence of the fossil remains has not been satisfactorily accounted for, the rocks are silent, the geological hammer can wake no intelligible response, the fossils are dumb, and the Bible gives no encouragement to the fanaticism of imaginative philosophy."

Perhaps not; any more than it does to the fanaticism of a brazen-faced and almost atheistic effrontery which, in dealing with a purely scientific matter, would substitute "Moses and his declarations" for the living

oracles of God's truth as inscribed, in glowing and ineffaceable characters, on all that we see around, above, and beneath us. For ourselves, we cling to Nature, "dumb prodigy" that she is, and to her "stone-book that can neither see, nor hear, nor speak," as a thousand times more eloquent and trustworthy than the so-called revelation contained in the "paper-book" which robs the mass of Protestants of their reason, as well as of their living reverence for the living God. Idolatry in any shape is bad; but of all forms of idolatry, surely none are so degrading and contemptible as that which, like the Bible-worship of modern Christendom, provokingly attempts to put out the eyes of men under the pretence of enabling them to see. Ignotus.

Right Feelings and Right Actions.

THE Pharisees taught, as almost all Christian churches now teach, the entire and literal inspiration of the Scriptures; and they required that these Scriptures should be interpreted in accordance with the traditions of the fathers of their church, in the same way that every church now requires them to be interpreted in accordance with its own formalities, the embodiment of its traditions. This was the pretention against which Jesus contended. He opposed the principle of closing the Scriptures against the free and unfettered investigation of every inquirer, and of making them the exclusive source and final limit of truth. With him the Kingdom of Heaven was a life, not a doctrine. He never once refers to the importance of right belief; but he dwells exclusively upon the value of right feelings prompting to right actions, and he makes the actions the test and proof of the feelings. Against these lessons the Pharisees protested during his lifetime, and almost the whole Christian church has protested since his death; and in both instances successfully. The entire history of each one of the numerous bodies into which the universal church is divided, is a practical illustration of the lesson, that among Christians the life is nothing in comparison with the creed, and that the minutest doctrinal differences may outweigh a hundred common virtues. Christianity has triumphed, but it has been by adopting from the adversaries of Jesus the principles that he denounced, and the spirit that condemned him to the cross. Sacrifice in the place of obedience, sacramental efficacy in the place of good works, orthodoxy of creed as the test-of love to God and an intolerant zeal for conversion as the practical manifestation of love to man: such has been Christianity as exemplified in the history of the Church. And no one would more emphatically protest against its doctrines and institutions, its fantastic terms of admission and its capricious exclusions, than would Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet of Galilee.—*The Jesus of History*.

The Present Crisis of Faith.

EVERY age is, perhaps, vain enough to fancy its own crisis the most momentous; and its pretensions to originality may always be plausibly rebuked by citing from the past some apparent parallels to its speculations. To get rid of a troublesome discoverer or vigorous thinker there is no readier way—and it has the advantage of being at once cheap and stinging—than to dismiss his new ideas as stale fallacies dug up again out of the discarded rubbish of the past. This is the buffet which lazy common-place delights to inflict on every man who threatens to leave a mark upon his age. Lessing and Schlier-macher were only Spinoza in disguise—Coleridge was but Schelling done into English. In Maurice we have the Cambridge Platonists again. Were not Chillingworth forgotten, Newman and the Tractarians could never show their face. What do Strauss, and what does the Tübingen school offer but minor varieties of the old "exploded rationalism?" If Germany has recovered from Eichhorn and Gesenius, England will recover from Colenso. And if we have forgotten the Deists of the last century, what is to keep in memory the Freethinkers and Latitudinarians of this? This mode of dealing with the phenomena of our time may satisfy a theologian whose critical discernment just enables him to divide mankind into two classes, "Infidels" and "Christians," and who binds up all literature under these two labels, as he fuses all the books of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures into one "Bible." But how weak and false it is can be no secret to anyone who can really compare the present with the past; and is dimly felt, if not confessed, in the evident alarm of all Churches, and the religious supense of intellectual and scholarly men everywhere. Whoever can look beneath the surface must be aware that the present crisis of faith is far deeper and wider than any since the Reformation, perhaps we might say, since the apostolic age; deeper, as reaching more fundamental problems; wider, as affecting the inner life of the whole civilised world. We will not be deceived by the loud voices of unyielding dogmatism, and the hard features of professional advocacy; but will mark the multiplying signs of spiritual perplexity, and overhear the running whisper of prayer for "more light."—*James Martineau*.

Deference to Public Opinion.

It is not by self-respect and self-reliance that men get the reputation of being wise and prudent; but by subordination, by a cringing deference to public opinion; not by giving weight to superior personal qualities of other men, but to superior wealth, station, or great renown. When some years ago a young minister said some words that rung in the churches, the criticism made on him was, that he was not thirty years old. It is common for young men to postpone becoming true to their convictions until rich and well known. That is to put it off for ever. Suppose Paul had waited until he was rich, or until he was a great and famous Rabbi, before he told men that Christianity alone was the law of the spirit of life,—how long had he waited, and what had he done? Suppose Jesus, when about thirty, had said, "It will never do for a young man like me to respect my soul now; I must wait till I am old. Did not Moses wait till he was fourscore before he said a word to his countrymen about leaving Egypt." What would have become of him? Why, the Spirit of God that irradiated his vast soul would have gone off and perched itself on the mouth of some babe or suckling, who would have welcomed the great revelation, and spread it abroad like the genial sun. Do you think that Simon Peter and John and James and Joseph would have been more likely to accept Christianity, if they had been rich and famous and old men? As well might the young camel have waited till he was old and fat and stiff, in hopes to go the easier through the needle's eye.—*Theodore Parker.*

Moral Causes and their Effects.

THE intuition of the moral sentiment is an insight of the perfection of the laws of the soul. These laws execute themselves. They are out of time, out of space, and not subject to circumstance. Thus; in the soul of man there is a justice whose retributions are instant and entire. He who does a good deed, is instantly ennobled. He who does a mean deed, is by the action itself contracted. He who puts off impurity, thereby puts on purity. If a man is at heart just, then in so far is he God; the safety of God, the immortality of God, the majesty of God, do enter into that man with justice. If a man dissemble, deceive, he deceives himself, and goes out of acquaintance with his own being. A man in the view of absolute goodness, adores, with total humanity. Every step so downward, is a step upward. The man who renounces himself, comes to himself.

See how this rapid intrinsic energy worketh everywhere, righting wrongs, correcting appearances, and bringing up facts to a harmony with thoughts. Its operation in life, though slow to the senses, is, at last, as sure as in the soul. By it, a man is made the Providence to himself, dispensing good to his goodness, and evil to his sin. Character is always known. Thefts never enrich; alms never impoverish; murder will speak out of stone walls. The least admixture of a lie—for example, the taint of vanity, any attempt to make a good impression, a favourable appearance—will instantly vitiate the effect. But speak the truth, and all nature and all spirits help you with unexpected furtherance. Speak the truth, and all things alive or brute are vouchers, and the very roots of the grass underground there, do seem to stir and move to bear you witness. See again the perfection of the Law as it applies itself to the affections, and becomes the law of society. As we are, so we associate. The good, by affinity, seek the good; the vile, by affinity, the vile. Thus of their own volition, souls proceed into heaven, into hell.—*Emerson.*

Correspondence.

The Unitarian Position.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Since your editorial notices inform readers that the discussion of questions relating to free religious inquiry is admitted into your paper, I, as a seeker for "more light," am induced to address you for the purpose of ascertaining what are held to be "cardinal points" in that rational phase of religion known as Unitarian, which, as a sceptic in relation to the self-styled orthodox creeds, I should like to see logically stated for the edification of men who, like myself, are accused of infidelity. I know that in my position there are considerable numbers of men who desire to aid in social work such as can best be effectively taken in hand by a community disciplined under chosen and trained leaders, and administered analagously to a church system; but these independent

thinkers, having once broken loose from the mental incubus of superstitious belief, are unable to approach with a feeling of consistency any communion where assent would be required to be given to a belief that at best might be metaphysical beyond possible verification, and although possibly true, might *not* be true, and therefore worse than useless to take for granted as a safe foundation for a *living form* of religion.

A time there was when I attended church services to seek therein the "appointed means of grace," but I ceased so to do when self-contradiction became apparent in ecclesiastical teaching, after subversion of that peculiar interpretation which I had been carefully trained to give to the Bible in order to impart what has been termed a "safe" meaning to its doctrine. A man in my position dreads nothing so much as a return to the land of metaphysical mists and shadows which erudition has discovered in the Greek Scriptures; but what must I confess relative to my altered reading of the general scope of the Hebrew Testament? Why, that these very writings which formerly were held out to me as leading up to, or as inferring the dogma of the soul's immortality, have at length appeared not only not to infer or assume any such doctrine, but positively to lean in the mass altogether the other way. Will any of your readers then indicate upon what precise grounds Unitarian theism teaches a religion that inculcates rationally and not dogmatically the hope of life beyond the grave? I have heard the dogmatist argue that "If man is not immortal where would he the good of any God at all;" and, on the other hand, a so-called rationalist has based his steadfast conviction in life hereafter upon what he assured me was *instinctive conviction*, which to my apprehension seems at best but analogous to the symbols x or y of some unsolved problem.

"The abstract arguments for the immortality of the soul," observes F. W. Newman, in his *Phases of Faith*, "had always appeared to me vain trifling, and I was deeply convinced that nothing could *assure* us of a future state but a divine communication." This is precisely my present intellectual position, and it is perplexing to me to find the very same believers by instinctive conviction in human immortality denying or explaining away those special instances of resurrection of the dead which are recorded as material facts in both Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Is it not but too plain that the special instances are much too material for mere Platonic believers, who do not always see that *particular* instances may be negative to any loosely held notion of a general and indiscriminate resurrection. I do not, and I dare not, say that higher conditions of existence are not the destiny of humanity, or that this planet may not be the abode of beings as much superior to its present inhabitants as they, in their turn, are higher on the infinite scale of organised life than the quadrumana; but I can emphatically assert that manifestation of higher life has been marked by such extremely rare instances as to constitute the miraculous, which is therefore considered supernatural. The Rev. T. Binney, in his essay, *How to make the best of both worlds*, recommends those who look for no life beyond the grave to make the most of *one*, upon the ground that they have all the better reason for turning to good account the life they can realise; and I have heard an avowed atheist commenting upon this secular view, argue that the very best preparation for a world to come (should there be one) is to get duty effectively done here whilst daylight lasts to do it in. Now, while I really believe that the human races are progressing towards new and regenerated conditions of existence, I yet maintain that the doctrine of personal salvation, so far from being the alpha and omega of living religion and morality, may readily become actively antagonistic to it, so that in the garb of an apparent messenger of light there may be, sugared over, the devil himself, drawing men away from, and not towards, that divine deed of redemption, which, as the late Baron Bunsen said, was intended to set man free from the rule of selfishness in his lower animal nature.

A halo of sanctity once for me surrounded orthodox church doctrines, and continued so long as I fancied truth was in the assertion that they led to something nobler than mere personal safety; but, alas! the charm slowly vanished as the years rolled on, and the converse of sacerdotal propositions became all too apparent to be overridden by plausible arguments to explain inconsistencies.

Religion, I hear it said, is nothing unless based upon dogma, the assumption apparently being that the acceptance of a certain set of theological propositions is essential to salvation. Was it, then, dogma or rational belief in Jesus of Nazareth to teach that a man who *held fast* to his life should lose it, but if he *surrendered* it then he should eventually recover it? What also led Paul of Tarsus to say—"If by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead? *Might* attain this? Why the man was no Sadducee, and as a Pharisee could he ever have doubted it? Yet he does express a doubt, and evidently did so while hopeful of attaining to what he believed was quite possible. But if not, would it lead to the inference that the loss of life hereafter is opposed to human conception of goodness in Deity? Why should not an ethical man obey what is called the law of universal being in the surrender of the one in itself for the lives of the infinitely many, and in following this to accept the consequences of such conduct as they come, regardless of sugar-plums for good boys, or a rod-in-pickle for naughty ones? Still, if religion must transcend ethics, why should it not embrace science; and why am I to be solemnly warned that the Bible was never designed to teach science, but only to lead us into the paths of holiness. It is not farfetched, surely, to surmise that this non-scientific view is entertained because its upholders know nothing of what science once was or may hereafter disclose, while the "path of holiness"

hypothesis being vague and indefinite, is a broad and easy road to adhere to.

There are things mentioned in the Bible which I must accept as conveying objective truths, for I cannot slur them over as being the subjective impressions of the writers, such as has been commonly accepted as valid explanation of apparently incongruous narratives since the days when the *Tractatus Theologico Politicus* of Spinoza began to be more generally read by continental neologians. I would not contend that allegorical or hieroglyphic pictures find no place in the Bible, but I am persuaded that there are real scientific truths told in the only way that the non-scientific Hebrew language would admit of expressing them, and I decline to accept for the contrary of knowledge any mere absence of it.

I have read the published sermons and essays of Dr. Channing and of the Rev. J. Martineau, and, readily yielding my assent to most of what they say, can now understand their protest against the tendency to petrification of mind inherent in the huge bulk of sacerdotal erudition; but when they come to lay much stress upon what they make a fundamental moral basis in "sin consciousness," then I dissent, bearing as I do in mind Paul's terrible cry, "Wretched man that I am, who shall rescue me from this body of death!" which I conclude from the context to have meant his self-consciousness in *personal* sin. I do not know that Unitarian theism in general makes so strong a point of this conviction of sin, but I have certainly found it strongly urged to repulsion of my logical sense in both the standard divines I have alluded to. When I turn to the late Rev. Theodore Parker, I have only to express regret that this penetrative mind did not enter the world a quarter of a century later than it did; for were he alive now, I am sure he would have found some way on which to travel for the purpose of stretching forth a hand in intellectual sympathy with the struggling mass of theological sceptics who are hurrying on they hardly know where from the metaphysical phantoms they leave behind.

Surely the time is come for religious regeneration. Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, representing the Hindoo religious reformers, arrives in England and is welcomed by its citizens as a man of promise, but others sneer at this Brahmo Somaj leader because he preached in Unitarian churches, and stigmatise his faith as mongrel Christianity! I am not yet a Unitarian by profession whatever I may eventually become, but I protest against this exhibition of the *odium theologicum* as insulting to the English public. Baboo Sen pointed to the sectarian divisions, the inconsistent lives of professing believers as being a bar to the Christianisation of India, and there can be little doubt that in so doing he touched a raw and sore place in John Bull's hide. To make moral selfishness a basis for Christianity is to manufacture the proverbial rope of sand, and even criminals working the treadmill lose all energy when they find they are grinding away to no purpose.

W. B.

Biblical Inspiration and Infallibility.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Since I wrote, in a former number of your periodical, on this subject, the popular belief in the infallibility of the authorised version of the Bible has received a severe shock; a Convocation of Bishops of the Archbishopric of Canterbury having decided to appoint a Committee (to include, it appears, some eminent Nonconformists) to revise it.

It is not very easy to ascertain the origin of the idea of the infallibility of the English version. Even if we conceded the question in favour of the original writings (which, as I have before said, are not in existence, that learned pundit, Dr. Wazir Beg, to the contrary, notwithstanding), we should require that all the transcribers and translators should be equally inspired; or, as the author of *The Pilgrim and the Shrine* puts it, tersely and irrefutably, "an infallible revelation requires an infallible interpreter, and both are useless without an infallible understanding to comprehend the interpretation." But neither the transcribers nor the translators claim anything of the kind, and any such claim on the part of any one else would be met with contempt and derision.

The translators of the present English version, in their grotesquely fulsome dedication to that "wisest fool in Christendom," the "Most High and Mighty Prince, James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc.," only say this, "For when your Highness had once out of deep judgment apprehended how convenient it was, that out of the Original Sacred Tongues" (not *writings*, mark), "*together with comparing of the labours, both in our own and other (sic) Foreign Languages, of many worthy men who went before us*, there should be *one more* exact Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue." There is no claim to infallibility here.

It would appear, therefore, that the origin of the popular belief lay in mistaking the meaning of the words, "the original sacred tongues."

Lord Shaftesbury, who makes such lamentation over the proposed revision, as likely to produce *two* Bibles, one for the Church of England and another for the dissenters, may calm his fears on this point by calling to mind the fact that there are already in existence many different and differing versions of the Bible or of some of

its parts. And, then, what about the more modern translations into heathen languages? These tongues, as must be known, are necessarily very imperfect, being limited in their range of expression by the limited knowledge of the world and its products possessed by these peoples. A very large proportion of the Book therefore can only be conveyed to the limited intellect of the savage by the roundabout process of periphrasis; and who will undertake to assert, with regard to matters of which the savage cannot possibly have had any previous knowledge, that this mode of interpretation will convey the precise ideas of the original writer? And if not, what becomes of the infallibility?—what of the savage's soul?

Well, now, suppose the revision begun. How far will the revisers go? Where will they stop? The Bishop of Gloucester and others have already condemned the stock text of the orthodox respecting the *three heavenly witnesses*, the mainstay of the dogma of the Trinity. How much farther are they prepared to go? If they are honest, the result will be a *Unitarian Bible*. Mr. Wilson, in his *Concessions of Trinitarians*, has clearly shown that *every* alteration in the text of Scripture, according to Unitarian criticism, had been conceded by eminent Trinitarian critics, including Archbishop Whately, Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Pye Smith.

But however the revision may be conducted, one thing is clear, the dogma of Biblical Inspiration and Infallibility has received its death-blow.

It would occupy too much of your space to dilate longer on this theme, or to speculate upon what is to be the view taken of the Bible after this consummation. I may take up this latter subject on some future occasion. Iota.

Tu Romano Cave-to.

To the Editor.

SIR,—The Rev. Cave Brown Cave, now on his way out from England, has been appointed to succeed the Rev. W. B. Clarke, at St. Thomas's, North Shore; the congregation having no more to do with the appointment than that very apocryphal personage known to all men as the man in the moon. It is not intended, however, to intimate that the appointment is either informal, illegal, or even injudicious; for its legality is unquestionable, and it is equally certain that the Bishop is quite alive to the expediency of appointing, as successor to the former distinguished incumbent, some one whose powers should not be below mediocrity; and Mr. Cave, we believe, has the reputation of an efficient preacher and a thoroughly good man. But it would only be consistent with the practice of primitive Christianity and with common sense, to allow the congregation to appoint their own minister; and as the powers that be have recently referred the clergy to their congregations for their stipends, this principle of congregational election will, sooner or later, assert itself universally and with undeniable emphasis. The hearers at St. Thomas's, consisting of judges, barristers, heads of departments, engineers, lawyers and merchants, are quite as competent to deal with a question of this sort as they are to pay for a clergyman; and the first time that a ritualist, or a muff, or any one not to their taste, gets possession of their pulpit, he will have to vacate at the peril of his stipend, on the principle that those who pay the piper have an undoubted right to decide as to what sort of music is to be discoursed.

Your readers are aware that the Wesleyan body is governed by a hierarchy of one hundred ministers, styled the Conference, and they happen to be amongst the richest of all rich corporations—their fixed property, at the present moment, being estimated at millions. This is brought about thus: Whenever a new chapel is projected, trustees are appointed, who collect funds, and have the privilege of making themselves liable to the builders—the Conference, as a ride, invariably steering clear of all brick and mortar, and every other liability whatever. But as soon as the chapel is out of debt it is transferred to Conference, and hence their nice little estate.

Shortly after the death, some forty years ago, of Dr. Adam Clarke, a, or rather the, great gun of the Wesleyans, a promising young fellow was appointed by Conference to preach to a congregation in a Yorkshire circuit; but he was soon at loggerheads with the Conference. Dr. Clarke had always maintained that the term "eternal Son," applied to Jesus Christ, was "eternal nonsense," nothing less indeed than a contradiction in terms; and our young parson, thinking as Dr. Clarke had thought, took the liberty to say as Dr. Clarke had said. The Conference heard of it and suspended the preacher at once. A little heresy might be tolerated in Dr. Clarke; but our young friend, who was a nobody, and obviously on the high road to Unitarianism, was to be handled somewhat differently. But the congregation was just as prompt as the Conference. The Conference suspended the parson, but the congregation suspended the Conference, and intimated that Mr. B. would continue to preach for them, *coute qui coute*, and if Conference declined to provide the stipend, no matter, they would relieve Conference in that particular also. Heresy was bad enough, but rebellion was worse, and so Conference succumbed.

And now comes the cream of the joke. The chapel in question had just been freed of debt, and the trustees

had even moved in the matter of surrendering the estate to Conference, when all at once they proved so tardy in carrying out the arrangement that Conference had to remind them of it. The trustees then intimated that recent events had taught the people that the best way to secure the right-of-way to their own pulpit was to retain the keys of the front door of their own chapel. The trustees, therefore, would continue to retain the fee simple of the estate for the benefit of the congregation; and there the chapel stands to this day a monument of good sense, pluck, and Christian independence.

Ballot Box.

Editorial Notices.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—J.L.—W.B.P.—received.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 420 George Street, Sydney, Sept. 5, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. I., No. 9. October 3, 1870.

Notes.

ANOTHER testimony has been added to the essential and characteristic weakness of Protestantism, by the parliamentary and newspaper discussion that has recently taken place in Sydney on the question as to whether religion permits under any circumstances the severance of the marriage bond. The Roman Catholic, whose opinions on the subject are merely the echo of the decisions of his Church, affirms, naturally and consistently enough, that it does not. But the orthodox Protestant, who has neither the sacramental theory of marriage to fall back upon, nor the authority of his individual reason and conscience, but must go, with the Rev. Colin M'Culloch, to the Bible as "the only rule of faith and the sole judge of controversies," is precluded, by the conflicting character of the biblical testimony on the subject of divorce, from consistently arriving at any conclusion at all. We know that the crude and, in many respects, barbarous legislation of Moses allowed a man to "put away his wife" on absurdly insufficient grounds; and we know also that the pure-hearted Jesus, shocked at the usage of his countrymen in this matter, affirmed that nothing would justify a man in putting away his wife but the one ground of her faithlessness. This we hold to be the true view of the divorce question so far as the woman is concerned; but those who accept the Bible as an absolute and unerring standard of truth for the settlement of all controversies, have, in addition to the opposition between the law of Moses and the law of Christ, other and graver difficulties to get over, and among them the fact that the Bible can be quoted (Cor. vii. 1, 7, 8) in disapproval of marriage itself, and (Num. xxxi. 18) in approval of adultery of the most revolting kind. Nothing can, in our opinion, be more absurd or futile than the popular Christian practice of consulting the sentiments and usages of a bygone age for light and guidance on moral and social questions with which, as springing from the exigencies of an existing civilisation, the thought and sagacity of the time are alone competent to deal. What, then, with regard to the question of divorce, are the facts that arrest our attention? Do we not find that in a very large per-centage of the marriages that take place, all considerations of personal fitness and mutual affection are persistently ignored in order to make room for the play of aims and motives which degrade what should be the most sacred and solemn act of life, to the level of an ordinary business speculation or something worse? Is it not a fact that crowds of girls are at the proper age transferred by their parents to the marriage market, where any man, any loafing scoundrel even, providing he move in the right circle and be of comely exterior, is at liberty to choose from the wares on sale? And can we wonder that marriages thus contracted should so frequently breed domestic misery and estrangement, and faithlessness to

the marriage vow? We speak of a state of things which undeniably prevails, and which clearly necessitates a Divorce Court as a partial remedy for the evils engendered by it. New South Wales, we fear, is not, morally speaking, so much in advance of the old country, as to be able, advantageously, to dispense with such a Court, and although the Upper House may, as it probably will, see fit to reject Mr. Buchanan's Bill in its present form, we are persuaded that a wisely-framed divorce law—such as the Legislature will at no distant date find it necessary to pass—would, if judiciously administered, be conducive to the welfare of the community.

WITH regard to the now celebrated thirteenth clause of Mr. Buchanan's Matrimonial Causes Bill, it does appear to us, after all that has been said in favour of and against it, to involve a step in legislation, the advisability of which may be questioned on both moral and social grounds. The moral culpability of the married adulterer or adulteress is, of course, admitted; but if, in estimating criminal acts, we are to take into consideration the circumstances which tend to their commission, and the results to which they lead, there can, we think, be little doubt that faithlessness on the part of a wife towards her husband is a much greater offence than faithlessness on the part of a husband towards his wife. There is great force, as it seems to us, in the statement by an able contributor to the *Herald* on this subject, that our social system, which (especially during temporary separations) surrounds the man with temptations, and the woman with safeguards, makes the offence of adultery very different in their respective cases. In view, therefore, of the difference in the physical constitution of the sexes, of the greater demoralising effect of an adulteress in the family or the community than an adulterer, and of the fact that a woman, when she does fall, falls lower than a man, in that her descent is from a higher moral elevation, it is difficult to understand the approval which has been extended to a proposed enactment which, if passed into law, would, we are persuaded, do no good, and, possibly, a deal of harm. It is contended that a woman should, as a matter of justice, be empowered to disconnect herself, if she so please, from her faithless husband. Yet we are told in the same breath, that women do not wish to be thus empowered, and that were they so, not one in a thousand would seek relief from the measure which would thus be rendered practically inoperative. Does not this poor apology for the thirteenth clause, moreover, imply that a general acting upon it on the part of women might, as in our opinion it certainly would, be fraught with evil results both to the family circle and society at large? Circumstances there, of course, are under which the law—that of England, for example—should operate to the release of an ill-used and dishonoured woman from the man who has so falsely sworn to love and protect her; but any Legislature, should hesitate, we think, before rendering divorce *a vinculo* obtainable by a wife on the ground of a marital act which, according to Jesus, involves no greater responsibility than an impure desire. For if, as he teaches, to look upon a woman to lust after her is to commit adultery with her in the heart, how many of us who are ranked as models of social propriety would turn out, when tested by this severe standard, to be whited sepulchres full of something worse than dead men's bones!

MR. BUCHANAN, in replying to the Rev. T. O'Reilly's biblical anti-divorce argument, expressed his astonishment that a divine of the reverend gentleman's standing, should exhibit so lamentable an ignorance of the obvious drift of certain texts adduced by him into the controversy. For ourselves, we are not astonished at it in the least. The glibness in quoting Scripture for which some preachers—the Rev. Thomas O'Reilly, for example—are so famous, is easily mistaken by the shallow-minded for a real acquaintance with the biblical writings; but all discerning persons see in it nothing more nor less than a trick which the preacher, when at his wits' end for something to say, is in the habit of resorting to with a view to the occupation, or, in plain words, to the wasting of time. The voice of the Rev. Thomas O'Reilly is by no means unfamiliar to our ears, and we should be concealing truth did we not say that his superficiality, as an interpreter of the Bible, is truly alarming. At this, all things considered, we cannot, as we have said, feel astonished; but we are astonished and amused too, at the reverend gentleman putting himself forward, in his controversy with Mr. Buchanan, as the friend and champion of the Protestant working man. That his teachings, and views of life and duty, are acceptable to an artisan here and there, we do not question; but that the Protestant working men of Sydney, taken as a class, would regard the amicable advances of a clergyman who, if he could, would deprive them of their weekly day of rest and recreative enjoyment, with other than feelings of distrust, we take the liberty of doubting. To read the newspaper or an instructive book on Sunday, or to invigorate the mind and limbs by a walk in the woods instead of going to church, is a sin, accordingly to Mr. O'Reilly, of no small magnitude. But the Protestant working man, accepting the anti-sabbatarian teaching of Jesus in preference to the irrational sabbatarianism of Mr. O'Reilly, does not think so, and will, therefore, hesitate, we think, before enlisting himself under the banner of a would-be champion, whose views, if carried into effect, would convert the working man's one day out of seven from a blessing to a curse.

IT is with no common satisfaction that we chronicle the fact that Dr. Steel, the respected minister of St. Stephen's Church, has announced himself favourable to a revision of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. He admitted, in his recent lecture on this subject, that the Bible contains at least 1,500 inaccuracies—we suspect the number will be found nearer 15,000—of one sort and another, and that these, in justice both to the ordinary

reader and the Revealed Word itself, should be expunged from our English version. In making these admissions, however, Dr. Steel earnestly deprecates a too ruthless manipulation of the Sacred Ark which has enshrined for centuries, and enshrines even now, the religious hopes and aspirations of Christendom. He is prepared for a "loving" revision of the text as it stands, by a comparison of it with such of the originals as are accessible to us, but not, it seems, for a new and searching translation of the originals themselves. The precise drift of this distinction it is, perhaps, not easy to see. If Dr. Steel, in drawing it, would plead for the retention of that charming Anglo-Saxon simplicity of language to which the authorised version is indebted for no small part of its hold upon the hearts of Englishmen, we cordially agree with him. We are quite sure that a translation of the Bible interspersed with long words of Greek and Latin derivation at the cost of the terse Saxonisms which place it within reach of the humblest intellects would secure the approval of no sect or party, and it is not likely, therefore, that any company of scholars appointed for the purpose, would take the responsibility of producing such a translation. But if Dr. Steel, in offering his plea for biblical revision, would limit the revisers to the rectification of a specified number (1,500) of inaccuracies, keeping out of sight the authorship and authenticity of the several books, the absurd and misleading doctrinal glosses contained in the chapter-headings, and the many passages in the Old Testament that are an offence to morality, we at once join issue with him, and say that any such revision would be scarcely worth the labour bestowed upon it. Those who, like Dr. Steel, are prepared to go "thus far and no farther," must not be surprised if they encounter inquirers who, in view of their advances, are strongly impressed with the *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. It is not an *amended*, Bible that thoughtful men are now-a-days asking for, but a Bible that shall be fairly and honourably adjusted to the religious thought of the age, and which the crucible of modern independent scholarship will soon be called upon to furnish. In offering our comments on Dr. Steel's lecture we take the opportunity of expressing our high admiration for him as a thorough Christian gentleman, whose usefulness in Sydney is only equalled by the modesty which invariably characterises his actions, and whose reluctance to hurt the feelings of the most sensitive unbeliever is so unlike the savage illiberality of some ministers of his own Church in Sydney that we could name. Some time, we suspect, will elapse before another Presbyterian minister announces himself in favour of biblical revision, and a much longer time before one will be found quoting with approval—as did Dr. Steel the other night—from the works of so dreadful a heretic as the late Theodore Parker.

THAT the foolish and, as it turns out, unfounded charges of the *Protestant Standard* against the management of the Sydney Infirmary should have involved a sub-committee of the directors of that institution in "days of searching and anxious inquiry," and the examination of more than thirty witnesses—should in fact, have raised so respectable a "storm in a tea-pot"—will doubtless inspire our unscrupulous contemporary with a sense of his powers as a literary dirt-flinger, and incite him to fresh achievements in the same line. As this precious specimen of a newspaper has no other purpose to serve, no other *raison d'être*, than the wholesale defamation of the religion of Roman Catholics—a religion at least as respectable as the Scotch Calvinism which Mr. Buckle justly speaks of as the most frightful superstition that has ever cursed our earth—and, with this object in view, never scruples to trace iniquity or mismanagement, wheresoever found, to Romish agency; it does surprise us that the Infirmary Committee should have so far parted with their wits as to attach the slightest importance to the *Standard's* charges against the institution under their control. Miss Osburn, though a professed Protestant, must, it seems, be a Romanist in her heart, because, forsooth, in her selection of assistants, she refuses to join the proprietors and abettors of the *Standard* in their venomous crusade against a class of religionists who, if some Protestants had their way, would be hounded from society as unworthy to earn an honest penny, and because, to the horror of these bibliolaters, she ordered certain shattered and vermin-abounding bibles to be burnt! Could bigotry and superstition go further? But putting religion out of sight, it may be worth the Committee's while to consider whether the efficiency of the Sydney Infirmary, from an undue attention on the part of its nursing staff to unimportant matters of detail, is not being damaged. We think—and we are not alone in our opinion—that it is.

WE can believe that Miss Osburn's charge of "rebellion" against "Sister Annie," in that she refused, or consented only under protest, to worship God in accordance with hospital regulations, was just the sort of proceeding to put that prim and prudent aspirant to apostolic honours, the Rev. John Graham, who, as spiritual adviser to the under nurse, essayed to extricate her from the difficulty, in a bit of a fix. Unencumbered by the grave responsibilities pertaining to the head of a church stipending its minister at the rate of £ 1,000 per annum, any ordinary person would, if consulted on the matter, have seen, we think, at a glance, that Miss Osburn's conduct towards Miss Miller involved the assumption of an authority which, whether recognised by the Infirmary Committee or not, is clearly false in principle. The head of a nursing establishment, call herself by what high-sounding title she may, has no moral right to compel or to expect the members of her staff to attend divine service at all—still less any particular form of divine service; and Mr. Graham's action in the matter should, therefore, have been prompt and uncompromising. Believing, however, as he does, in the "beatitude of peace-making," and recognising, as he does, "the authority of a Book which declares that a meek and quiet

spirit is in the sight of God of great price," the exemplary pastor of Pitt Street Church must needs counsel his client to exhibit her Christian meekness in submitting to an insolent infringement of her personal rights, at least until it might be convenient to him "to take the mind of the Board" on the subject. The "beatitude of peace-making" is fine enough in its way; but the "beatitude" of a clear and untroubled conscience, and, if needs be, of being "persecuted for righteousness' sake," though emanating from the same source, is clearly an obstacle in the path of that "meek and quiet" disciple of Jesus—John Graham, the peace-maker! How pleasant, too, to know that we have a mind among us which, modestly shrinking from the noise and glare of the thunder and lightening, can discern, "grandeur as well as beneficence in the noiseless action of sunshine, dew, gravitation" and—*soft soap!*

THE seizure of an unlicensed still on the premises of a reputedly respectable mercantile firm would scarcely call for comment in this journal but that rumour will have it that the establishment of Messrs. Thame and Walker is by no means the only one in Sydney where illicit distillation and other such dishonourable trade practices have been carried on. We do not question—we on the contrary rejoice to believe—that there are tradesmen and merchants among us, whose business transactions are as free from trickery, as their consciences are from reproach, and who, sooner than stoop to acts unworthy of their manhood, would calmly encounter the most depressing contingencies of the mercantile calling, including poverty itself. The fact, however, is at least as unquestionable that Sydney, like other cities, abounds with men in whom the sense of honour has been extinguished by the lust of gain, and for whom, accordingly, no transaction can be too nefarious, providing it turn in money. No doubt these knaves have their view of the ends of human existence, and aim to compass them with a zeal and assiduity which, if turned upon legitimate undertakings, would do them boundless credit; but, alas! that their soul-destroying thirst for lucre should blind them to the fact that life without honour is only so much infamy, as its fraudulent successes are only so much irreparable loss. Disheartening, too, is it to reflect that the tricksters we speak of are but too often of the class who, for the accomplishment of their ends, make great pretensions to piety, and scandalise religion by using it as a cloak for their disreputable practices. These remarks are not aimed specially at Messrs. Thame and Walker, who are probably neither better nor worse than many Sydney tradesmen whose frailties have escaped ventilation at the Police Court. We do think, however, that the leading member of the firm, who has the reputation of being a smart business man, should have suppressed his whining regret at having fallen into a temptation which he probably never made an effort to resist. He might, too, while he was about it, have expressed regret at having led others into temptation—the still-worker, for example, by a lure of £5 per week; and who, for want of the bail which his employers had no difficulty in procuring for themselves, is now, shabbily enough, recruiting his spirits in the Darlinghurst limbo.

BUT there are illicit *literary* stills in operation, it seems, as well as those for the production of new rum. For, as we learn from a lengthy correspondence in the *Dunedin Evening Star*, the Rev. Robert Scrimgeour, Presbyterian Minister of that city, has been detected in the publication of a long passage from Professor Ferrier's "Institutes of Metaphysics" as his own. Mr. Scrimgeour's self-exculpatory explanation is, that in sending his communication to press he forgot to insert the inverted commas. we agree, however, with Mr. Robert Stout, the reverend gentleman's chief antagonist, that his defence, all the circumstances of the case being taken into consideration, is at least open to suspicion; and that it would have looked much better, and have been deemed more satisfactory by his friends, had it taken the form of a frank and clear-the-breast-of-it confession that the temptations besetting us in this sublunary state of existence are sometimes too strong for even an ecclesiastic to resist. That illicit stills of the Scrimgeourea type are often worked with impunity over long periods of time, we have abundant grounds for believing. We at any rate know of two Presbyterian clergymen—one stationed in Sydney and the other in the Hunter district—who have exhibited an audacity in their literary plagiarisms which in the case of the one that was moved some time since to administer an "Antidote to Unitarianism" did not stick at appropriating almost word for word, and publishing as his own production, a sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Melville, in his capacity of "Golden Lecturer," at the Church in Lincoln's Inn Fields. A fraud of some dimensions was suspected at the time, but the discovery of it came too late for prompt exposure. We counsel the divine in question to be more cautious in administering "antidotes" for the future, and to prepare them, if possible, from his own repertory of drugs.

IN applying to the Rev. George Fairfowl Macarthur for a subscription in aid of the erection of a new Wesleyan Church, the Rev. Mr. Dash, of Parramatta, must indeed, have been amusingly ignorant of his man. That the honoured Principal of King's School is characteristically closefisted we by no means wish to insinuate. His benevolence on ordinary occasions may, for aught we can say to the contrary, be unexceptionable. Doubtless to one in want of bread he would be found offering something better than a stone; but it may be questioned whether so dogged and imperious a believer in priestly rights and apostolic succession as the Rev. G. F. Macarthur notoriously is, could treat an act of familiarity towards him on the part of an *unauthorised* teacher of religion as anything less than an insult. Instead, therefore, of privately informing Mr. Dash that he had nothing to give, it became a point of duty with Mr. Macarthur to caution all good churchmen, in a letter to

the editor of the *Cumberland Times*, against "assisting a cause which is not only diametrically opposed to the teaching of their own Church, but also to the teaching of Holy Scripture," and to lecture nonconformists of every type upon the sin of standing aloof from the one true Church of Christ. It would, we think, take a much cleverer man than Mr. Macarthur to defend these ridiculous assumptions without making a fool of himself, and we abstain, therefore, from dissecting the pompous rigmarole of ecclesiastical precedents and Latin quotations with which he attempts to bewilder his readers, and to deprive them of their common sense. Parramatta, however, in the person of Mr. W. L. Jones—whose spirited utterance we have great pleasure in transferring to the pages of the *Free Religious Press*—is more than able to hold this high and mighty divine in check. "I feel it my duty," says Mr. Jones, "to vindicate truth against any violation of its sanctity. I claim this privilege not because I make any pretension to religion, for I profess to be nothing more or less than a good, upright and honourable man, which I consider of paramount importance, and I hold spiritual communion with none but my Maker, the Great Architect and Creator of the Universe; thus I repudiate all sectarian denominations, or, properly speaking, all ecclesiastical toll-bars on the high road to Heaven. I certainly was baptised and confirmed in the doctrines of the Church of England, until experience and mature age convinced me of its errors, and of the deception of its ministers. And moreover I find that, contrary to the injunctions of Christ, the religions of the present day are little more than gigantic systems of collecting money, for Christ exhorted his disciples to take neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in their purses, nor shoes on their feet, nor a second coat. I question very much if Mr. Macarthur, or any other minister, would have courage enough to humble himself so much as to ride on the colt of an ass as Christ did; on the contrary, they must have the gayest of buggies and carriages, and their associates the opulent and wealthy, or the *élite* of the land, except on collecting occasions, instead of being with publicans and sinners, as Christ was, for the purpose of doing good." What a new "lesson for the day" have we here, if Mr. Macarthur and the preaching class generally would but "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it."

WE have recently been much interested by two communications from very intelligent inquirers relative to Unitarianism—one from a Catholic priest, addressed to the *Unitarian Herald*; the other from a Sydney correspondent addressed to ourselves. Both correspondents seem to be under the impression that their position is antagonistic to Unitarianism; but this appears to us to be a mistake in both cases. Liberally suggestive of doubt and difficulty they doubtless are, but at the same time they indicate an undercurrent of thought so much in unison with our own, that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of ranging them with that portion of the church militant that is distinguished by the Unitarian standard. The Catholic priest, it is true, whilst enunciating pure Unitarianism, cannot avoid indicating a parting fondness for the old flame that assuredly he is about to abandon; but this will all be over so soon as he satisfies himself that he has had the felicity to form an acquaintance more worthy of his regard. "If," says the priest, "the Unitarian organisation can *gladly* and *bond-fide* open its membership to such persons as believe in a Supreme Being, holy, just and merciful: who governs us by general laws which he does not violate; one of those laws being that he aids with a special help the soul of whoever asks that grace. That these truths and the great principle of the excellence of piety, justice, charity, self-restraint, moderation, generosity, fortitude, are certain to us through our consciousness, and through the almost universal consciousness of mankind; but that all these need to be brought out by training and to be encouraged and intensified by public and private teaching and by public and private acts of religious worship, &c., &c., it will afford a resting place for men who, profoundly religious, full of faith and earnestness, still are embarrassed by the difficulties of the historic religion." We certainly can see no reason why persons of this description should not find a resting place in the Unitarian ark, and with unfeigned pleasure we extend to them the right hand of fellowship. We can cheerfully and unreservedly subscribe all that has been advanced, and with reference to both correspondents we may briefly say that the growing disposition to dis sever truth from its ancient concomitant, State Church authority, has not been discouraged by Unitarianism. On the contrary, we are of opinion that the truth can speak for itself and needs not foreign aid for its vindication. It comes with its own credentials, and anyone of ordinary education and average intelligence may determine the merit of those credentials without the assistance of the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury. We accept the teachings of Jesus Christ: at the same time we do not hold even his teachings as above or beyond criticism. The Apostle Paul we hold in the highest estimation. As Isaiah amongst the prophets so was Paul amongst the apostles. A nobler heart than his never palpitated in a human breast, whilst his devotion and labour in the propagation of the truth are unparalleled: at the same time we are not blind to the fact that he is not at all times strictly accurate as a reasoner, and we cannot subscribe everything he advances merely because he is a great and good man, a genuine noble of nature. We hold the Bible to be the best of books, but we claim the privilege, notwithstanding, of deciding for ourselves as to its plenary inspiration. We believe in a future and better state of existence; but we may have arrived at the conclusion by a road that may not be deemed altogether orthodox. In a word, we are merely inquirers after the truth, like our correspondent., "W. 13.," and we can assure him that if he pursue his inquiries rationally and manfully, he will find that Unitarianism is equal to the solution of tougher

doubts than any that he has given utterance to, and a sure road to the peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Old Testament Morality.

CHRISTIANS generally at the present day profess to believe that every book in the Bible is God's word. How much of this profession is based on sincere conviction, and how much is mere pretence, it is not for us to say, but looking at the present attitude of the thinking world, it seems impossible to doubt that within a very few decades "plenary inspiration" will have become a dogma of the past. The more sagacious of the Bible worshippers have, indeed, already recognised the fact that their position is untenable. It is not uncommon to hear the admission in terms such as these: "Even if the Mosaic records cannot be completely brought into harmony with the discoveries of modern philosophers, it should be remembered that the Bible was not given to instruct man in science, but to teach him holiness and lead him up to God." It is proposed, in fact, to surrender a part of the fortification in order to save the rest; to give up the geology and astronomy of the sacred book as intellectual surplusage, and to stand by its religious and moral teaching as the only foundation of spiritual truth. A new issue is consequently now raised. The Church hesitates to say, as it said to Galileo, "If Nature differs from the Bible then Nature is wrong but it still exclaims—"If your morality and religion are at variance with the Bible, then your morality and religion are wrong." The Church, however, is not as powerful now as in the days of Galileo, and the advocates of biblical inspiration will have no light task in defending the sacred writings from serious charges of false theology and bad morality. They will find themselves involved in a conflict of incomparably greater importance than any arising out of a question of science, one too in which every man and woman of sound mind, from the Queen to the peasant, is competent to take a part. An ignorant man, knowing nothing of science, *may* be deluded by his priest into the belief that Lyell, Huxley, and Darwin are impostors, that Egyptian hares chewed the cud, and that there were three days and nights before the sun was made; but if he be true to his own conscience—and woe to the man in whom the voice of conscience is mute—he will refuse at the bidding of priest or Bible, or any other external authority, to say that evil is good and good evil.

It is not intended in these remarks to disparage the Hebrew Scriptures, *regarded from a rational point of view*, but to protest against those who would thrust them upon us as the voice of God, to which our reason and conscience are both to be prostrated. The unknown and forgotten compilers of the ancient legends which constitute the bulk of the so-called historical books of the Old Testament were probably honest men who little thought that the most trivial passages in their writings would be elevated into canons of faith, and who profess only to record the semi-barbarous exploits and laws of a people who had scarcely seen the dawn of civilisation. The theology of these books, too, is such as no enlightened theist can now accept, their conceptions of the deity abounding in anthropomorphism of the grossest kind. But when we reflect that they treat of a period in the world's history when religion had scarcely risen to the level of polytheism, it will be seen that the old Jewish idea of the divine being was, relatively to the age, far in advance of that of modern Christendom. The Hebrew Jehovah was, it is true, bloodthirsty, jealous, vindictive, and vain, but he was on the whole a less unamiable being than the Heavenly Father of the Calvinists.

The question, however, now immediately before us is this : Are the Hebrew Scriptures from Genesis to Esther—our view being directed for the present to the former half only of the Old Testament—to be accepted for all time as an infallible, or even a useful, moral and religious guide? Do we find in them lessons of purity, self-denial, gentleness, charity, or any great religious doctrine such as the immortality of the soul? Now it can easily be shewn that such direct teaching as these books contain was never intended and could never be adapted to mankind in general. It is not, indeed, to be denied that amongst a vast mass of obsolete, frivolous, or offensive ceremonialism some passages are to be found—the greater part of the decalogue for instance—enjoining an unexceptionable though somewhat negative morality; but, unhappily for the theory that these maxims were regarded as of universal obligation, the same god who thundered from Sinai the Commandments—"Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt do no murder," had a short time previously instigated his chosen people to perpetrate a most discreditable fraud in the matter of jewellery upon the unsuspecting Egyptians, and afterwards urged them in the most emphatic manner to slaughter the unoffending Canaanites wholesale. Righteousness in these books usually means Mosaic ritualism, and hatred of Baal. To do evil is to neglect Jehovah's priest and to sacrifice to the wrong god. Moral turpitude is seldom rebuked; mercy and gentleness often. Jael is solemnly blessed in the congregation by a prophetess of the Lord for being, perhaps with the single exception of the "man after God's own heart," the most perfect incarnation of treachery and murder, whom the Almighty for his inscrutable purposes has seen fit to create; while Saul, for being more merciful than his God towards the Amalekites, is deprived of his throne, and to make amends for the error, Samuel "hews Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal." Occasionally, indeed, some outrageous crime seems

to provoke a shade of divine displeasure. Thus David was rebuked by Nathan and sentenced to punishment; but mark! not on account of his foul breach of moral law, but because "he had given the enemies of God occasion to blaspheme;" because, in other words, the notoriety of the affair amongst neighbouring nations would damage the prestige of Jehovah worship. It is impossible to conceive a greater discordance than that which exists between the spirit of the old Hebrew ethics and those of the Gospel; and nothing can be more amazing to one who is unaccustomed to the inconsistencies of Christian theologians than that the Hebrew law should be regarded as God's law for mankind, in spite of Paul's distinct and oft repeated assertions to the contrary, and in the teeth of Christ's words quoted in the latter part of the fifth chapter of Matthew, except the still more astounding proposition that Christ is identical with the very Jehovah whose sentiments he repudiates and condemns!

But, it may be urged, the Bible invites us to draw near to God by recounting to us the deeds of holy men of old who lived, worked, and thought under the special guidance of the holy spirit. Let us take a glance at one or two of these typical characters as they would strike, not the subtle philosopher or mystic, but one of the toiling millions who tries to learn wisdom and goodness from the Bible, and brings to the task only common sense and an unprejudiced mind.

Abraham, the "father of the faithful," and "the friend of God," may, from the prominent and honourable mention of him in various parts of the Bible, and especially the New Testament, be regarded as the greatest of the ancient Hebrews. Bunsen says of him that he was "an immortal hero, a wise, pious, and righteous patriarch, a noble-hearted and high-minded man, who was the first to break the curse of slavery to the bloody worship of Moloch with its rites of infanticide; and was able to do this because he esteemed the voice of God speaking directly through his reason and conscience." So much for the philosopher's view. Our mechanic, however, who takes words in their plain literal sense, and has no taste for paradoxes, will gather a very different idea from his reading of Genesis. He will find that Abraham was a grossly superstitious man who, a traitor to his reason and conscience, if he had any, and in subservience to the bloody worship of Moloch was actually prepared to sacrifice his favourite son in obedience to what he must have known to be a diabolical prompting, if his views of the deity had been otherwise than low and degrading. Abraham seems not to have been devoid of generous impulses as far as his external relations were concerned, especially in the case of Lot and the king of Sodom, but it is much easier to discover revolting than humane features in his domestic life. He treated Hagar and her son with heartless cruelty, and twice in his career tried to purchase security for his life by the sacrifice of his own and his wife's honour! It is to be hoped for the credit of humanity that these episodes in the life of Abraham are not historical.

If we compare the history of this patriarch with that of the founder of Mormonism we may trace some striking resemblances. Both by divine command left their homes to originate a new theocracy. Both had repeated visits from angels. Both countenanced and practised polygamy, and both were great prophets of the Lord. Of course it would be unjust to contrast men living so widely apart, in point of time, by any absolute standard of morality; but, *regarding them as exemplary*, it is not easy to see that Abraham was the superior of Joseph Smith.

The next striking character we meet with in sacred history is Jacob. The life of this man is quite unique, and, if not an historical character, he is the creation of a genius of no mean order. We meet sometimes in the story of his life a quite artistic combination of sharp practice and religious cant, which leads to the suspicion that the lesson of Jacob's career has been well studied by some very godly men of our own day. Whenever he ventured on some unusually smart speculation, "the Lord" was certain to be concerned in it—see, for instance, Gen. xxvii. 20 and xxxi. 9—and we read indeed that "the Lord" agreed to afford him countenance in consideration of receiving ten per cent, on his incomings. Of all the queer episodes in Jacob's life, perhaps the most bewildering to piety and common sense is the scene at Isaac's bedside. Imagine, a scheming woman and her son fraudulently obtaining a blessing from a doting old man, whom the clumsiness of the imposture of which he was the victim proves to have been almost totally bereft of his senses, and by this act binding the destiny of unborn millions! The Almighty has apparently no voice in the matter. Isaac has pronounced some magical words which are irrevocable, and which, as theologians tell us, determine the pedigree of the Saviour of mankind. The spiritual as well as temporal fate of unborn generations hangs on the question whether goat's skin can be successfully passed off as human flesh, and the heirloom of the promise is bought for a dish of venison! Surely this is the apotheosis of absurdity, superstition and knavery.

It would of course be a futile task to attempt within the limits of a single article anything like an exhaustive treatment of our present subject, or indeed to do much more than indicate the nature of the argument. "Time would fail me," says the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, "to tell of Gideon and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephtha, of David also and Samuel, and of the prophets," and as far as any moral purpose could be served, a most unprofitable task it would be. Many of the prophets were indeed heroic men who, in the true spirit of martyrs, fought single-handed against the king, people, and priests, but of the many and varied

characters detailed in the books of the law and the so-called histories, how many can be cited as noble and great examples? There are doubtless, episodes in the career of some of these ancient men of renown, Jacob's wrestling with God, for instance, and David's fits of penitence, which, interpreted in a certain manner, may be shewn to have a deep religious significance, and these circumstances would have some weight in opposition to the views now advanced, if the world were peopled exclusively with Thomas Carlyles; but it would be hard in any case for the most industrious seeker after spiritual food to deduce any edifying or ennobling lessons from a study of Lot's career, or of Samson's, or of Esther's. It is difficult indeed to conceive of any valid excuse for allowing the stories of some of these worthies to get into the hands of children, except the fact that many of the allusions in them convey no meaning to an innocent mind.

It has often been urged, and it will doubtless be urged again, that to disparage the venerable books, and to defame the old patriarchs, judges and kings, whom Christians have always from their infancy invested with a halo of sanctity, is to do a very cruel and unnecessary, if not wicked thing. It must be admitted that to insult wantonly the sincere religious convictions of any Christian—or, we would add, of any Jew or Pagan—indicates a bad heart and a wrong head, and is not the part of a seeker after truth. Thus the prophet Elijah who, previously to his murdering a number of men for heresy, grossly insulted their religion and their worship, is a pattern of what a religious reformer should not be. It is a sacred duty fearlessly to proclaim the truth, but let this be done in the spirit of love as well as truth. Harmless superstition may, then, be left alone. But when is it harmless? Are not the false moral standards to which men bow their reason as fitting objects for the iconoclast as groves and high places? Does or does not the false morality of the Old Testament affect directly or indirectly the progress of mankind? If it does, then it is a deadly sin to suffer the question to rest, be the consequences what they may.

In order to solve the problem, let us consider whether the conventional morality of the present day is not more akin to the old Hebrew ethics than the Gospel maxims. Is not "an eye for an eye" all but universally regarded as a far more fitting rule of life than "love your enemies?" Is not fashionable vice practically condoned by respectability, a virtuous heretic shunned and persecuted, and a genteel orthodox adulterer welcomed into the "highest circles?" Are there no Judahs now-a-days who, without the smallest loss of social prestige", indulge in the lowest vices "by the way to Timnah," and on the judgment seat cry out with virtuous indignation, "Let her be burnt?" How can we hope that religious persecution will cease or even be abated while Josiah, who slaughtered the priests of Baal on their altars, is held up as a model for the young? Think of the hundreds of thousands of poor wretches who have been burnt for witchcraft! Perchance, sometimes, outraged human nature tries to get the better of the demon of superstition and pleads for pity on the poor victim. But no! Exodus says plainly "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," and so the stake is lighted. How precious must the Bible be to the negro slave owner, who, as God's minister, carries out the divine edict against the children of Ham, and regulates his household morals on strictly patriarchal principles! Is the test book of foreign policy towards weak states used by those most Christian powers, England, France, and Prussia, the sermon on the Mount, or the book of Joshua? Let the Danes, the Sikhs, the Arabs, the Chinese make answer. What a scandal it is to civilisation that two of the most advanced and powerful nations in the world should slay each other by tens of thousands, and afflict with sorrow and desolation many an innocent home, from absolutely no other motive than lust of martial glory. Yet how can the Christian minister with the Old Testament in his hand denounce this work of the devil?

"The Lord is a Man of War." "He teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight," says the old Hebrew. "God is love," says the minister of a far different religion. The Christian world must not for ever halt between two opinions. "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Jehovah, then follow him." Sagitta.

Life and Death.

WE learn from the book of Genesis that "the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

A pre-Christian philosophy deals still more liberally with him; and, discovering in his intellectual constitution indications of a divine nature, claims for him life and immortality beyond the grave. That man will exist in another state, hereafter, we do not dispute; but that he is immortal *per se* we unhesitatingly deny. He who first breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life must reanimate and sustain him on another arena; for, whether in this world or the next, "in God we live, and move, and have our being." To make man immortal *per se* is to deify him—to add another member to the Godhead already inconveniently and irrationally overcrowded.

A late earl conferred an unspeakable obligation on his fellow men by eliciting those excellent productions known as the Bridgewater Treatises, illustrative of the power, wisdom, and goodness of God, as manifested in

the Creation; and without doubt they have made it manifest that external nature and man's physical condition felicitously harmonise. The temperature at the surface of the earth when it was first honoured with inhabitants, must have been far too high for man as at present constituted; and an atmosphere impregnated with carbonic acid gas to the extent of supporting the vegetation that flourished during the formation of the coal measures, would be equally hostile to his well-being and existence. But since then, the temperature has been toned down to man's physical organisation; and the carbonic acid gas that before poisoned the air has been reduced to harmless dimensions. Man's moral and intellectual constitution demanded a more elaborate physical organisation than was conceded to his predecessors in existence; and doubtless he is entitled to rank, in every respect, as the first of all created beings; but we fail to discover in that organisation, admirable though it be, any intention on the part of the Deity to confer on man immunity from death; or, indeed, to make any difference between him and pre-adamite existences with regard to their liability to dissolution. We believe that the divine author of all things had appointed man once to die before he was created, and, of course, before sin was possible; and that when he breathed into man the breath of life, he at the same time breathed into him the breath of death; for the atmosphere that ventilates our lungs and aerates our blood—the air that we breathe—is at the same time our life and death, and will be to the end of the chapter.

Not quite a century ago, a Unitarian minister, Dr. Priestly, had the honour to astonish the world by discovering that the atmosphere was not a simple element, as previously supposed, but that it consisted of oxygen and nitrogen. Oxygen, of vital importance to us, eventually becomes our bane—fatal to us; whilst nitrogen, fatal to us *per se*, in combination with oxygen becomes not only harmless but beneficial. At first it appears strange that oxygen, the supporter of life, should enter into close alliance with nitrogen, the antagonist of every living thing; but had it not been for this arrangement man would not have lived out half his days. We should have lived too fast by half, as some of our fast friends notoriously do. They approve of oxygen, simple and uncombined with nitrogen, and finding it in brandy they too often find a premature grave as well. Without nitrogen to moderate and diminish the too energetic action of its companion, our animal spirits would mount up to the third heaven of excitement, and whilst one half the world would be down with fever the other moiety would be rampant in madness, and life would be reduced to the briefest chronicle. Some philosophers have denied the possibility of the world's conflagration; but were the Deity to withdraw the nitrogen that at present preserves us, the solid earth would light up in blazing rivalry with the sun; "the hardest rocks, the very crust of the earth, yea even the waters of the ocean would be set on fire, and all the elements of the world would literally melt with heat."

A recent discovery presents us with oxygen performing a very important part in the economy of life as a powerful disinfectant in the form of ozone, which is pure oxygen under a different molecular arrangement. Oxygen appears as a molecule oxygen appears as a molecule of two atoms, ozone of three, and the latter operates as a disinfectant by parting with the third atom, which, combining with miasma, restores the atmosphere to its normal purity, the ozone itself falling back to its pristine condition of oxygen with a molecule of two atoms.

The surface of the earth for the depth of eight miles is the mausoleum of man's predecessors in numbers inconceivable; and the anatomy of their remains shows that the principle of life that animated their whole system differed but little from that of their successors. Man, therefore, in dying, merely submits to the inevitable fate that, it may be, a million years ago, removed the living from existence to the universal charnel-house. And after all he is only called upon to submit to a law that in mercy provides him with a sepulchre for all the ills that flesh is heir to. God never intended that this world should be disfigured by the all but universal exhibition of humanity tottering on crutches "with every part blasted with antiquity." Three score years and ten is man's allotted course, and by this time, oppressed by infirmity, life has lost most of its attractions for him. A centenarian lady of our acquaintance, with no ailment but old age, used to say that the prospect of immediate dissolution would occasion her less uneasiness than the certainty of having to live as long again; and we believe that medical men almost invariably find that the aged meet their death with a calm resignation closely allied to satisfaction.

But another state of existence is claimed for man, and the resurrection of the dead and life everlasting are prominent items in the Christian creed throughout the world. It is alleged that life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel, though that doctrine was current centuries before the gospel was preached, and *resurgam* was as deeply chiselled on the tombs of Grecian and Oriental philosophers as on the marble monument of the Christian.

A modern writer of great ability has recently endeavoured to show that Jesus Christ was an Essenian Jew, and that he gave currency to the doctrines professed by that harmless section of the Hebrew community. The doctrines of a future state and the resurrection of the dead were certainly taught by the Essenes, who also professed a great contempt for riches, and advocated a communism of poverty, in all of which Jesus Christ was in strict unison with them; but they condemned anointing with oil, and were total abstainers from wine, in

which particulars he differed from them. Still, associated as it is with other doctrines of the Essenians prominently taught by Jesus Christ, we have no doubt whatever that the doctrine of the resurrection as taught by him is altogether of Essenian origin.

By the resurrection of the dead it appears that we are not to understand the resurrection of the body, though Jesus Christ appeared to his disciples with the self-same body that was nailed to the cross, and that must have tasted death. John informs us that "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced the side of the dying man and forthwith came thereout blood and water," evidently indicating a rupture of the pericardium, which the faculty hold to be necessarily mortal.

We confess that Paul's explanation of the resurrection does not afford us the slightest assistance in unravelling the mystery. "But some men will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." The attempted analogy between a dead body and a grain of wheat is obviously a failure, and although Jesus Christ, according to John, discourses to the same purpose, still his authority will not make right that which is so flagrantly wrong. Jesus says, "Verily verily I say unto you except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." So thought Paul; but both are wrong, and by their mistaken reasoning they establish the fact that there is no resurrection at all if the measure of it is to be gauged by the produce arising out of dead seed. If the seed be dead there can be no germination, no growth, no resurrection. The Egyptian wheat that a few years ago was taken from the mummy's hand and planted in England, had been dormant, but alive, for thousands of years; but under auspicious circumstances, with favourable temperature, moisture and soil, it woke up again, and gave evidence of a vigorous vitality in a produce of marvellous fertility.

Under ordinary circumstances, the resurrection of the body is an absurdity that may be made manifest without much difficulty. In death, the particles forming the body, released from vital control, evaporate, volatilise, and disperse on every hand with every wind, to become the constituents of, peradventure, twenty different bodies, animal and vegetable it may be. The last atom that formed the tip of Cleopatra's nose may possibly be in association with an aggregation of atoms that altogether form a great toe of Pius the Ninth. But where there are so many claimants for the same atom we apprehend the difficulty of satisfying all will be insuperable, and infer, therefore, that both the atom itself and the doctrine that honours it with resurrection will be abandoned to those who may be able to make a profitable use of either one or the other.

The difficulty of dealing with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead has not been lessened by the manner in which the evangelists describe the appearance of Jesus Christ to his disciples after his crucifixion. Indeed their contradictions are so palpable and flagrant that we abandon their narrative as amongst difficulties altogether beyond our power of solution, and turn to the metaphysical aspect of the matter which we are glad to say we find much more satisfactory.

Both man and the inferior animals are alike subject to death; but for man alone is claimed the heritage of immortality, and why? Because man alone aspires to it and alone can comprehend it, or form the least conception of it; and because he does aspire to it it is presumed that he will realise it either for good or for evil, as his prior existence may determine. For every desire or faculty, either in man or in the inferior animals, there appears to be a counterpart in accordance therewith in external nature, and by analogy it is inferred that there would not be this "longing for immortality" were there no immortality to long for.

But man looks naturally and reasonably beyond the grave for the adjustment of those unadjusted accounts that death still leaves open between man and man, and between God and men. What gross, what execrably cruel injustice has not the white man inflicted upon his sable brother, and, hitherto, so far as this world is concerned, with perfect impunity? If the recording angel has registered the sighs and agonised groans of the tortured African, what a chronicle of deep damnation is there to greet and to appal the villainous man-stealer in another world? The account, though long and bloody, has yet to be adjusted; and our confidence in the justice of heaven leads us to the conviction that the coloured victim will find in a better world the justice that was denied to him in this. Successful villainy triumphs in a thousand forms. The traitor trustee betrays his trust and impoverishes the widow and the fatherless, whilst he feathers his own nest at the expense of those whom he was bound to cherish and defend. Whole families are reduced to desolation and despair by some artful thief who trims his villainous boat to sail with, not against, the law, and avoids and laughs at all its meshes; but because Justice is blind and impotent here is the account for ever closed, or, rather, is it never to be opened for adjudication?

And with regard to religious persecution. Is that a closed account? We incline to think not. To do the Romish Church justice we must admit that she possesses the best possible argument for a future state of punishment, inasmuch that she preeminently deserves it. "We defy mortal man to read Dr. Baird's Sketches on Protestantism in Italy with Notices of the Waldenses, without rising from the perusal fully convinced that the atrocities of the minions of this wretched Church are unparalleled either here or in hell. But this is another unsettled account, and will probably require for its final adjustment a Judge, whose infallibility, we rejoice to know, is somewhat less questionable than that of Pope Pius the Ninth.

But the last great day of reckoning is not to be approached free of solicitude or misgiving. To the best of us, Death is the King of Terrors; but this is, in a great measure, attributable to censurable want of confidence in Him who has been our guide, our friend, and best benefactor throughout the whole course of our lives. We exclaim, in all sincerity, with Balaam, May I die the death of the righteous, and may my last end be like his. But to die the death of the righteous we must live the life of the righteous. Avoiding evil, may we be active in doing good. Religion is abundantly oppressed with Superstition; let us, in the interest of humanity, exert ourselves to improve matters in this respect. The world requires more light, and how is the darkness of error to be dispelled but by the radiance of the light of truth? Let us not, therefore, be idle in this respect, but determine to leave the world better and more enlightened than we found it, if to do so be within the compass of our ability. We came into the world all tears: may our passage through it be such that when we leave it our farewells may be couched in smiles,—the index of calm resignation and a confident hope that death may be the portal to a higher state of existence.

"On parent knees, a naked new-born child
Weeping thou sat'st while all around thee smiled;
So live, that sinking on thy last long sleep
Thou then may'st smile, while all around thee weep."

Libra.

Where and what is Hell?

NEXT to the fault of having no religion at all is that other of having the religious ideas in such a state of confusion that one ordinarily shuns any attempt at analysis as he would the vapour of some infectious disease. Mental idleness has no doubt a great deal to do with this—the putting off until to-morrow what should be done to-day. Thus men become self-constituted authors of their own spiritual discomfort, and still far as ever removed from that state of mental ease which a greater or less degree of religious assurance can alone impart. And why is this? The mind demands its reasonable exercise as well as the body, otherwise it is apt to contract such an access of lethargy as to wholly preclude its healthy action. Our hands and feet are made to minister to our well-being with a prospect of future ease and enjoyment. Are the expectations of futurity on so sandy a basis that all energy of pursuit and the examination of a so-styled faith are undermined by the ever-encroaching tide of spiritual unbelief? Listen to the outward profession, and you would at once repel the charge; note the daily practice, and you would at once affirm its correctness.

But if man is naturally inclined to postpone these considerations, either from mental apathy or from an unacknowledged dread, it is only to carry the *lethalis arundo* in his side and to suffer self-inflicted torment. With coward mind he stands aloof, hoping to filch in some way or other the happiness of a future state, and by seeming to embrace what he possibly thinks he believes, because he has never said in so many words that he disbelieves it, he holds himself up as a consistent and exemplary character, before whose eyes heaven and hell are clearly decided localities open at once to his own mental vision and spiritual capacity.

But here we must join issue with our devotee, and ask him without further preface on what he grounds his belief in a Hell—understood theologically to be a place of everlasting fire and torment, reserved for such as shall at some undefined period be debarred the gates of heaven. Where and what is Hell? we ask. Can we gather any distinct notion of it from scripture phraseology? Shall we take a dip into mythology? or base our ideas on the inverted cone of Dante's Inferno? If Hell is deep, where is its depth? If its interior is fire, where is its focus? If the molten centre of our earth be the receptacle of the damned, we might find it somewhat difficult to imagine how earth and hell should go together when "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up;" or, if the crust of our earth be gradually cooling, as the most noted geologists of the day concur in saying, what becomes of Hell at some remote period with all its undying flames, unless we suppose that the mode of punishment by the result of natural circumstances changes from furnace heat to arctic cold? But again, putting our earth out of the question as the habitat of the wicked, where else can we locate the ultimately damned? Science assures us, if the Bible does not, that our own little earth is only one of the very least of millions of worlds revolving in a universe to whose proportions our globule here is in inconceivably less ratio than is the human form to the planet it inhabits. If "Hell is moved from beneath," as the son of Amoz has it, where is this beneath? Is it below, above, or on either side of us? Or must its site depend, perhaps, on our hemispherical position? But giving up earth, or any part of earth, as the *barathrum* of a future retribution, must we look for a

Hell beyond our orb in the widely-ranging realms of air, where spirits of evil are said to wander? Or must we finally place our Pandemonium in some other star, so far removed from mortal ken as to trench on the very confines of imagination?

While we would deal with this naturally interesting point in no unbecoming spirit, so as either to shock the prejudices of the weakly or minister unbridled hardihood to the vicious, we feel no inclination whatever to indulge in a squeamishness that would be out of place, or to bow before the idol of a long-existing superstition. We would try, if possible, to agitate the subject in a sober manner, to ask again what and where is Hell, and see what influence for good or bad such belief has had on the ordinary conduct of mankind.

If an object is supposed to justify its means, we can easily enough fathom the intentions of those who first set this dogma going. Examine it critically and it assumes the character of a class idea, naturally enough generated in the minds of a minority from the very earliest period of struggling civilisation by a longing for mental ascendancy and the all-pervading lust of rule. Beside this, contemplation of the heavenly bodies with all their intricate and marvellous machinery—stirring visions of sleep, coloured and fluttering with strange and portentous forms—the severe and oppressive silence of deeply-shrouded night, when stillness itself would seem to deal in speech and to strike us with an undefined awe—these and suchlike incidents of nature were early turned to profit by the more cunning mind and rendered subservient to that enslavement of the human understanding it has ever hitherto been the object of one petty class especially to impose, and the seeming fate of the other to submit to from supposed inability to resist. It was easy for the craft of an acuter intellect to embody the sickly visions of another's diseased imagination. It was no hard task for cunning to create a Hell where the material lay so ready to the hand in the sickly terrors of a disordered mind—and if some punishment *in terrorem* was needed to confirm this subjugation, it readily enough fixed on an element whose racking and often-experienced pain on earth would give very ample ideas of the torture and fire-torments of a future state of sorrow. How this idea came to germinate, to grow, and to produce an ever more and more vigorous crop of baleful fruit, can truthfully be conjectured by anyone who reflects how insensible man becomes to his religious state, how reprehensibly callous about dispelling those mists and unwholesome exhalations that cloud the otherwise sunshine of the heart and gloom it with a sad and increasing distemperature. Fettered by a keen and depressing superstition that ever pertinaciously cleaves to him like the burden of Faithful on his way to the Beautiful Mountain, man wends his weary way; all the while inwardly chafing at a serfdom as unentitled to his obedience, as it is unworthy of his manhood.

Again we inquire where and what is Hell?—whether Hades, Gehenna, Tartarus, Orcus, or what not? Our earth, like every other atom of creation, will have its comparatively little day, and then break up and be dissolved for the structure it may be of worlds to come. No theological Hell can then, we repeat it, be contained in this puny sphere if punishments are to be never-ending. What other position can we reasonably assign it? Shall we place it far away beyond the limits of our globe, in some immeasurably distant region of space where imagination may altogether run riot in the boundless expanse of the universe? Yet why imagine that any portion of the great whole should be devoted to any such ignoble purpose, or that any such improbable Hinnom for the refuse and viciously corrupt mortality of our little speck, should so blemish that loveliness and harmony so conspicuous features in all that we see around us? Why should man so wander from the track of sober probabilities? Why lash himself, as he so often does, with a scourge of his own knotting? Why accept as a fact what is after all but a designedly mischievous interpretation of a mere word, which, if we may judge from Jonah and the whale, and the parable of Lazarus and Dives, is but a figurative form of speech that but characterises the lowest depression of the human mind? What in fine is Hell but a figment, an absurdity, a something, like the oracles of old, not to be too closely examined by the vulgar eye for fear the crafty mechanism should be detected, and the moving springs laid bare to view. Its coarse and material terrors are more often inferred than expressed. And with reason; for in the absence of any sufficient evidence to establish a Hell, it is thought by those who are ordinarily too clever or may be too reticent to commit any religious solecism, that it may more judiciously be left for the imagination to act, than to jeopardise a dogma by unskilful manipulation. And so unless imagination be disciplined and be one of more than ordinary *élan* and vigour, it is but too apt to be caught in the every-hole-and-corner-spread web of any suggestive genius of superstition that from its spider-like hole views its victim's involvement, endeavouring to cut off all hope of escape by now and then throwing an additional coil.

In touching on this too seldom discussed subject, we trust we have laid ourselves open to no charge of impropriety. Our reader's satisfaction, ease of mind, and a not impardonable curiosity is our primary object in venturing on an otherwise unbeaten track; and we should deem it but small compliment to his wit and understanding to scoff at what should rather be calmly weighed. And in briefly concluding our remarks, we would ask once more whether Hell is not rather to be looked for within the region of the human heart than in the shadowy realms of fancy. Undoubtedly it is. For what however startling fictions of Hell have not their veritable realities in life? Note how superstition distorts the human sense and renders it absolutely torpid with

fear, and in hourly terror of the accidents of life, as if, forsooth, physical laws had anything to do with moral conditions. If the glutton and debauchee are not made to wallow in the waves of an imaginary hell, is their breast less exempt from the recoil such vices engender? If no poetically retributive torment racks the man of broken trust and violated friendship, does neither anguish rend nor conscience scathe him? In fine, can a more fiery hell be thought of than that which burns in the heart of the avaricious, or tortures more agonising than such as come home sooner or later to the persistingly impure?

"Cerberus et Furiæ? jam vero, et lucis egestas,
Tartarus, horriferos eructans faucibus æstus:
Quæ neque sunt usquam, neque possunt esse profecto.
Sed metus in vita pænarum pro male factis
Est insignibus insignis : scelerisque luella
Career, et horribilis de saxo jaetus eorum,
Verbera, carnifices, robur, pix, lamina, tædæ :
Quæ tamen etsi absunt, at mens sibi conscia factis,
Præmetuens, adhibet stimulos, torretque flagellis,
Nee videt interea, qui terminus esse malorum
Possit, nec qua) sit pænarum denique finis;
Atque eadem metuit magis hac ne in morte gravescant:
Hinc Aetherusia fit stultorum denique vita!"

Quilibet.

The Power of Goodness.

MEN admire in God what they admire in themselves. It is so unavoidably. You may see three periods in man's history. In the first bodily force is most highly prized. Here the hero is the strongest man; he who can run the swiftest, and strike the hardest; is fearless and cruel. In that state, men conceive mostly of a God of Force. He is a man of war. He thunders and lightens. He rides on the wind; is painted with thunderbolts in his hand. He sends the plague and famine. The wheels of his chariot rattle in war. What represents Force is a type of Him. In some primitive nations their name of God meant only the Strong—the Powerful.

Then as men advance a little, there comes a period in which intellectual power, or wisdom, is prized above bodily force. Men esteem its superiority, for they see that one wise head is a match for many strong bodies. It can command ten weak men to overcome a strong one, whom singly they dared not touch; but no aggregation of foolish men, however numerous, can ever outwit a single wise man, for no combination of many little follies can ever produce wisdom. In this stage he is the hero who has the most intellectual power; knows the secrets of nature; has skill to rule men; speaks wise sayings : Saul, the tallest man, has given place to Solomon, the wisest man. The popular conception of God changes to suit this stage of growth. Men see His Wisdom; they see it in the birth of a child, in the course of the sun and moon; in the return of the seasons; in the instinct of the emmet or the ostrich: God works the wonders of nature. Wisdom is the chief attribute in this age ascribed to God. Who shall teach Him? says the contemplative man of this age—where the sage of a former day would have asked, Who can overcome Him?

There comes yet another period, in which moral power is appreciated. He is the hero who sees moral truth, walks uprightly, subordinates his private will to the universal law, tells the truth, is reverent and pious, loves goodness, and lives it. The saint has become the hero; he rules not by superior power of hand, or superior power of head, but by superior power of heart—by justice, truth, and love; in one word, by righteousness. "The Queen of Sheba came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon," said Jesus, "but behold a greater than Solomon is here." In this period, men form a higher conception of God. Men believe that He is not only wise, but good; He loves men : He loves justice, goodness, truth; demands mercy and not sacrifice; He keeps His word, and is an upright God. He is no longer regarded as the God of the Mosaic law, jealous, revengeful, exacting; but as a Father of infinite goodness. In one word, God is Love.

Now we do not always appreciate the excellence of Goodness. We seldom believe in its power. Mankind has been struggling here on the earth six thousand years—perhaps much longer,—who knows? Yet even now, few men see more than signs of God's Power and Wisdom in the world. Most men stop at the first. The force of muscles they understand better than the force of mind, and that better than the excellence of justice, uprightness, truth, and love. So it has become a political maxim to trust a man of able intellect, sooner than a

just and good man of humbler mind. Most men, perhaps, tremble before a God who can destroy the world to-morrow, and send babes new-born to endless hell, far more than they rejoice in a God who rules by perfect justice, truth, and love, who to-day blesses whatever He has made, and will at last bless them all more abundantly than thought can fancy or heart can wish.

We bow before the man of great capabilities of thought, of energetic mind, of deep creative genius. Yet is the good man greater than the wise man—taking wisdom in its common sense of intellectual power, capacity of thought;—greater and nobler far! He rests on a greater idea. He lives in a larger and loftier sentiment. And men come at length to see that a single good man, who conforms with God, yields to no temptation, harbours no revenge,—not railing when mocked at, not paying back scorn for scorn; who is able to stand alone amid the desertion of friends, and the ribald mockery of the public mind, serenely lifting up a forehead blameless and unabashed to men and God; who lives in the law of the Just, the Good, the Holy, and the True,—is greater than all Cæsars, all Cromwells, all Napoleons. His power is real, not depending on the accident of a throne or an army, and as the most ancient Heaven, is permanent and strong, resting on the same foundation with them—the law of God. He lives in his undying powers.

Ask yourself what is it that makes you admire this or that great man? Is it what is highest in you, or what is lowest? Is it your best quality? If not, then is your admiration not of the best things in man, for the quality you admire in him is only an enlargement of the same quality in yourself. Your little honours his much, and if your little is not of your best, no more is his much. It is dangerous to admire what it is not safe to love.

When a good man commences his career of Goodness, sceptics will doubt and bigots will oppose him. These men have no faith in Goodness, only in cunning or in force. But the great heart of mankind will beat with him. Even men indebted to sin will forsake their old tyrants, and welcome him to their arms, confessing their former life a mistake and a grievous curse. By-and-by the world rolls round to his side, and the longer it stands the more will his ideas prevail, for the world is going a pilgrimage towards the Truth.

The secret history of the world is a contest between ideas of Goodness and Badness. We sometimes think it is all over with Goodness; but it gets the better continually. What is bad dies out, perishing slowly in the ages. What is good lives for ever. A truth is never obsolete. All nature is really leagued against selfishness; for God is the author of nature, and there is no devil. A selfish nation digs its own grave; if strong it digs it all the deeper, and the more secure. That is the lesson which Home teaches the world. A selfish party in the nation does the same thing. A selfish man in society seems to succeed, but his success is ruin. He has poisoned his own bread. For all that is ill got he must pay back tenfold. God is not mocked. The man laughs that he has escaped a duty. Poor, blind man! a curse has fallen on him; it cleaves to his bones. Justice has feet like wool, so noiseless you hear not her steps; but her hands are hands of iron, and where God lays them down it is not in man to lift them up.

Goodness is the service of God. The good heart, the good life are the best, the only sacrifice that He demands. When men saw mainly the power of God, trembling thereat, they made sacrifice of things dearest to them, to bribe their God, as to appease a cruel king. "Come not empty-handed before thy God," said the priest. Even now, many a man who sees also the wisdom of God, and bows before Him as the soul of thought, will sacrifice reason, conscience, and good sense, as Abraham would offer Isaac, and as Solomon slew sheep and goats. They think God loves tears and hates smiles; so they pay him with gloom, gloomy Sundays and gloomy weeks, and most despairing and melancholy prayers. How many think religion to consist of this. Belief is the sign of their Christianity and its only proof! No doubt there are, practically speaking, two parts of religion: Piety the sentiment, Morality the expression, a revelation of that sentiment, as the world is a revelation of God. Piety is the in-ness of Morality, as Morality is the out-ness of Piety. No doubt there are two parts of service to God, namely, Faith and Love within the man, Works and Goodness without the man. If faithful Love be in the man, works of Goodness must needs appear in his manifested life. If not, who shall assure us that Faith and Love exist within? a good tree is known by its good fruit. It is of more importance that the tree be good, than it be called by a good name.

Now one of the sacramental sins of the Christian Churches has been to lay the main stress on expressions of Faith, on Devotion, or Belief. If they laid the main stress on real Piety that were well, for it would be making the tree good, when, of course, its fruit would be also good. Piety is love of God with the mind and heart; he who has this must conform to God in his self-government, so far as he knows God's will. But Piety cannot be forced. It eludes the eye. It will not be commanded nor obey the voice of the charmer. So the Churches early insisted that Belief and Devotion were the main things of Christianity. They told men what to believe—how to be devout. They gave men a creed for their belief, and a form or a rite for their devotion. The whole thing was brought into the outer court—placed under the eye of the priest. Behold Christianity made easy; the Power of God and the Wisdom of God, and God's Goodness too, become a stumbling-block and foolishness to the Christians themselves! None was accounted a Christian but a conformist to the ways of man. He only was a Christian who believed the popular creed and complied with the popular form. The absolute Religion of Christ

had passed away from the Churches; the sectarianism of the priesthood had usurped its place. Goodness was cheated of its due. In the name of Christ was it taught that a good man might be damned; he had kept the Law of God, as reason and conscience make it known; he had been faithful to God and true and loving to man; he had believed all things that to him were credible, and done prayerfully the duty of a man. "What of that?" said the priest, "he has not believed nor worshipped with the rest of men. Hell waiteth for such." Would to God I could say that these things only *were*, that they *are* not. It has for many a hundred years been a heresy in the Christian Churches to believe that a man goes to heaven on account of his goodness, his righteousness, or is acceptable to God because he walks manfully by the light God gives him! *Has been* did I say? Far worse, it is so now! It is a heresy to believe it now in all popular and recognised Churches of Christendom! A creed and a rite are of course but external—only the gold of the altar—not the altar sanctifying the gold. Once they were symbols, perhaps, and signs of all good things to some pious man. They helped him to commune with God. They aided him to grow. Losing their first estate, to many they become not stimulants of Goodness, but substitutes for it. The mail rests at the symbol and learns no more!

It was so in Judea when Christ came into the world. No nation of old time surpassed the Jews in their concern for external rites of devotion. No modern nation has equalled them in this. But they were not a moral nation. Christ found that in the popular faith Goodness and Religion were quite different things. Men thought that God was to be served by rites and beliefs. So the priests had taught, making Religion consist in what was useless to God and man;—a wretched science with the few, a paltry ceremony with the mass. Not so did the prophets teach, for priests and prophets are never agreed. Christ fell back on Goodness. He demanded this, he set forth its greatness, its power, in his words and in his life. He encumbered no man with creeds, nor rites. He said, "He that doeth the will of my Father shall know of the doctrine." He summed up the essentials of Religion in a few things, a right heart, and a right life, in Piety and Goodness. He knew they would extend, and that swiftly, to many things. Moses and the Law might go their way; they had authority to bind no man. His words were their own evidence and proof; moral truth is its own witness. He had authority. Whence came it? From the scribes and the priests? They hated him. From tradition, Moses, the Old Testament? Quite as little. He puts them behind him. He had authority because he conformed to God's Law, in his mind and in his heart, and in his life. So God spoke through him; inspiration came, and though his friends forsook him, and Churches and State rose in tumult, clamorous for his overthrow; though the better than against him, and he stood alone, he was not alone—world turned friends, and Church, and State, and world, better than twelve legions of angels, the Father was with him, and he fell not!

Even publicans and harlots welcomed him. They did not love sin. They had been deluded into its service; they found it a hard master. Joyfully they deserted that hopeless Armada, to sail the seas with God, soon as one came who put the heart, conscience, reason, on Religion's side, speaking with an authority they felt before they saw, showing that Religion was real and dear. Humble men saw the mystery of Godliness, they felt the power of Goodness which streamed forth from their brother's heart of fire. They started to found a Church on Goodness, on absolute Religion, little knowing what they did. Alas! it was a poor Church which men founded in that great name, though the best the world ever saw; it was little compared with the ideas of Jesus; little and poor compared with the excellence of Goodness and the power of real. Religion.

Some day there will be churches built in which it shall be taught that the only outward service God asks is Goodness, and Truth the only creed; that a Divine life—piety in the heart, morality in the hand—is the only real worship. Men will use symbols or not, as they like; perhaps will still cling to such as have helped us hitherto; perhaps leave them all behind, and have communion with man in work, and word, and joyful sympathy, with God through the elements of earth, and air, and water, and the sky; or in a serener hour, without these elements, come nearer yet to him. But in that day will men forget Jesus—the son of Joseph, the carpenter, whom the priests slew, as a madman and an infidel, but whom the world has worshipped as a God? Will his thought, his sentiments, his influence pass away? no, oh! no. What rests on the ideas of God, lasts with those ideas. Power shall vanish; glory shall pass away; England and America may become as Nineveh and Babylon. Yes, the incessant hand of Time may smooth down the ruggedness of the Alleghany and the Andes, but so long as man is man must these truths of Jesus live; Religion be the love of man, the love of God. Men will not name Jesus, God; they may not call him master, but the world's teacher. They will love him as their great brother, who taught the truth, and lived the life of heaven here; who broke the fetters of the oppressed, and healed the bruises of the sick, and blessed the souls of all. Then will Goodness appear more transcendent, and he will be deemed the best Christian who is most like Christ; most excelling in Truth, Piety, and Goodness. They will not be the preachers who bind, but they who loose mankind; who are full of truth; who live great noble lives, and walk with Goodness and with God. Worship will be fresh and natural as the rising sun—beautiful like that, and full of promise too. Truth for the creed; Goodness for the form; Love for the baptism—shall we wait for that, with folded arms? No, brothers, no. Let us live as if it were so now. Earth shall be blessed and heaven ours.—*Theodore Parker.*

Individuality and Independence.

WE need more of *Nature* in the soul; that is, a reverting to first principles, a development of primitive instincts, and some increased confidence that there still lives a God to hear and teach us. Never shall we by mere herding together, or by leaning on authority old or new, make up for intrinsic weakness in each separate soul. Moreover, it is only by insight into the Present, that we can understand the Past. In political history and in all physical science this is acknowledged : one who knows nothing of the existing forces, in States or in unorganised Nature, cannot rightly discuss past events. So, if *a chasm* be gratuitously assumed between the spiritual action which we know and experience, and that which animated apostles and prophets,—or, what comes to the same thing, if we know nothing of any spiritual force as all within ourselves,—we shall for ever be in the dark concerning their minds and souls. But with more Individuality, more Independence of man, there will be more capacity to learn of God. Then we shall not aim (in theory, any more than in practice) to become little Christs or little Pauls; we shall as freely disclaim it, as in literature the becoming little Homers. Such imitation does not tend to excellence but to stupidity. Men of little faith fix their eyes on the Past, as did the Scribes and Pharisees : Faith gratefully and reverently acknowledges *and uses* the Past, but sets her face towards the Future. Those who build the tombs of the prophets, but allege that all inspiration is now closed, would in former days probably have aided to persecute them : those, on the other hand, who use individual prophets only as aids towards the Eternal Source of Prophecy, are the true imitators of those holy men. When we sympathise with God, and with the inmost yearnings of His devout servants, we can afford to smile, though mournfully, at the invectives of misguided zeal, if it blindly regard us as enemies of God. But let the songs of praise or of sacred complaint, which the pious of past ages have bequeathed to us, nourish our spirits and link us to them : let us hope and seek that the life of God may be in us, as it was in them, a guide into truth and an energy for action; then shall our daily work be daily joy, and we shall eat angel's food.—*F. W. Newman.*

Religion and Dogma.

LET us have done with theological refinements. There is an excuse for the Fathers, because the heretics forced them to define particular points; but every definition is a misfortune, and for us to persevere in the same way is sheer folly. Is no man to be admitted to grace who does not know how the Father differs from the Son and both from the Spirit? or how the nativity of the Son differs from the procession of the Spirit? Unless I forgive my brother his sins against me, God will not forgive me my sins. Unless I have a pure heart—unless I put away envy, hate, pride, avarice, lust, I shall not see God. But a man is not damned because he cannot tell whether the Spirit has one principle or two. Has he the fruits of the Spirit? That is the question. Is he patient, kind, good, gentle, modest, temperate, chaste? Inquire if you will but do not define. True religion is peace, and we cannot have peace unless we leave the conscience unshackled on obscure points on which certainty is impossible. We hear now of questions being referred to the next Æcumenical Council (A.D. 1512)—better a great deal refer them to doomsday. Time was, when a man's faith was looked for in his life, not in the Articles which he professed. Necessity first brought Articles upon us, and ever since we have refined and refined till Christianity has become a thing of words and creeds. Articles increase—sincerity vanishes away—contention grows hot and charity grows cold.—*Erasmus.*

Moral Courage.

LEARN, from the earliest days, to insure your principles against the perils of ridicule: you can no more exercise your reason if you live in the constant dread of laughter, than you can enjoy life if you are in the constant terror of death. If you think it right to differ from the times, and to make a stand for any valuable point of morals, do it, however rustic, however antiquated, however pedantic it may appear;—do it, not for insolence, but *seriously* and *grandly*,—as a man who wore a soul of his own in his bosom, and did not wait till it was breathed into him by the breath of fashion. Let men call you mean, if you know you are just; hypocritical, if you know you are honestly religious; pusillanimous, if you feel that you are firm; resistance soon converts unprincipled wit into sincere respect; and no after time can tear from you those feelings which every man carries within him who has made a noble and successful exertion in a virtuous cause.—*Sydney Smith.*

The Religion of Childhood.

THERE is something very deplorable, when we reflect upon it, in the way in which mankind in all ages have sought to take by violence that kingdom of heaven whose golden gates are ever open to him who knocks thereat in filial entreaty. From lands and times when they tortured the body to days like our own in England (and elsewhere,) when they only strive to wrench the affections and distort the judgment, the same all-pervading error may be traced. Naturally men who have thus acted in the case of their own souls have no scruple to act so in their children's behalf; and to drill a young mind to religion is conceived of from first to last as a difficult task, to be achieved only by constant coercion of the spontaneous sentiments and the enforcement of a duty naturally distasteful. It is an immense evidence of the readiness of the human heart to love the Divine Father, that, with the training usually given in this Christian land so many are still found to resist its natural consequences and to love God *in spite* of their education.

If a mother wished to make her boy grow up full of affection and respect for a father in India or Australia, how would she set about it? Would she first start with the notion that it would be a very hard thing to do, and contrary to the child's nature? Would she insist on it morning, noon, and night as his severe duty? Would she talk of the absent parent in a conventional voice, and make addressing by letter, or doing anything for him a sterner task than any other? Lastly, would she perpetually tell the child that when the father came home, if he had not been obedient and was not affectionate to him, the father would turn him out of the house and bury him alive? Are these the methods by which a wife and mother's instincts would lead her to act? Surely we have only to imagine the reverse of these—the popular processes of religious instruction—to find the true method for guiding children's hearts to love their Father in heaven. A child must NOT think it a hard thing, a task of fear and awe, a notion to be dragged into its lessons and its play to make them more irksome and less joyous, that it OUGHT to be feeling what it does not feel.

Above all things the idea that such a thing is possible as ultimate and final rejection by God ought never so much as to be presented to the mind of a child. A child can very well understand punishment; nor does it at all love the less, but rather the more, those who punish it justly and for its good. But punishment extending into infinity beyond justice—punishment whose aim and result is the evil and not the good of the sufferer—this is an idea utterly opposed to all the instincts of childhood. Of course the poor little mind takes in the shocking doctrine, presented to it like poison from its mother's hand. But the results are fatal. In one it is indifference; in another dislike; in another an atrophy of the religious nature; in a fourth a fever of terror from which the escape is only by casting off all belief. Even when the most fortunate end is reached and the man throws away in adult life the doctrine taught him in childhood, even then for long years the shadow remains over him. We return to early FEARS as well as early loves many a time before we relinquish them for ever. The parent who would give his child a truly religious education must make it his care to ensure him (as he would ensure him against listening to far lesser blasphemies) from ever even hearing of an Eternal Hell. This done, we firmly believe that, if he himself love God he will find it the easiest of lessons to teach his child to love Him likewise. We must remember this : God's voice speaks in the heart of a child as in the heart of a man—nay, far more clearly than in the heart of a disobedient and world-encrusted man. To teach a child *whose* voice that is, to make him identify it with the Giver of all good, the Creator of this world (so fresh and lovely in his young eyes!)—to do this is to give him religion. And the religion thus given will grow into fuller, maturer life, till it rises to the reality of prayer, the full blessedness of Divine communion.—*F. P. Cobbe*.

Poetry.

If all around us yield to change—
The woods, the streams, the mountain range;
Shall man affect to be
Unchangeable as He who guides
The flight of time, and stems the tides
From all eternity?

Rather a lesson let it teach—
How frail at best is human reach,
Unless the Power that moves
Our inward being should impress
The stamp of His own steadfastness
On whomsoe'er He loves.

Ah! give me grace to be content
With what I have, and ne'er lament
Because my means are scant:
For riches are but apt at best
To leave the soul but little rest,
And urge to further want.

And do I play the hypocrite
With my own soul while thus I write,
And simulate denial?
I'll trust at least I may be found
In time of trouble whole and sound
When put upon my trial.

Yet human impulse, what is it
Else than a fond and vain conceit
Indulged at any moment,
And suffered oft to lead astray
The mind too weak to curb the sway
That leads to after torment.

Oh! may I keep a jealous eye
O'er mind infirm, and ne'er rely
On hopes without foundation,
Which rise and fall with every wind
That agitates the human mind—
A profitless sensation. Q.

As a fond Mother o'er her children bends
In melting love, and clasps one to her breast—
One at her feet, one on her knee she tends,
Whilst to another's brow her lips are press'd;
And 'mid their sports and murmurs still attends
To every varied fanciful request;
Whispers to one—to one a glance she sends,
And smiles or chides, in all her love's confess'd.
So watches over us the Sovereign power
Of Providence : this comforts, that supplies,

Hears all, and doth on all His mercy shower;
And if some grace or favour He denies,
'Tis but to teach the Soul her prayer to pour,
Or by denial graciously replies.

D. G.

Correspondence.

Successful Delusion.

To the Editor.

SIR.—A Catholic priest, far ahead of his co-religionists, writing to the *Unitarian Herald*, observes, "but the Catholic Church can at least produce what is either a miracle or a stupendous fact, it *exists* in spite of all its inherent weakness; after 1800 years it has succeeded; it alone succeeded."

Delusion, according to this writer, like wine, is all the better the older it is. The blood of St. Januarius, to the eternal disgrace of the Catholic Church, has been allowed to delude the Neapolitan lazzaroni every time Vesuvius begged to be heard, for centuries. Is the humbug more respectable or less disgraceful this century than the last? Besides, by making antiquity a merit, the writer shelves his own Church to the exaltation of Hinduism and Buddhism, and suppresses the Holy Scriptures in favour of the paranas and tantras that in point of antiquity run a respectable race with even Chinese antediluvianism.

The Catholic Church succeeded, and why? Because it entered into an unholy alliance with temporal princes to plunder and oppress all the peoples of the earth—to trample out opinion with the iron heel of oppression in blood and flame. It is by such means as these that she has prolonged a discreditable existence, to the disgust of heaven and earth alike.

The Catholic Church has succeeded, and how? It is true she boasts the enlightened patronage of Spain and Portugal, a few Hibernian palludians, and the painted whores and banditti of Italy; otherwise she is losing ground on every hand. Austria has torn up the Concordat and Hungary declines to allow the Pope to make himself ridiculous by the publication of the infallible dogma within her borders. A hundred bishops have protested against the servility of their episcopal brethren who consented to write down the Pope, after the fashion of Dogberry of old. The penultimate dogma asserted a conception without sin—the last, a conception without sense—the weakness that precedes death and dissolution. So may it be!
Veritas.

Editorial Notices.

THE cost of printing and publishing the *Free Religious Press* is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A.F.R.P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription : Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—H.R.—J.R.—Subscriber.—J.W.—W.C.—received.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and
Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, Oct. 3, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.
Vol. I., No. 10. November 7, 1870.

Notes.

It is not denied that our criticisms on what is being said and done in ecclesiastical circles are frequently, as events will have it, but never, we hope, unjustly or even censoriously, reprimanding in tone. No such unpleasant necessity, however, awaits us with regard to the address recently delivered by the Rev. John G. Fraser, on assuming office as Chairman to the Congregational Union of New South Wales for the ensuing year. On the contrary, we have to thank Mr. Fraser for the fine catholicity of spirit which pervades his really admirable—we had almost said Channing-like—utterances; for his thoughtful appreciation of the religious demands and yearnings of the age; for his protest against subscription to articles of faith as a basis for church-fellowship; for his outspoken willingness to subserve the ecclesiastical to the moral with a view to the abolition of the sectarian divisions which have hitherto so sadly perplexed and embittered our human relationships; and for his generous and tolerant attitude towards those whom he speaks of—under misconception, we think—as "aiming to destroy Christianity." Mr. Fraser says:—"The conviction is gaining ground that subscription to elaborate creeds affords no real security for unity of belief." Again: "We are all more or less in danger of having Christianity driven out of our hearts by Churchism." And again: "We must be just as regards the excellencies of others, for Christian justice is the first step to brotherly love. . . . I do not hesitate to say that I value Congregationalism highly. I believe its great principle most thoroughly; but I say with all my heart, may the time soon come when the name of Congregationalism may be known no more, if it will hasten the time when men shall say no longer, 'See how Christians can hate each other,' but be able to say with truth once more,—'See how these Christians love.'" With Mr. Fraser's leading principle, which is fairly represented by the statements just quoted, our concurrence is, we need hardly say, both cordial and complete. We emphatically repudiate any and every form of Christianity which, taking its stand on some speciality of doctrine, would limit the range of its sympathies to those who *believe*, instead of owning its fellowship with the good and noble, irrespective of sect. The wonder is that Mr. Fraser should, in the latter part of his address, so lose sight of this principle as to treat a denial of the supernatural as a disqualification for the Christian name. He speaks of Rationalism, which he evidently identifies with a repudiation of the supernatural, as the "form of active and direct opposition to Christianity, now most prevalent," and traces it to "man's aversion to spiritual things and his still greater aversion to submit himself to their power." What we are to understand by these vague generalities, it is hard to say. But Mr. Fraser must surely be aware that there are multitudes of devout men in the present day to whom the supernatural element of Christianity, as popularly taught, is an insuperable stumbling-block, but whose admiration for the person and work of Jesus is at the same time not less profound than his own. To propose to exclude such from the "Church of Christ" is surely to misread the sublime confession that "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him."

A CLEVER advocate's rule of action is a thing proverbial. He will adroitly take this side or that side with equal *aplomb*, but, as old Trapbois would say, only for a proper consideration. If his religious sympathies are touched, and the doctrines of his church assailed by a side wind, his eloquence is wont to be something above par, and to present at times the nearest approach that may be to sincerity. But somehow or another we live in an age when facts, not opinions, are chiefly dwelt upon, and the however clever and spruce opponent of the Divorce Bill must see how he has given us little else beside a *rechauffé* of objections far more lucidly, and perhaps even more eloquently, expressed in the pages of our parliamentary Hansard. Still Mr. Dalley's speech is not without merit; and some of its points are especially remarkable, as, for example, where he compliments the venerable prelacy of the Church of England on their cordially uniting with the hierarchy of Rome in what he is pleased to style "conscientious obligations." We feel ourselves unable, not to say indisposed, to follow the honourable gentleman through the farrago of his speech—his onslaught on the current literature of the day, and his moral timidities; but would simply remind him of the celebrated Mrs. Partington, her broom and the Atlantic Ocean. We are given to understand that our worthy advocate is still "fancy free," and since he tells us he "left unsaid much that he would have desired to say," we may charitably suppose his best things would have come last, and so give him the benefit of the doubt. For ourselves the precedent of an old country's legislation has considerable weight. And we are not tempted to forego our opinions of the general advantage of a Divorce Bill though discountenanced by either Roman or Protestant. Church, and however inconspicuous, or even objectionable, the instrument by whom it has been submitted to Parliament.

REALLY his reverence of Melbourne is quite shocking. He talks of the dressing and undressing of young ladies at some recent confirmation at St. Kilda as he would speak of a female athlete, or some Spartan nudity.

The white uniform of the confirmed, together with the absence of mantles and shawls, is too much for him. All this white robing is, so we are told, "a silly kind of symbolism." His reverence does not approve of symbolism except in his charges and addresses, when, by his peculiar method of handling his subject, it carries its own antidote in irrelievable dullness. The Bishop is well aware of the common practice in England of wearing white dresses and flowing veils during confirmation. He gives, however, no heed either to clime or circum-stance; but *sic volo sic jubeo* seems to be the motto, and the growth of true holiness is to be henceforth patent to the episcopal eye under modest merino or a homely gingham. This conduct of the prelate's in giving pain to another is unquestionably no part of that charity that thinketh no evil. It is nothing else than petty tyranny in its most oppressive form—rude to the sex of those whose girlish age and devotional approach should have taught him reverence; out of all taste in its implied reflection on the parents who sent them up or the teachers who had prepared them; and, lastly, not at all in conformity with that oath at consecration "to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that which he shall be persuaded may be *concluded* and *proved* by the same." As for the authority by which Confirmation is administered, the less said about it the better. It does the recipient no harm, if it does him no good. No one need be confirmed in order to receive the communion, for all the glosses in the Church Catechism or elsewhere. And as for the imposition of hands in Confirmation, it is after all but an imposition of another kind which, however fondly clung to hitherto by the episcopate, has most assuredly its only basis either on the *laissez aller* principle, on respectable prejudice, or on simple ignorance.

It will be remembered that our last number contained an article on Old Testament Morality, the main object of which was to show that the prevalent habit of regarding the whole of the Scriptures as moral and religious lessons sent by God is inconsistent with a belief in the benevolence of the Deity, with the teaching of Jesus, and with the dictates of our reason and conscience. Whether our view is right or wrong it is at all events in harmony with John's words—"the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Yet for this attempt to prove that the work of Christianity is sadly impeded by the shackles of Judaism, that singular paper, the *Protestant Standard*, denounces us in language as energetic, if not as sublime and poetical, as that of the prophets of old. Of argument, it is almost needless to say, our contemporary offers nothing. With the exception of some not very complimentary observations on the writer, whom he describes as a "blasphemer," an "infidel," and a "slogger," the notice consists of a number of quotations from our article, judiciously garbled, perhaps on Bishop Burnet's principle that "too much light is hurtful to weak eyes." We do not complain of attacks of this kind which will certainly serve rather than injure our cause, but we are totally at a loss to understand what objection—such as would satisfy a reasonable man—can be urged against the views we have put forward. For instance, the editor of the *Standard* is indignant at our assertion that Jehovah—the God whom we suppose he identifies with one of the persons of the Trinity—instigated the Jews to rob the Egyptians of their jewellery, and afterwards to slaughter the unoffending Canaanites. Now he either believes this, or he does not. If not, then he must admit that the Bible is unreliable as a history. If he does—be it so. But surely atheism is preferable to such a creed.

SOME three months ago an event took place which has thrown all sound churchmen in England into a state of unprecedented consternation. Indignation meetings have been held, protests have been sent in to Convocation, dismayed priests have been rushing frantically into print, and all utter the same cry of anger, sorrow, shame, and despair. And what, it will be asked, is the occasion of all this godly hubbub? Have the clergy suddenly become alive to the scandals which disgrace their church—such as its chronic internal discord, its well-endowed sinecurism, its open and shameless trafficking in the cure of souls, or the shocking atheism of some of its deans and chapters, who previous to the election of a bishop pray for divine guidance in their choice, knowing well that it is Gladstone and not God whom they must and will obey? No—far worse than this: the ancient abbey of Westminster has been desecrated! To have buried within its precincts the Unitarian Charles Dickens was indeed a cruel blow, but there followed something yet more fearful. A living Unitarian, Dr. Vance Smith, one of the scholars appointed to revise the New Testament, has with his colleagues partaken of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at its altar! To add to the agony of these champions of the "honour of their incarnate Lord" several of the bishops seem rather gratified than otherwise at this "insult to the redeemer and the Archbishop of Canterbury unmistakably snubs them. True they have themselves admitted to the Eucharist some who illustrate a Christlike life mainly by contrast, but then salvation is by faith, not by works of the law, and that regular communicant, Lord Steyne, though loose in his morals, is a sound homoousian, whereas, this son of Belial, Dr. Smith, is a notorious homoiousian. A calamity like this is not to be repaired by ordinary means, so a writer in the *Church Times* proposes that a special service be held on a day appointed by the leading clergy of the Catholic party. "in reparation to the great dishonour done to the Blessed Sacrament in Westminster Abbey.".....Or "perhaps in the present case," says the same writer, "a day of fasting and humiliation would be more suitable." For ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that the sacramental inauguration in Westminster Abbey of a purely literary work, was a clear indication that the Revisionists were, in at least one

respect, unfitted for the task they were chosen to accomplish, and that Dr. G. V. Smith would have done himself great credit if instead of humbly accompanying the great ecclesiastics to Westminster Abbey to manipulate bread and wine prior to the splitting of Greek particles, he had stoutly pro-tested against the proceeding as wholly uncalled for.

WE note with much pleasure that the Vicar and other clergy of Stratford-on-Avon have entered upon a vigorous crusade against that scandal of modern civilisation—that mockery of woe—the conventional funeral. "With a view," they say, "first to Christianise, secondly, to cheapen, our funerals, and to emancipate the poor, the rich, and those poorest of the poor, the respectable gentry of limited means, from the miserable thralldom of public opinion under which they groan, and to abolish that stringent *undertakers' ritual* which they seem powerless to shake off, the clergy of Stratford-on-Avon have adopted three measures which they hope will gradually effect a change for the better." These are, briefly, to do away with (1) expense and pomp of conveyance, (2) feasting in the house of the deceased, and (3) the burdensome and costly black appendages, and presents of gloves, scarfs, etc., to the officiating clergyman. What thinking being could fail to be horror-stricken on beholding for the first time the ghastly procession of mutes, plumes, and black carriages wending its way to the churchyard? What trace can be discovered in all this of Christian faith in the resurrection of the just? What even of real sorrow for the departed? It tells of little else than blank despair, or hypocrisy of the most revolting kind. The destroying angel will indeed seldom come without bringing sadness and sorrow, but to a sensitive mind the tyranny of the "funeral ritualists" invests death with many artificial horrors. It is a remarkable fact that the protest of the Stratford clergy was almost immediately followed by the publication of Charles Dickens' will, which contains the following passage bearing on the subject, and shewing that "unconsecrated intellect" may sympathise heartily with a genuine Christian work. "I emphatically direct that I be buried in an inexpensive, unostentatious, and strictly private manner. That no public announcement be made of the time or place of my burial, that at the utmost three plain mourning coaches be employed, and that those who attend my funeral wear no scarf, cloak, black bow, long hatband, or other such revolting absurdity."

THE readers of the *Herald* have recently been treated to an exhibition of theological child's-play in the form of letters upon that apparently exhaustless topic, the Beast of the Revelation. But the only impression such effusions are likely to leave on the mind of anyone who has the patience to wade through them is that the Apocalypse is a work of surpassing importance, given for our spiritual guidance, but that no two interpreters can agree with regard to its drift. Dr. Barry, for example, disgusted at the "sensational charlatanism" of the "uninspired prophets" who bewilder and delude the weak-minded by their "absurdities and contradictions purporting to be based on scripture," vigorously protests against identifying Louis Napoleon or any other modern celebrity with the "Beast" which the Seer of Patmos had in his mind's eye when, with the evils that had befallen his country as well as his faith pressing heavily upon his soul, he allegorically threatened Imperial Rome with the impending vengeance of insulted heaven. So far Dr. Barry is no doubt in the right. It strikes us, however, that his charge against Mr. Baxter and others of "tampering with Holy Writ" may fairly be turned on himself when, after scouting the notion that the Apocalypse contains allusions to Louis Napoleon, he naively attempts the quite as unaccomplishable feat of finding allusions to Jesus of Nazareth in the Old Testament. "His first coming," says Dr. Barry, "is the grand theme of the Old Testament." And again : "Our faith in the Messiah rests largely on the fulfilment of that which went before, of type, of vision, or of verbal promise—to Him give all the prophets witness." Now we may presume Dr. Barry's faith in truth to be greater than even his faith in the Messiah, and, in the interest of truth, we, therefore, request him to name a "single Old Testament prediction," as Mr. W. R. Greg forcibly puts it, "clearly referring to Jesus Christ, *intended by the utterers of it to relate to him*, prefiguring his character and career, and manifestly fulfilled in his appearance on earth." This, we are persuaded, he cannot do, at least without a misrendering of the obvious import of language—without a "tampering with Holy Writ"—which, if resorted to in the case of any other book, would promptly be treated with the contempt it deserves. Another writer in the *Herald*, Presbyterian Anglicanus, maintains that the Apocalypse foretells the destruction of Jerusalem, and when asked how this can be, seeing that the latter event, as Dr. Barry affirms, occurred more than twenty years anterior to the date of the Apocalypse, boldly maintains that St. John wrote his mysterious work in A.D. 67, and has the impudence to quote, in support of his assertion, Ewald, De Wette and L'cke,—German critics who deny altogether the authenticity of the book! Presbyterian Anglicanus might, we think, prove his case much more neatly in some such style as the following :—The Apocalypse clearly points to the overthrow of Jerusalem, and therefore must have been written before it; and the fulfilment of its predictions shortly afterwards affords a triumphant vindication of its prophetic character. Carnal men may not be convinced by this reasoning, which is by no means uncommon among divines, but they should remember that the symbol of orthodox logic is *the circle*.

IN the course of his argument against the "day-year" theory of interpretation, Presbyterian Anglicanus refers to a large number of prophecies which have beyond all doubt been already fulfilled. The following may be taken as a specimen :—"When God said, Ye shall wander in the wilderness forty years, he uttered a prophecy which,

as every body knows, was literally fulfilled." Verified predictions of this kind are, it is said, so numerous that they ought to set at rest the question of the inspiration of the books in which they are contained. We doubt, however, whether our orthodox divines have ever brought forward as clear a case of prophecy fulfilled to the letter as some which were uttered by an old hermit in the ninth century. Thus in a divine trance this old recluse exclaims (see Thomson's *Alfred*) :

"In this Edward's time
That pod-like youth remark, his eldest hope
Who gives new lustre to the name he bears—
A hero ere a man. I see him now
On Cressy's glorious plain!
A captive king, the rival of his arms,
I see adorn his triumph!"

How literally this wonderful prophecy was fulfilled in the *Black Prince* everyone acquainted with the barest outlines of English history well knows. Again, the hermit tells us that a great queen shall arise who

... .."Shall raise Britannia's naval power,
Shall greatly ravish from insulting Spain
The world-commanding sceptre of the deep."

With these examples before him who will dare to assert, that the gift of prophecy, as well as of working miracles, had died out in the dark ages, or that the author of the "Seasons" was not an inspired writer?

SINCE our last issue the Rev. Charles Clarke, of Melbourne, has on several occasions preached to large and approving audiences in Sydney, and we desire, in the remarks we are about to make, to do him justice. He is in truth a preacher of merit. His rhetorical powers are undoubtedly considerable. His vocalisation, though thin, is extremely musical, and his delivery, if occasionally marred by affectation, is always telling. He has a tolerably firm and comprehensive grasp of poetic imagery, and his command of apt and appropriate language happily exempts him from the trick—so common among ordinary preachers—of indiscriminately quoting from the Bible for want of something better to say. It may be that a bediamonded finger and an enormous bunch of charms suspended from the waistcoat button-hole—suit as they may the stage-actor or the street-dandy—are scarcely consistent with the office of the Christian preacher; but these little conceits may, in the case of Mr. Clarke, be overlooked on the score of his sensible repudiation of that time-honoured inanity—the white tie. As for his theology, it seems to be of the sort generally known in orthodox circles as "winning." His message or theme is not of the Eternal Wrath which relentlessly pursues the hardened sinner beyond the confines of this life into the unutterable terrors of the next, but of the Everlasting Love which tenderly yearns for the redemption of the erring, and has its one grief in the refusal of the sinner to avail himself of the proffered salvation. This sort of Christianity is, of course, incomparably superior to the hell-fire rant which unfortunately still forms the entire stock-in-trade of so many preachers, and is therefore calculated to do a deal of good. As preached, however, by Mr. Clarke, it is sadly weakened and vitiated by his inordinate Christ-worship. We are not forgetting that the Trinitarian theory involves the investment of Jesus with divine attributes and honours; but what we complain of is that with Mr. Clarke—to judge from the five or six sermons he preached in Sydney—it deifies Jesus to an extent, and in a manner, which seriously deflects the thoughts and affections of the worshipper from God himself as the proper object of adoration. The prayers we heard him offer up in Bathurst-street Chapel were addressed not to God *through* Jesus, as is usual in Trinitarian places of worship, but *to* Jesus directly, and with little if any allusion to God at all. Again, in his sermon delivered in the same Chapel, based on the words, "The Master is come, and calleth for thee," Mr. Clarke eloquently descanted upon Jesus as (1) our strength, (2) our insight, (3) our assurance, (4) our peace—as, in a word, our everything; but he had nothing to say—the deity, in fact, was not alluded to from end to end of his discourse—of the solemn and mysterious relationship subsisting between the spirit of man and the dread ineffable Spirit of the Universe which must be both understood and felt before worship can become a veritable communion with the Unseen, and a veritable preparation for the duties and responsibilities of life. Now, we cannot help thinking that many Trinitarian Christians will agree with us when we say that Christ-worship, when carried to this pitch, becomes a serious religious offence. For our own part, we go further and say that it involves an idolatrous substitution of the creature for the Creator—of the shadow of being for its substance.

Revision of the Bible.

AND so at last after the trifling and tergiversation of half a century and more we are to have a revision of the Bible. The authorised version of above two centuries and a half is at length pronounced defective, and *To Biblion*—the book of books—is to come out like an old friend with a new face. Interpretation is as it were on its last legs—driven to bay—must either stand fast or succumb. Suggestions that have been hitherto insolently pooh-poohed have now to be respectfully met and fairly answered. But singular enough we notice how the call for revision comes not so much from the multitude, who after the turmoil and religious heartburnings of three generations, care really very little about the matter,—however willing to make some concession to order and decorum,—but from the very clergy themselves, who can hardly fail seeing how they are daily losing ground in public estimation, and how something more is wanting to constitute a clergyman beside a white tie and a stand-up collar. Hence their struggles to redeem a false step, and by all sorts of petty manoeuvres, such as Synods, Sustentation Acts, and what not, to bring themselves before the public eye. For intolerant as they ever are in carrying a doctrinal point or an uncial reading, they have no armour proof against cold contempt, and the indifference that frets them like a galling blister. And if we now feel small sympathy for that professional nervousness which is shewing itself somewhat ludicrously among the reported reviser's, it is because we feel how little all such are entitled to our regard and reverence who only come forward now because it is their policy so to do, and whose co-operation is notoriously not so much the result of conviction as of a yielding to outward pressure and expediency.

We would advance nothing unfairly or indistinctly. And in pointing to the clergy of the so-called Establishment as the inveterate opponents of any, however the smallest, revision, we need only direct attention to that episcopal influence in the House of Lords that has ever hitherto fallen like some noxious blight on the religious strivings of more earnest souls. And when from time to time a little body of more than ordinarily ardent spirits would respectfully suggest the need of some revision either of Bible or Liturgy, they found that no amount of argument, no weight of reasonable representation, served them in the least, since they were invariably battling against a foregone determination, and assailing a stronghold of class prejudice that force alone could bring to reason. United in close antagonism against all concession, while their squabbles among themselves became a scandal abroad, the clergy have long ceased possessing either the love or reverence of their congregations. One disability after another have they accordingly entailed upon themselves from the earlier period of the eighteenth century when their Convocation was bedusted, like a swarm of fretful insects, in the abolition of the Corporation and Test Acts, in the wresting of Catholic Emancipation, in the Commutation of Tithes Bill, in the more recent dissolution of the Irish Church, in the National Education Bill, and last, though by no means least, while looking nearer home, we behold the withdrawal of all State Aid, together with a fast growing resolution on the part of congregations not only to pay their own pastors at their own discretion, but to appoint them too; and by so doing relieve themselves at once and for all of a fungus-growing episcopacy whose cost is, and has ever been, in a ratio inverse to its use.

But what are these revisers about to do? For ourselves we can scarcely conceive a *lectio vexata* wherein opinions are likely to be at all unanimous. The Bible is a very peculiar book. Look at it as a translation from the Hebrew; and in the total absence of any other Hebrew work, it must needs be, so far as it can be, its own interpreter. It is not like one of our standard Classics of Greece or of Home, where the sense of any word or passage of more than ordinary intricacy may be gathered from the use of the like word in kindred and perhaps contemporaneous authors; but criticism comes to a standstill, is lost in the darkness of ambiguous phraseology, and all it can do is to grope about, now giving one meaning, now another, as peculiar and as varied as the features of its expositors. As for the Septuagint version it is only of any value so far as it shews the system of interpretation ruling at the period of the Ptolemies. Its authority is small, beside which hundreds of passages might be culled varying most remarkably from the authorised version; and now and then even verses and whole chapters are left out—as in the books of Joshua and Job—from some cause or other not worth dwelling on. Then, again, as to the Vulgate of Jerome, the authorised version of Scripture in England previous to the Reformation, while confessedly it is the work of a zealous and industrious spirit, yet swarms with such an amount of generally admitted false translations and broad misconceptions, as even the worthy saint's *Prologus Galeatus* has ever been insufficient to establish. In the old Italic version we have nothing more than a translation of the Greek Septuagint. But even these versions, with all their errors, are less harmful than is a tampering with a text, or foisting in whole epistles in the New Testament, with the insidious object of impressing a tenet or bolstering up a doctrine.

But passing by the testimony of Campbell, who in his first Dissertation on the Gospels remarks on the singular poverty of the Hebrew language,—how the greater portion of its words are equivocal, and in their

signification entirely uncertain,—let us quote a letter of the late Dr. Arnold to his friend the Chevalier Bunsen, no contemptible critic in European estimation (Life i., 412.)—"I have been trying to learn Hebrew, but am discouraged by my notions of the uncertainty of the best knowledge hitherto gained about it. do you think it possible to understand Hebrew well, that is as we understand Greek, where the language is more precise and more clear than even our own could be? Conceive the luminous clearness of Demosthenes owing to his perfect use of an almost perfect language, and our complete understanding of it. But the interpretation of the Hebrew Prophets seems to me, judging from the different commentaries, to be almost guess work, and I doubt whether it can ever be otherwise. Then the criticism of the Old Testament—the dates of the several books—their origin, &c., all seems to me undecided, and what Wolf and Niebuhr have done for Greece and Borne seems sadly wanted for Judæa."

When men begin to babble about uncials and the comparative value of manuscripts—the extraordinary fidelity of a Masoretic text and the veracious character of an Alexandrian version, we may exclaim, perhaps, like Dominie Sampson,—"Prodigious!" while we raise our eyes at such marvels of talent. Still, for all that, they fail to convince us. We want something better than pedantry and book-learning. We long for the expression of such an amount of unanimity in probably very few essentials of faith, as shall not only confirm our own religious views, but equally influence the duty and well-being of others. Without looking for any suspension of nature's operating power assuming, so to say, the character of a miracle, we would, if not too chimerical an idea, aspire after such an agreement in religious sentiment as might from its wholeness powerfully impress us with the idea that the embracing any tenets whatsoever, is, after all said and done, very subservient to our every day duty to one another.

This would seem, however, at present a somewhat Utopian idea. So in the meanwhile our faith is to be handed over like some old and tarnished painting, to be carefully scraped, retouched, varnished and framed. The picture has become so smoked and begrimed by inartistic daubs and injudicious pigments, that it needs an episcopal eye to detect its merits, a diaconal "reunion" to compound the colours, and a select corps of first-rate clerical artists to lay them on. It is true we have not now as we had in the early years of the seventeenth century, a silly Jamie of "no-bishop-no-king" notoriety, to give us the benefit of his deep research, and—as one of his worthy archbishops had it—the advantage of "his divine inspiration and his specially being moved by the finger of God!" But if we have no royal fool, we have plenty of meaner parentage who would as soon concoct a faith as they would mix a salad; and if they hesitated themselves to swallow the ingredients they would have small compunction in palming them on public appetite.

But hearing so much about a *textus receptus*, and assuming it to be, as we take it, a version that is to command general acceptance, we are anxious to learn what a *textus receptus* can have to recommend it. What amount of consent shall sanction its approval, what deficiency of uncial, patristic, or other testimony is to determine the true ring of the theological metal, and to stamp it with the hall-mark of this very reverend guild? Or, if opinion runs neck-and-neck, so that no side preponderate, who shall give the casting vote that shall saddle us with a belief in the same manner as we might be subject to a provincial tax? But that parliament now-a-days wholly ignores having anything to do with such an *olla podrida*, this *textus receptus* might be promulgated like a state law, when it might at least command some respect and notice; whereas now, under the sole auspices of its proposed collaborateurs, it is likely to be but a very indifferent and unheeded compilation of heaven knows what, to be believed heaven knows how!

As for any concord, or kindly consideration for the feelings of those who religiously differ from them, the past; may safely be taken as a reflex of the future; for the party instincts of this arrogant sect are ever seen to run counter to the educational and other prejudices of those about them. Observe the common every day intercourse of life between the clergyman of a hitherto petted denomination and the nonconformists, whether exhibited on the platform or in the more private gatherings, whether accident shall now and then bring them together, or interests affecting the whole profession shall seem to call for some general expression of opinion. It would appear almost unnecessary to dwell on what so many must have seen—the self-satisfied bearing of him of the Establishment, his soft and smooth exterior brightened with a smile as warm and as cheery as wintry sunshine; the under current of nervous techiness that bristles with self-conceit; the semi-comic terror of committing some solecism either of conduct or of expression that shall lay him open to the remark and ridicule of those about him, and an ill-managed con-tempt of the more expansive ideas and enlarged views he finds gathering round him at every quarter. It is the adventurous, uncalculating, and spontaneous energy of the practical nonconformist that throws his own moral cowardice so unmistakeably into the shade. And he likes it as little now as he ever did. The feeling that existed between these two parties under the reign of the virgin queen is now as rife as ever. It is not one iota diminished. History tells us with undeviating testimony in letters graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock how, when hundreds of ministers were ruthlessly cast out from their homes and launched upon the world maltreated and "destitute, the con-forming clergy devised every means that either craft or malignity could suggest to preclude all hopes of return. Foremost in the persecution of

his day was Archbishop Whitgift, not inaptly styled by Hallam "a very gladiator of theological controversy, but whose noted ignorance of, and want of taste in, classic lore is not wholly unexemplified in some of the higher ecclesiastics of our southern hemisphere, but who possibly make up for what they lack in science and understanding by their full possession of a "consecrated intellect." These, together with their subordinates, are not the men upon whose sleeves we must pin our faith, or whose, revision of the Bible shall leave nothing to wish for. If they have the guile of the serpent they have not the practical wisdom of Balaam's ass, that at least spake once to the purpose, nor can they, like' so many modern Joshuas, hope to stay the passage of that intellectual progress, as the son of Nun, we are told, made sun and moon to stand still in the earlier times of Israel.

But why not leave the Bible altogether alone, when, as we have already remarked, it cannot, with the scant materials we possess, be bettered. It is a very excellent book as it stands, and deserves a better fate than to be tortured and dislocated by ignorance. What the very first rate biblical criticism of the continent has failed accomplishing, namely, clearing up the many difficulties of scripture exposition, may well be let alone by the shallow literates of the present day, who are really but as pigmies to the earlier giants of criticism. Why not, we repeat it, let the Bible stay as it is. It is one of the few remaining models of our good sound wholesome Saxon. As yet it is sullied by no meretricious ornaments of language, and may well bear its place with Shakspeare, Milton, and the Pilgrim's Progress. Besides, it is more or less associated with the earliest memories of most of us, and its quaint and simple tales, seldom devoid of some instruction or other, scarcely charm us less in maturer years, though we may neither be inclined to view it as a plenarily inspired composition, nor to invest it with those lofty attributes wherewith the injudicious and over-zealous are so wont to encumber it.

Should imprudence, however, and vainglory proceed so far as to induce our would-be revisers to persevere, they should at least bear in mind there is a sentence on record which, of what import soever in the estimation of others, should be (if they are consistent) of no secondary importance in theirs. In the last chapter of Revelation, in fact, the last chapter of the Bible, it is said—"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." With this religious, and, apparently to us, crucial dilemma staring them in the face, confirmed as strongly by Deuteronomy as by Revelation, we leave our reverend (we cannot say revered) revisers to flounder on as they best may, wishing them meanwhile more wit, and, may we add, a great deal more honesty. Quilibet.

Prophecy.

THE Sacred Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, are constructed on the hypothesis that the world we inhabit embraces the whole of the habitable creation—that God created this world and this world only. The sun and moon, it is true, achieved "honourable mention," but the dignity of even mere satellites is not conceded to them. They are two great lights, the one to rule the day, the other to rule the night. The stars, too, are set in the firmament merely to give light upon the earth.

This limited view of the matter had a tendency to produce, and it did produce, an erroneous conception of the relationship between God and man; and its effects are only too evident in the pages of the sacred narrative. The only rational creature on the only world that God had created, man was prone not only to entertain a very exaggerated notion of his own importance, but to associate therewith an equally erroneous estimate of the position and attributes of his maker; and the result of this is, that the Scriptures teem with instances of unwarrantable familiarity with the deity—witness, for example, the profane story of Jacob's wrestling—on the part of the sacred writers.

Ancient philosophy, long antecedent to Christianity, had speculated in the doctrine of a plurality of worlds; but it was reserved to modern times to convert speculation into certainty, and to make manifest with the confidence of mathematical precision that there are other worlds besides our own. The telescope has enabled us to extend our acquaintance with Heaven's vast concave, and has introduced us to other suns and other systems, and to worlds unnumbered and innumerable; whilst the astronomer captivates and overwhelms us with the magnificence of his descriptions of their magnitudes, their distances, and their orbits. The distance of the Moon from the Earth is tripled by the diameter of the Sun, whilst Sirius, the dog star, is sixteen times larger than the solar orb. And yet the empyrean in all its unfathomable depths is studded with such as these, and in numbers beyond the power of words to express or the imagination to conceive. Herschel, looking through his celebrated telescope in the direction of the Milky Way, described the fixed stars as they appeared to him, as "scattered in millions like glittering dust." Still, though in number and magnitude inconceivable, these worlds upon worlds and suns upon suns own allegiance to one universal law that pervades all space and influences alike the atom

and the planet.

"That very law that moulds a tear
And bids it trickle from its source,
That law preserves the Earth a sphere
And guides the planets in their course."

It was reserved for our illustrious Newton to announce in his *Principia* the principle of gravitation, and thereby to give stability to the present astronomical system. This system, we need scarcely say, invests the deity with power and glory inconceivable, but it reduces the earth to a mere point, and man to something less than the shadow of a shade.

We cannot help asking, therefore, if the God of the modern astronomer, the author of ten thousand worlds, is the same being of whom the inspired penman of Genesis has the temerity to write, "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins and clothed them." If so, then we must take the liberty to say that nothing more derogatory to the dignity of the Author of all things was ever uttered. That the deity should ever condescend to visit man in his own *propria persona* to hold converse with him, as scripture elsewhere has it, "face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend," is a strain upon our credulity to which it is altogether unequal. The first Napoleon was wont to say that there was but one step between the sublime and the ridiculous, but in this case the intervening step has been annihilated, for the recital in question is not only ridiculous but incredible.

But on second thoughts, we are not disposed to insist upon the incredibility of the story, for it occurs to us, from a passage in the life of the Reverend John Huntingdon, S.S.,

The Reverend John Huntingdon graduated at "Christ's," and achieved an S.S., which, for the benefit of the uninitiated, we may explain was intended to indicate that he was a sinner saved.

divine and coalheaver, who flourished at the beginning of the present century, that he, at any rate, must have credited it, and had the felicity to enjoy favors kindred to those extended to our first parents. Mr. Huntingdon was a genuine ignoramus, but he was fluent, and therefore one of the most popular preachers of the day. His was the era of leather breeches, and he used to boast as instances of divine favor, that whenever his nether garments became the worse for wear, the Lord used to provide him with a pair of unimpeachable doeskins. Doubtless he reasoned in this way : If God provided coats for Adam and Eve, why not breeches for his servant John Huntingdon; and we confess that the reasoning appears to us unexceptionable.

Recoiling, however, as we do, from all such pretensions to familiarity with the ways and attributes of the Almighty, we are, nevertheless, firm believers in inspiration, and are decidedly of opinion that from first to last, in all ages, God, in his goodness, has influenced the human mind in the discovery of truth, *utile dulci*, and still continues to do so, as more light is desiderated for the illumination of mankind. The achievements of Newton appear to us to place the inspiration of this eminent philosopher beyond doubt, and we half suspect that the exalted strains of Handel are also of celestial origin. Still we are much inclined to believe that never since the creation has anyone enjoyed the privilege and right and special commission to say, "Thus saith the Lord." We are aware that prophets, so-called, in any quantity have asserted their pretensions to be the oracles of the Almighty; but the questionable manner in which they have exercised their self-created functions must be our apology for disputing their claims.

"We may be wrong, but we hold the whole tribe of prophets, even of the highest order, as nothing more nor less than palpable dealers in the impossible. What, in the name of common sense, can they *know* of events hundreds of years, it may be, before they happen? Knowledge is the child of fact, and of fact only, nor can it exist prior to the predicted event with which it is associated. Prediction may have probability to recommend it; but after all it is only speculative, void of the gristle of truth and fact, and may be falsified by an issue the very opposite of that foretold. The fall of Jerusalem might have been safely predicted from the madness of the defenders who fought the battles of the Romans within the walls much more effectually than the Romans themselves outside; but the prediction, though fulfilled, might have been shelved; for another Maccabeus might have emerged from the intermural warriors, as Napoleon from the French Revolution, and a brave despair might have disconcerted the generalship of Titus, and opposed a successful resistance to the legions of even Imperial Rome.

We have before us, in Matthew's gospel, an account of a successful prophecy by Isaiah, who, it is said, anticipated the event predicted seven hundred years at the very least. By what extraordinary catenation did the prophet connect the event predicted with his own intelligence, so that he was enabled to foretell it with such precision and clearness as to command the acknowledgment of the evangelist that the prophecy had been fulfilled? The prophecy was made to Ahaz, and its fulfilment was in the time of Herod, so that the event

predicted was gradually maturing through twenty or thirty generations. Was Isaiah master of the intervening history that bridged the time between Ahaz and Herod? Or shall we be told that the world's history is chronicled in the regions above a thousand, or, it may be, ten thousand years in advance, and communicated to the prophetic mind as circumstances may demand? Tell us rather that the prophetic office, as ordinarily understood, is a piece of absurdity from beginning to end, and we prefer that method of disposing of the difficulty to any other. The chapter that contains the prophecy is headed thus : "Ahaz is comforted by Isaiah: Christ promised." Of course any one reading the chapter will at once perceive that the allusion to Christ in the chapter heading is outrageously indefensible; and if Ahaz could be comforted by an event that was to take place some seven hundred years after he had subsided into dust and ashes, he must—taking into consideration the business that brought him into communication with the prophet—have been of much the same order of intellect as the lady mentioned in *Blackwood*, whose peace of mind had been destroyed by Dr. Auckland's announcement that the supply of coals would not last more than twenty thousand years. Surely both Ahaz and Mrs. O'Dowd were much too sensitive and emotional for the wear and tear of this state of existence; for one was obviously as unnecessarily depressed as the other was elated under the influence of coming events, which in their cases cast exceedingly long shadows before them. We had almost omitted to mention that Isaiah had foretold that the name of the child predicted would be Maher-shalel-hash-baz. This is so astoundingly like the name of Jesus Christ, that probably some of our orthodox friends will accept the coincidence as additional evidence of the fulfilment of the prophecy. We have only to substitute Mahershalal for Jesus, and hashbaz for Christ, and not the slightest additional alteration is required to make the name square with its prophetic requirements. It is true that we do not look upon the two names as implying a distinction without a difference; nor can we say with regard to them, "if there is any difference they are both alike;" but this perhaps arises from our unskilfulness in the interpretation of prophecy. Nor can we flatter ourselves with the prospect of improvement in this respect, for, sooth to say, we find the study of the prophets, at best, but a bootless employment. "We find repeatedly that God himself is brought upon the *tapis* by the prophets in association with conduct that no man, with the feelings of a man, can contemplate without abhorrence. Look at Samuel, for instance, a leading prophet, in his treatment of Agag, the unfortunate and harmless king of Amalek, a prisoner in an unjust war waged by Saul in obedience to the prophet. Agag's life had been guaranteed by his captor; but this did not prevent Samuel from hewing him in pieces in the name of Jehovah. Or turn we to another distinguished prophet—Jeremiah, by whose sanction the high priests of Baal were slaughtered by Josiah, thus countenancing the Church of Rome in her atrocious enormities in the suppression, by sword and flame, of religious opinion, when in opposition to her own. The war, too, as waged by Moses and Eleazar against Midian, in which God is made to participate, is atrocious from its barbarity, and disgusting from its indecency. The order issued by Moses to butcher the males, to massacre the married women and to debauch the single women, would have disgraced a Polynesian savage, yet was it all perpetrated in the name of the Lord. We know not whether David ranks amongst the prophets, but we do know that his conduct was, on some occasions, most atrocious in character, and we trust that no one will believe that he was a man after God's own heart; otherwise they will entertain most erroneous ideas of the deity.

Such, then, was this celebrated prophecy, and we think it may be accepted as a fair sample of similar pretensions on the part of the prophets universally. It consists of a long chain reaching through seven hundred long years; and we should only be too glad if the advocates of the prophetic would favor us with a link or two of this wonderful concatenation; although we are very confident that we should find the metal utterly unequal to bear the strain of the commonest of all common sense.

But briefly, in conclusion, we shall turn to the greatest prophet of all, namely, Jesus of Nazareth himself, and endeavour to show that in some cases it is much safer to follow the suggestions of our own reason, than even his recorded teachings. Our readers need not be told that contemporary with Jesus Christ there was a sect of Hebrews known by the title of Esseneans or Essenes, whose honest and simple style of living favorably influenced the gentle spirit of the gentle Jesus. "They held riches in great contempt, and maintained a community of goods, for not any one was found among them possessing more than others, it being a fixed rule of their sect, that every one who enters it must give up all his goods into the public stock of the society, so that among the whole number, none may be found lower than another by reason of his poverty, or any on the other side elated above the rest by his riches." Here was the influence that prompted Jesus Christ to declare that the poor were blessed and that the rich were just the contrary. Prompted by the Essenian view of the matter, he advised the wealthy young man who sought his advice on one occasion to sell all that he had and give to the poor, and follow him; but the young man proved to be wiser in his day and generation than his teacher. Will any man in his senses have the assurance to tell us that poverty is a blessing and that riches are a curse? Does any one allow the doctrine to influence his practice so far as to lead him to sell all that he has for the pleasure of aggrandising the poor? Nevertheless, should there amongst our readers be a rich man hungering and thirsting for the felicity of poverty, we can only say that we shall be most happy to favor him with the address of at least

one poor man who will be very glad indeed to assist him to the best of his power in the art of sinking. But the universal practice ignores the teaching, and all the world is industrious to secure as much of the world's good things as possible, insomuch as to justify the more-candid-than-courteous tombstone which in a southern county of England informs its readers, that "Here lies John Saunders, who died fretting and sweating to get rich, much such another fool as you."

But to err is human, and as Jesus was man and man only, it were unreasonable and delusive to look for divinity as the characteristic of *all* his teachings. We have not, indeed, to go beyond the New Testament to find, in the weaknesses he exhibited and the misconceptions he entertained, undeniable proof of his pure humanity; his last pathetic exclamation, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" itself indicating, we think, that Jesus, in his last moments, lost somewhat of the faith which had been the guiding inspiration of his life.

We have said that we believe in inspiration—that God "has endowed some men with brains so much larger and finer than those of ordinary men, as to enable them to see and originate truths which are hidden from the mass; and that when it is his will that mankind should make some great step forward, he calls into being some cerebral organisation of more than ordinary magnitude and power, which gives birth to new ideas, and grander conceptions of the truths vital to humanity." We believe also that there are none of his children whom he does not favor with so much intelligence as shall serve to pilot them safely through the world with all its mazes, and finally to land them in a better state of existence where religious differences are unknown, where there shall be neither hunger nor thirst, neither poverty nor distress, for God shall wipe away all tears from all eyes. Libra.

Sin and the Sinner.

WHAT is Sill, theologically considered? Is it, as the old Divines told us, High Treason against the Majesty of Heaven; participation in the rebellion of the Chief "who led the embattled Seraphim to war"? As Adam's sin was only an act, not *malum in se*, but only *malum prohibitum*, and yet the origin of death and all our woe, is all sin primarily and mainly Disobedience? Or, again, are many modern thinkers right in speaking always of Sin as weakness, folly, ignorance, the naughtiness of a froward babe, the stumble of a child in learning to walk? The answer to these questions is obscure. We must go somewhat far back to seek it.

Half the erroneous theology in the world seems due to the arbitrary conception of "Omnipotence" as an attribute of God. Were Divines to content themselves with following out the very strong indications which He has given us of His moral attributes, and when they come to speak of His Power be satisfied to say that human imagination fails to conceive its extent, they would avoid shutting up themselves and their disciples in many an *impasse* of their own making. He to whom we attribute the ordering of the thousands of clusters of starry systems, the Architect of the Universe, possesses indeed such Power that it seems superfluous to hesitate at any phrase which may convey to our poor human souls even a shadow of its immensity. But having (not unnaturally) applied to it the term for absolute illimitation, men have long reversed the process of reasoning, and having induced, as they think, from creation that God is Omnipotent, they deduce back again from that metaphysical term many conclusions for which creation itself lends no warrant. So firm are they often in holding by this wholly arbitrary term, that it continually happens, when the mysteries of evil have to be explained, that God's moral attributes, of which we really know somewhat and whereon alone rest our reverence and love, are thrust into narrowest compass and woefully abridged, to make broad the road for this "Omnipotence" of which we confessedly know next to nothing.

Among those points which we must surely hereafter come to recognise as inevitable, is the one great one, in which perhaps all our difficulties are involved: the moral imperfection of all finite free agents. It cannot be too often repeated, seeing how constantly it is ignored, that, unless God had made us without moral natures at all, without knowledge of right and wrong, or power to choose between them,—in a word, unless He had left us mere brutes in human bodies, there was no other thing we could be, save imperfect moral creatures. The dreams of impeccable Angels, of sinless spirits of the Blessed, for ever dazzle and deceive us. There can be no such beings; and if there could, this world would present an utterly insoluble problem. With reverence, but yet with certainty, it may be said: ONE infinite and therefore perfect Moral Being alone is *possible*. All below Him, not being infinite, must have more or less of weakness and ignorance, and therefore of imperfection. Only the degree of the finite moral being's imperfection is (so far as we can see) arbitrary. For this planet's moral inhabitants God has chosen to create a race, doubtless not nearly the highest, and probably not the lowest, in the ranks of free intelligences. But it must needs be that all the other myriads of races which people the stars are of the same order with ourselves; all finite, and therefore all morally imperfect.

Accepting human imperfection, then, as we believe men must sooner or later accept it, not as the result of a Fall, nor as curable by any alchemy of sacred blood, but as a necessity determined by the fact that we are finite

moral beings—the consequence will follow, that the design of God in creating us will assume quite a new significance. That design will clearly appear to be our gradual elevation through higher and higher moral grades, wherein the original imperfections of our nature will become evanescent, and degrees of virtue be attained which, viewed from our present state, would doubtlessly appear transcendentally pure, but which, when attained, will disclose above and beyond them the summits of yet loftier ranges of holiness. It is almost needless to add, that the belief in such a design of the Creator includes the universality of the "great Salvation." That every created soul will attain at last the virtue for which it was made, is a proposition so shut up in the prior one that "God made it for that purpose," that we ought not to need it should be stated at all.

The different bearing of such a doctrine as this and of the old theology on the question of the nature of Sin, is obvious enough. To the disciple of the Old Creed, sin was terrible, partly no doubt in itself, but chiefly in its accessories of fiends and flames. To the disciple of the New Creed, sin is terrible too; but it is terrible *for itself*, and because committed against a God absolutely good.

To seek for strong words to express the abomination of Sin is a vain attempt, seeing that moral evil, being necessarily the greatest kind of evil, can have no just illustration in any other and lesser kind. Even eternal physical torture, which the deeply wrought consciences of men of old threw out as a sort of material symbol of it, would to divinely-illuminated eyes bear no relation to the moral woe of Sin. It is the Sin which must constitute the Hell, not the Hell which can represent Sin. Christ nailed on Calvary for ever would be the type of eternal Torture, and the very anti-type of Sin. We cannot doubt that the greatest saints have been those who have most vividly perceived the sinfulness of sin, and have attained to a constant keenness of the moral sense which ordinary men know only in rare moments of high spiritual activity. Those seemingly limitless abysses, deep below deep, of selfishness, vanity, double-mindedness, of which we have sometimes gained one awful glimpse, peering down into the dark places of our souls (a glimpse which left us awed, bewildered and wellnigh hopeless while its clear memory remained),—those depths a true Saint must look into and daily expose to the light of God till depth after depth become purified. *He* is not the man who can think least of Sin, nor is any other man's opinion about it to be taken in comparison of his. The soul approaches the holiness of God through the sense of Sin, and he who has little sense that Sin is horrible can have little sense that Holiness is adorable.

I feel assured that when the New Creed of love and trust has thoroughly taken its place in the minds of men, its moral power will be higher than that which the Old Creed of fear has ever wielded. Just as a loving and saintly mother exercises over her wayward son an influence which the severity of his father or his ever-renewed threat of final disinheritance altogether fail to obtain, so the faith which allies itself with all that is in us of noble, of holy, of grateful, and of tender, will work on our hearts as no other ever did or could do. One of the wisest of living philanthropists (Matthew Davenport Hill), after a long life spent in beholding from the judicial bench the varied forms of human crime and baseness, has given as the result of his whole experience, *the aggressive power of love and kindness*, and the weakness of all powers beside. If this be so as regards such love and kindness as man may shew to his brother, assuredly it holds good as regards the infinite love and kindness of the all-merciful God. Let us but learn to see this love as it speaks to us in our hearts and through Providence, and its "aggressive" might must needs be felt. As in the old Greek fable, the bitter blast of the threats of perdition have but caused man to draw his cloak of selfishness still closer around him. The warm, cloudless sunshine of the Divine Love will force him to cast it behind him, and bare his breast to the beneficent rays.

Sin has also changed its aspect in some measure by having lost a certain definiteness of treasonable character given to it by its supposed embodiment in a Devil. No alteration in modern theology has yet taken place so unmistakeably as the dismissal of this Personage from the catalogue of Entities credible among cultivated persons. Other dogmas of the Churches, if silently disbelieved, are yet treated with a certain tenderness and hesitation. But the doctrine of the existence of Satan (beyond the narrow circles of professedly religious coteries) is neither put aside with respect nor attacked with seriousness. It is simply laughed at as ridiculous and childish. Very recently a distinguished man of science, lecturing to a crowded audience in London, mentioned casually, that certain obscure mental phenomena had, by some persons, been attributed to the influence of the Devil. Immediately the whole company joined in a hearty peal of merriment. Why? Not because the Devil (if he existed) might not have had the influence in question. By all accounts, the case lay entirely within his proper field of action. But the notion of a Devil doing anything whatever, was manifestly, in the opinion of the audience, altogether laughable and absurd. Surely this little incident (to be paralleled frequently in every theatre) was significant enough? The persons who laughed at the mere mention of the Devil were, no doubt, nine-tenths of them members of orthodox Churches, yet publicly and without any effort at concealment they shewed their entire contempt for the notion of the Devil *pur et simple*. When such are the spontaneous feelings of some hundreds of people, culled by chance from the most cultivated and refined classes of the community, it is hardly too much to assume that at last and truly, "Great Pan is dead."

The consequence to theology generally of the disappearance of so prominent an actor from the stage, can hardly fail to be serious. The tragedy of the Fall, for example, would without him (according to the well-worn

jest) resemble Shakespeare's Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. But the Fall, again, is only the first part of that dread Trilogy, whose second part is the Atonement, and whose conclusion is the Last Judgment; and if Original Sin, the primal Curse of death, and the promise that "the seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head," be all discarded, the rest of the story becomes well-nigh unintelligible. If we cease to believe that "in Adam all die," it will become difficult to believe that "in Christ shall all be made alive." The theory of the early Fathers concerning the Atonement, that it was a ransom paid by Christ to the Devil, has long been exploded; and since Anselm's days the supposed rights of the Evil One have been strangely transferred to the blessed Father of all. But it is yet impossible to eliminate from the history, the Serpent of Paradise, the Tempter of Christ, the Devil to whom Jesus and his apostles every instant refer, and yet preserve the plot in any condition of unity and completeness. If Devils be absurd delusions, it follows but too clearly that all the writers of the New Testament were absurdly deluded.

But the moral and practical results of the disappearance of Lucifer under the horizon, are more our concern than the theological, and they are hardly less important.

Moral Evil may be regarded either as a Positive or a Negative thing. It may be, as the 9th Article affirms, an *infection of nature*,—a virus like that of the plague, or the fungus of the vine and potatoe blight,—a real moral entity, propagating its kind. Or, on the other hand, it may be merely the *absence* of good, the lack of moral light and strength, which leaves room for the prevalence of the blind and brutish appetite. In other words, we may study moral dynamics, on the hypothesis of the old philosophers, that there exist in Nature both Weight and Levity, both Heat and Cold, both Light and Darkness; or, on the contrary, we may proceed on the modern system, and admit Weight, Heat, and Light to be positives, and Levity, Cold and Darkness to be simply their negations. It is obvious enough that the belief that God, the Moral Sun of the universe, has an Antitype in a Sun whose rays are darkness and frost, is a considerable aid to the perpetuation of the theory that Evil is a Positive thing. In fact, if there exist an Incarnate Sin, then Evil *must* be a positive thing; for, if Evil be merely negative, then absolute Sin would be absolute Nothingness; and instead of being the most active and powerful of spirits, Evil, as the old Chaldean Oracle averred, would be "more frail than non-entity." The abolition of a Bad God, then, is the first step towards the healthy faith, that Good alone is real and Evil is unreal; and that Virtue consists not in mere abstinence from vice, but in a heart and life filled to the brim with love to God and love to man.—*Frances P. Cobbe*.

The Historical Jesus.

IN the spring of the third or fourth year before the commencement of the Christian era an event occurred which was to influence the history of the world,—I refer to the birth of Jesus, generally called the Christ, or Messiah, sometimes Jesus of Nazareth, and sometimes Jesus of Galilee.

His parents seem to have been poor, but industrious and virtuous people, of whom very little is known. His father was a carpenter, which, however, is no indication of his position in society, since all the Jews, even the chief Rabbis, worked at some trade. His mother is said to have belonged to the house of David; that, however, is a mere conjecture at the most, as all the genealogies were destroyed at the time of the Babylonish captivity; nor would it signify anything if true, for the royalty of the house of David had for centuries been only a name.

Until he was seven years old the boy was consigned entirely to the care of his mother, who, no doubt, with the usual solicitude of mothers, performed her duties towards him. The elementary portion of his education devolved upon her; but it consisted, for the most part, in telling him the traditional history of his nation, teaching him to repeat its sacred poetry, and inculcating those lessons of virtue and of moral etiquette which the Jews regarded with such punctiliousness. One pictures them wandering over that beautiful little valley in which their village home was, and ascending the hills which surrounded it, now for the sake of the prospect that stretched out beyond, and now for the cool shelter to be found in the ravines and gorges of the limestone rocks, in loving and serious converse; he listening with rapt interest whilst she told him of "Enoch, who walked with God, and was not, because God took him;" of "Abraham, God's friend;" of "Jacob, the crafty supplanter;" of "Esau, who sold his birthright;" of Joseph, the martyr of virtue and the interpreter of dreams; of "Elijah, who went up to heaven in a chariot of fire and, above all, of Moses, the Exodus, and the wanderings in the desert. One laments that more is not known of that mother. She is said to have been a thoughtful, meditative woman—a thing likely enough; for the mothers of great men generally are such. But that is all we dare venture even to guess, so besmothered are the facts by fables.

At twelve years of age, according to the Jewish custom, he accompanied his parents in their annual journey to Jerusalem, to be presented in the temple, and have his name enrolled in the national registers. An incident is related concerning him at this time which may or may not be true. He is said to have been missed by his parents, and afterwards found in one of the courts of the temple, set apart for the use of the schools, in the midst

of an assembly, asking questions and replying to questions asked of him. This was the usual form of giving instruction. The Rabbis did not deliver lectures or discourses in a set manner; but each pupil asked what question he chose, to which a reply was given, and oftentimes a question was asked in return, which the pupils had to solve. What is related of Jesus, therefore, was nothing extraordinary, and the most one can make out of it is that, by deserting the company of his parents and companions for the sake of being present in the school, he showed more than a common thirst for knowledge. One would like to know, however, whether that reply put into his mouth when his mother expressed the anxiety she and his father had felt when they missed him, was actually uttered by him, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" For if it were, it would indicate an imaginative, enthusiastic nature, already wrought upon considerably by religious ideas, and would render it more easy to give credence to the assertions that he afterwards claimed to work miracles, and to be the Messiah, than otherwise we find it. However, the design of the writer who relates the incident is evidently to throw a mist of wonder over the child's early life, and is, therefore, not to be trusted. All men who become notorious share, in that respect, the same fate. When they are dead and gone, the world finds out that they were prodigies even in their cradle, and invents, or exaggerates, all sorts of wonderful tales about their early sayings and doings. Whereas, really great men are seldom prodigies in their youth. Great talents are of slow growth and development; and the masters of the world often sit in the dunce's place at school.

After this journey, he returned home, and we hear no more of him for several years. We have, therefore, to fill up the interval by our fancy. He would still pursue the study of the law, which, indeed, a Jew never thought completed; he learned the trade of his father, and would doubtlessly some-times share in the recreations of the boys of Nazareth. But he was probably always given more to solitary rambles amongst the wilds of the hills than to youthful sports; and as years increased, he became more contemplative and retiring. And his home, as I have said, was well calculated to nurse such musings as an incipient religious reformer would be sure to indulge in. The hill at the base of which the village was built was but 400 feet high. From its summit one commanded a view of the whole plain of Esdraelon, the Jezreel of the Old Testament, and the Armageddon of the Apocalypse. This plain was associated with some of the most stirring scenes of the ancient traditions, and could not fail to move deeply every Hebrew heart with emotional thoughts of the past. The gloom of the deep ravines, which were numerous in all these hills about Nazareth, would also foster the grave and serious thoughts which rose in his mind; whilst the luxuriance of the enclosed valley and its abounding wild flowers of the most gorgeous kinds, would nurture his mind with a sense of the beauties of nature and the goodness of God.

At the age of 30 a great event occurred in his history which henceforth changed the whole aspect of his life. About this time there was a great deal of religious and politico-religious excitement throughout Palestine, and many leaders arose who for a time obtained considerable popularity. First and foremost amongst these was one named John, called also, for distinction, the Baptist, or, as the word seems to have meant, the Purifier. This John assumed the habits and the garb of some of the old prophets; lived a wild, austere life; fed on the spontaneous fruits of the earth; and was altogether one of those abnormal natures which when excited by a religion, fill the multitude with deep reverence and awe. Some have said, he belonged to the sect of the Essens; but however much he may have been indebted to them, that hardly seems to be correct, as some of his tenets differ essentially from theirs.

Whether he had any early relations to Jesus is a matter of doubt; but there can be but little question that Jesus became one of his disciples, and, according to a common usage in those days, was publicly recognised as such by baptism. John's teaching was purely of an ethical character. He denounced the vices and hypocrisies of the times, and called upon men to reform their lives if they would escape the certain judgment of God. His manner seems to have partaken of all the sternness of his nature; and intense was the excitement he produced throughout the land. Crowds flocked to hear him—most of those who heard trembled, confessed their sins, and were baptised.

With the matter of the Baptist's exhortation Jesus would heartily sympathise; from the manner he would feel averse. He was of a gentle and loving nature, and was more disposed to weep over men's follies than to threaten them with the vengeance of God. How long he continued a disciple of John does not appear. It may have been until John got imprisoned for reproving Herod. But from the first, there were elements leading him to diverge. The difference in character already referred to led to difference in moral conceptions. Jesus was for enjoying the blessings God's bounty gives; the Baptist was for denying the flesh, and leading an austere life. John sought the wilderness and an escape from the abodes of men; Jesus, fond as he was of retirement, found his work in the towns and in the congregations of the people. Besides, discipleship did not then mean all that we have put into the word since. A disciple might question, discuss, and dispute with his master, and ultimately set up a school of his own.

One important influence, however, John seems to have had upon the mind of Jesus. He so deepened his religious convictions, that Jesus determined to devote himself to the work of reforming his countrymen with greater boldness than he had ever yet displayed. From that time he began openly to express his thoughts, and to

insist upon a preparation for the coming kingdom of God. There is a tradition, that after his connection with John, he retired for a time from all intercourse with men, and gave himself up to meditation in the wilderness. Such practices were not uncommon with the religious of those days. It was something like the custom of the Roman Catholics going into "retreat," as they call it. Yet I receive the tradition with hesitation, because it has come down to us in a form in which it is rendered absurd.

His more early efforts at teaching and reformation were doubtlessly put forth in the synagogue at Nazareth. He would begin, in the usual way, by asking questions; the questions would lead to discussion, discussion to the exposition of his own thoughts and feelings. Such a course once begun, could not stop. It was found that the young man, Jesus, had a power to touch the conscience and the heart. All Nazareth got moved by what he said, and by his way of saying it. By-and-by the people who lived beyond the hills heard of it. Some came to hear him for themselves. They invited him to return with them, and arouse the hearts of the people of their own synagogues. He listened to their invitation, and went. Emmaus, Sepphoris, Tiberias, Bethsaida, Chorazin, Capernaum, and all the region round about, became the scenes of his labours. There was nothing very uncommon in such a procedure; its parallel might be found in some sects still. The power of speaking to the heart always makes a man sought after, all the world over; it is seldom those who possess it refuse its exercise.

At first his exhortations were based upon the recognised truths, and were only earnest appeals to live consistently with the principles they professed. If the elder teachers and Rabbis felt any secret pangs of jealousy at the rising popularity of the young Nazarene, they could not but openly join in the universal commendation. As, however, he grew more earnest, and his work pressed heavily on his soul, these teachers and Rabbis themselves became the objects of his strictures. They were the leaders of the people; the shepherds of the poor, unfed, perishing sheep, the guides of these blind and ignorant men and women, he longed to raise and redeem from their low and selfish lives. Yet what sort of lives were these guides, these shepherds living? What conformity was there between their own professions and their doings? What were the teachings they gave the people from week to week? Alas! they were "blind leaders of the blind;" they were "dumb dogs, which could not bark;" they were "but hireling shepherds, and the sheep knew not their voice, and would not follow them." Must he not, therefore, speak out plainly concerning them as concerning the rest? Must he not tell the watchmen of their sloth and the blood upon their souls? Was he not raised up of God for the very purpose—the "servant anointed with inward grace to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord to all captive souls?" In his inmost being he felt that he was, and that, therefore, he must speak. Speak accordingly he did; and so seems to have begun his hostility with the scribes, rulers, and teachers of the synagogues.

His popularity, however, amongst the common people increased, whilst his controversies with the priests and rulers, or heads of the synagogues, grew hotter and hotter. It is certainly difficult to discern what could have been the ground of the violence of that controversy, excepting upon an admission one feels reluctant to make. There was nothing in his teaching to call forth their opposition. It was purely ethical and practical, and the doctrines, precepts, and admonitions were perfectly in accordance with the doctrines, precepts, and admonitions of the Pharisees, Essens, and the Talmud. There was nothing new either in the substance or the manner of his discourses, so far as we can discern. Even those passages given in the synoptics in which the relation of man universally to God is the most distinctly affirmed, can be matched by corresponding passages in the Talmud, and contain nothing which an enlightened Pharisee of those days would not have owned. It is true that men in authority, and especially ecclesiastics in authority, are apt to grow very bitter when their doings, character, and doctrines, or teachings, are attacked by some one much beneath them, and that they are not always very scrupulous in the means by which they put down the officious criticiser. But that hardly seems sufficient to account for the death to which in this case the opposition led.

I am, therefore, as I said, reluctantly led to the supposition that eventually Jesus was induced to accept for himself the Messiahship his admiring and loving disciples were eager to thrust upon him. He had touched the deepest chords of their heart; he had probed their conscience as it had never been probed before; he had aroused them to a new and purer life; he had awakened them to a sense of their nearness to God, and his intimate relations with their soul. Was not this the true kingdom of God? Must he not be the true Messiah that could do all this? "Come, see a man who told me all things which ever I did. Is not this the Messiah?" are the words the fictitious Gospel of John puts into the mouth of a woman thus affected; and the words indicate truly the working of the people's mind under such influences. As the Messiah they therefore hailed him, honoured him, ran after him from town to town, from village to village. The excitement grew uncontrollably; all the people seemed to believe; how could Jesus himself at last escape the belief? He did not escape. He at last learned to claim what all the common people amongst the Galileans were glad to own.

Ah! these founders of new religions—these reformers of people's morals and faiths—these agitators and renovators of the conscience and feelings, how great they are and how little! how heroic and how easily led! how wonderful in their generous, noble, truthful, loving natures, and how amazing in their fanaticisms! how they surpass us in their grand ideals, in their lofty aspirations, in their grasp of spiritual truths, and how they

make us ashamed for them by their vain fancies! One thinks of Luther throwing his inkstand at the devil; of Edward Irving, that grandest prophetic spirit of these modern days, led blindfold and with the meekness of a saint, by the fanatics that ruined his life and his cause; and of nearly all who have belonged to the same class. We may regret that Jesus of Nazareth had to pay the same penalty for the power of his reforming, spiritualising spirit; but no one who understands human nature will be surprised.

Those pretensions the people of Galilee were by no means disposed to oppose. Always turbulent, always ready to get up a revolt against the established government, and yet, touched to the depths of their rude nature by the purity and spiritual grandeur of Jesus, they gladly rallied around his person, and were equally prepared to pull down the synagogues of the sneering scribes, and to march upon Jerusalem and proclaim war against Rome. In such a district his pretensions could not but increase the number of his followers.

At length his popularity had arrived at its utmost pitch, and seemed to justify a trial of his powers in the capital itself. A journey thither, at the next feast of the passover, was resolved upon and performed. A large number of his followers accompanied him, or went in separate bands and met him on his entry. His journey thither was one continued triumph. Samaria sent forth the populations of its towns and villages to meet him. The inhabitants of Judah were moved, and admired. The whole city of Jerusalem was stirred at his coming. But there the veil of history falls, and through its thick folds all that we can see is, angry scribes and rulers moving hither and thither,—Jesus upbraiding them for the hypocrisies and immoralities of the times,—the turbulent Galileans getting exasperated at his reception, and raising a tumult in the temple by driving out the exchangers of money and the dealers in cattle,—then, a band of soldiers seizing the leader,—a trial, the sentence of which is extorted by a Jerusalem mob,—a bloody cross,—a body buried where criminals always were temporarily buried,—disciples returning with flowing tears and disappointed hopes to their mountain-homes in Galilee. That is all we see, and even a great part of that, perhaps, is due to our dreams, so dense is the covering tradition has thrown over the facts.

To give an estimate of his character with such imperfect materials to form it from is only to present an image of which conjecture must constitute the principal part. We know he must have been no common man, from the way in which he lived in the memory of his disciples. His power seems to have been chiefly founded on his goodness conjoined with a persuasiveness of utterance which led his foes to say, or to be reported as saying, "Never man spake like this man." He seems to have been as gentle and as tender as a woman; and yet capable of a sternness and a severity of invective which exasperated his opponents to the utmost degree. Of the purity of his character his foes raised many doubts; but the doubts must have been known as malicious slanders by his friends, or his hold over the public mind could never have attained the strength it did. Of his opinions we know but little. The teaching handed down by tradition does not differ, as I have already said, so far as its doctrines and ethics are concerned, from that common to the higher class of the Pharisees or of the Essens. Whether he asserted in broader terms than they would have used the universal Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man, does not appear. Certainly, the gospels would lead us to conclude the reverse. That he was deeply moved by the condition of the people, and devoted his life to their moral and spiritual renovation, there can be no doubt. And wherever a large-minded, generous, noble, loving, tender soul, with eloquent demeanour and persuasive lips, devotes himself to such a work, he will make an impression which will win thousands to his cause and perpetuate his memory in the hearts of his disciples long after his death. But for all that history tells of him, had not other causes been at work, and had no other great men risen to take his place, Christianity would have died out amidst the hills of Galilee with the generation in which it was born; or have been now remembered as only one of the numerous Jewish sects which lived and perished in a day.—*Rev. James Cranbrook.*

Christianity and Christian Formality.

WHEN you see old Mr. Goodness, an unpretending man, honest, industrious, open-hearted, pure in his life, full of justice and mercy and kind deeds, you say, "That man is a Christian, if anybody is." You do not ask what he thinks about Jonah and the whale, about the beast with seven heads and ten horns, the plagues of Egypt, the inspiration of the Bible, the nature of Christ, or the miraculous atonement. You see that man's religion in the form of manly life; you ask no further proof, and no other proof is possible. When you say you wish Christianity could get preached and practised all round the world, thereby you do not mean the Christianity of Calvin or Luther; you mean that religion which is natural to the heart of man, the ideal piety and morality which mankind aims at. But when the Rev. Doctor Banbaby speaks of Brother Zerubbabel Zealous as a great Christian, he means no such thing. He means that Zerubbabel has been baptised,—sprinkled or dipped,—that he believes in the Trinity, in the infallible inspiration of every word in the Bible, in the miracles, no matter how ridiculous or unattested; that he believes in the total depravity of human nature, in the atonement, in the

omnipresence of a personal devil, going about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, and eternally champing in his insatiate maw nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand, while God, and Christ, and the Holy Ghost, can only succeed in saving one out of a thousand—perhaps one out of a million. Banbaby reckons him a Christian because he has been "born again," "put off the natural man,"—that is, made away with his common sense and common humanity so far as to believe these absurd things,—draws down the corners of his mouth, attends theological meetings, makes long prayers in words, reads the books of his sect, gives money for ecclesiastical objects, and pays attention to ecclesiastical forms. He does not think old Mr. Goodness's long life of industry, temperance, charity, patriotism, justice, brotherly love, profits him at all. He is only an unregenerate, impenitent man, who trusts in his own righteousness, leans on an arm of flesh, has been born but once, and will certainly perish everlastingly. It is of no sort of consequence that Zerubbabel is a sharper, and has ships in the coolie trade. Old Mr. Goodness's "righteousness" is regarded as "filthy rags," while Zerubbabel's long face and long prayers are held to be a ticket entitling him to the very highest seat in the kingdom of heaven. At the Monthly Concert for Foreign Missions the Rev. Doctor leads in prayer, and Brother Zerubbabel follows. Both ask the same thing,—the Christianisation of heathen lands. But they do not mean that form of the Christian religion which is piety in the heart and morality in the outer life. They mean compliance with the popular theology, not the Christian religion proclaimed in those grand words, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself," and illustrated by a life as grand as the words. They mean the Christian formality, as set forth in the little creed, and illustrated by the lesser conduct of a very mean, bigoted, and yet earnest and self-denying sect.—*Theodore Parker*.

False Estimate of the Body.

THE Christian Church has done great injustice to the human body. Paul of Tarsus said, "I know that in my flesh dwelleth no good thing." That ill-considered word has been a curse to mankind. It has peopled the most civilised lands on earth with puny men and sick women, and thence with starveling babies, born but to fill up the grave. "I know there is no good thing in my flesh," said Paid. He knew nothing like it; he dreamed so, or thought he dreamed so. God put no bad thing there; it is full of good things; every bone from the crown to the foot is a good bone; every muscle is a good muscle; every nerve which animates the two is a good nerve. Do you think that God in making man gave him a body that was fit only to be trod under foot, with no good thing in it? Trust your own flesh and your own soul, not the words of Paul,—a great brave man, but sometimes mistaken, like you and me.—*Ibid*.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Protestant Standard.

Per favor of the Free Religious Press.

SIR.—You disapprove of the style of my allusion to the rape of Adam's rib: allow me to inform you that you have unwittingly returned good for evil, and enabled me to achieve a decisive triumph over my own *rib*, of which I am not a little proud. My wife, you will please to understand, is a most decided trinitarian; and, aware that I occasionally employ an evening in attempting to evoke "more light" for the benefit of the benighted, she has been in the habit of favoring me, now and then, with a little merciless banter, to the effect, that as no one took the trouble to reply to my lucubrations, it was very evident that they were only entitled to the questionable honour of contemptuous silence. Your last issue has terminated my better half's satirical merriment on this score, and has entitled you to the expression of my warmest thanks.

In your leader of the same paper, you reminded your readers of the aggressive character of truth, and condemned the cowardly spirit that prompted many of your country friends to cushion their principles. But the truth is just as dear to the Unitarian as to your good self; and your own invitation to speak out in the interest of truth, might have suggested a less disrespectful bearing towards inquirers after it who are quite as solicitous as yourself to aid in the dissemination of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

But do you suppose for a single moment that I am to be silenced because the old women of both sexes think proper, in their tantrums, to denounce what I advance as blasphemous? To the statement contained in the 29th and 30th verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis, namely, that God had given to Adam and Eve the fruit of every

tree upon the face of the earth for meat, it is true I had the temerity to oppose a contradiction. Is this blasphemy? Then what, I should like to know, is to be said of the 17th verse of the next chapter of the same book, which contains quite as emphatic a contradiction to the allegation in question as my own?

Were, Sir, a correspondent of your paper to inform you, that, to the surprise of all his family, the cat, on the preceding morning, had suddenly jumped up, whilst the breakfast was being disposed of, and repeated the Lord's Prayer in unimpeachable English; or if Captain Smith of the *Flying Dutchman* had, on his arrival in port, written to say that, whilst in the neighbourhood of the Navigators, the man at the wheel had been nearly scared out of his wits by the sudden appearance of the genuine American Sea Serpent—that it had raised its enormous head over the taffrail and politely requested to be informed of the ship's longitude; and that finally, on being furnished with the information desired, it had gracefully withdrawn, at the same time wishing them *bon voyage*; would you believe either statement? I trow not. Why then believe biblical absurdities of exactly the same calibre and order, and insist upon everybody following your example? It is true, we imbibed the selfsame absurdities with our mother's milk, and our faith in them grew with our growth, and strengthened with our strength; but having arrived at maturity we thought it high time to put away childish things. You may be sure, therefore, Sir, that I shall not turn boa constrictor at your bidding, and swallow your talkative friend of Genesis, till he has had the benefit of a thorough overhaul. I am free, however, to confess that I am under obligation to you for the correction of one error that I had fallen into with regard to this loquacious reptile. I certainly did say that there could be no talk where there were no brains. Had I enjoyed the advantage of an earlier acquaintance with your long-winded effusions, I should certainly never have made such an egregious mistake as I am prepared to confess. I am now fully satisfied that there may be talk enough to bore a hole through an iron pot unassociated with the slightest symptom of anything like *nous*.

But are we to place our "(more) light" under a bushel because you find its radiance rather trying to your tender optics? Are we to keep our pearls out of sight because divers and sundry are unable to discriminate between pearls and paste? You grunt over our jewels in a style that indicates that you do not know what to make of them; but I do not quarrel with you on this score, because I willingly concede to every animal the privilege of using its own language, though it must be admitted that yours is vile, and venomous and vulgar in a superlative degree. Believing in talking snakes, you are doubtless well up in colubrine literature, and hence probably you have acquired your venom, and your propensity to hiss. There is one other creature that is given to hiss, and that is the goose. What a rare felicity it must be to you, Sir, to know that you have the honour to indicate in your bearing the leading characteristics of both the sibilant and envenomed reptile and the feathered shallowpate. Forgive, us, Sir, but we really thought when you talked about duckweed, it might be safely attributed to your confounded impertinence; we now see, however, (and we gladly acknowledge our mistake) that you were altogether prompted to speak as you did by your anserine exigencies, though at the same time we may say that we were not before aware that duckweed was altogether the right sort of pabulum for the family of the immortal Saviours of the Capitol.

I have nothing very serious to complain of with regard to your strictures on my blasphemies. Those who purpose to reanimate dry bones ought not to be surprised at their rattling. On the contrary, they ought to expect it, and to accept it as an encouraging symptom of returning vitality.

But surely you might have spoken of my excellent friend, the Editor of "More Light," in less objectionable terms. I had some thought of asking you what you mean by the abominable nonsense of his not being able to deal with evidence; but second thoughts convinced me that you were not master of your own meaning, or, rather, that you had no meaning to be master of. I am very certain that his powers of analysis ought to excite your envy instead of your snarl; and I am equally certain that he can at any time supply you with material that would prove a nut by far too hard for you to crack; though, to be candid, I am willing to allow that nature in its kindness, has provided you with that peculiar description of jaw that to Samson would have proved a godsend had he had another thousand Philistines to batter and to brain.

But, in conclusion, I may as well say that with the view of avoiding the invidiousness of both comparison and contrast, I took the liberty of clapping the pair of you into my official balance (Libra), when the Unitarian scale went down with such crushing emphasis, that, in the twinkling of an eye, the occupant of the other scale was hurled clean out of sight, extorting from me the involuntary exclamation, "By Jove, we are like the French at Forbach! We have lost a Standard."

Your obedient servant,

Libra.

The Legal Disabilities of Freethinkers.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In No. 7 of your periodical, you quote a case shewing the legal disabilities which attend a freethinker when called upon to swear in a Court of Justice, and I, and doubtless many others, know similar instances. If, therefore, you consider this communication suited to your pages, I beg leave to draw further attention to the subject.

I am one of those "infidels and heretics" for whose behoof the Anglican Church, now and then, when in the humour, so pathetically prays. I believe there is One God, the Architect of the Universe, Self-existent, Supreme; that the whole Creation is the result of his Almighty fiat, issued at a time so distant from ours that the finite mind is stupified by its contemplation; that I am an immortal spirit or soul, whose intellect is reason, connected for a time with a material part whose intellect is sense; that when my body becomes unfit any longer to contribute to the development of my spirit, then will it shake off my body as useless and set forward on its higher and eternal course of life.

I do *not* believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures in the meaning attached to this doctrine by Christians generally, but that they shew they are written by fallible men by the mistakes in which they abound. I do *not* believe in Three Gods in one, nor in eternal punishment, a devil, or a local hell; but that any punishment I endure is the just and necessary consequence of my own misdeeds, in the same way that I must necessarily suffer pain if I put my finger into the flame of a candle, the pain being in exact proportion to the time I have persisted in my folly. But worse than all this in the eyes of the hierarchies, I repudiate utterly the right my fellow man, be he bishop, priest, or deacon, may claim to influence my religious opinions.

With such heterodox views as these I enter the witness box, and, being sworn, am asked, "Do you believe the Bible?" If I answer "Yes," my testimony is received, and it carries weight with the jury according to its importance. Nor, in a certain sense, have I spoken falsely, because I believe Jesus to have been incomparably the best man the world has yet seen, and that his sublime doctrines, eliminated from the dross that surrounds them, are necessary and all-sufficient for man's moral elevation. But how do I stand in the presence of my Conscience and of my God? I know perfectly well that by saying "Yes" I am not answering to the *meaning* of the question; that the real question put to me is, "Do you believe the Bible as it is believed, taught and nominally acted upon in the Established and other churches?" If I answer this question in the affirmative I am perjured; if I speak the truth and say "No," or even if I explain my views I am looked on as an "infidel," and my testimony is regarded as worthless : in fact, I am virtually put out of court as something unclean.

I enter the witness-box with but one desire—to use the plainest words to convey to others the facts as they appear to me—to speak the truth, that is, and thus, as nearly as my erring nature will allow, to be like the Source of Truth, and worthy of my connection with Him. The *oath* can have no influence with me to make me speak more truly, for I know no degree in truth. I have no more thought of speaking falsely than I have of throwing my hat at the judge's head. The thing does not occur to me, and if it did, the consequences to my peace of mind would appal me. I should carry with me a sense of utter degradation, not only to the grave, but probably, and justly too, beyond it, for I should have rendered myself unfit for communion with all that is pure and exalting, and the stain would be so foul that no repentance, however sincere and protracted, would appear to me sufficient to expunge it. But my evidence is virtually rejected, while that of the *believer*, who kisses his thumb instead of the book, in order that he may lie with impunity, is accepted. Surely, Sir, "these things ought not so to be."

The remedy is simple enough: treat all witnesses alike in the matter of cross-examination. The quaker's scruples are respected and his testimony is relied on. Our oath has no weight with the yellow infidel from China, and he is allowed to blow out a match or chop off a cock's head without question as to his religious faith, and why should the white infidel from England be denied his right to have his evidence received?

If justice were done all examination as to the faith of a witness, who takes the prescribed oath, would be prohibited, but as matters now stand, I must leave the court either as a perjured man, or with the feeling that I am regarded by my fellows as something revolting, and have, in consequence, been deprived of my right as a citizen *in a Court of Justice*.

Zeta.

The Matrimonial Causes Bill.

To the Editor.

SIR,—As your columns are open to free discussion I trust you will all we space for a few remarks from one who is prepared to support the thirteenth clause of the Matrimonial Causes Bill as *the best part* of that bill. To the objections raised in your note on the subject I have one (to me all-sufficient) reply: namely, that they are based entirely upon conventionality—upon a certain fashion of looking at things; a fashion which may at any

time be modified or altered, nay, which it is the business of philosophers and moralists to modify in accordance with the dictates of reason and conscience. Our social system allows great laxity to men and is mercilessly strict towards women. Granted : but am I therefore to allow that our social system is the perfection of justice? Why should not Society require as high a degree of moral elevation in a man as in a woman? I am a diligent reader of the reports of Police Courts and Law Proceedings, and I have found that a wealthy ruffian may address rude remarks to an innocent girl returning after dark from her work to her home, and being repulsed may knock two of her teeth down her throat, at the cost of £5 only. Again, if there should be a squabble at a public meeting, and one of the gentlemen on the platform should give a clergyman a slap on the face with his open hand, he may be cast in damages for £100. But to steal a piece of silk from a shop will bring upon the offender probably a year's imprisonment. Now these, Sir, are facts, and part of our social system; but are they consistent with justice? Not at all. I regard them as the results of our English laws having been made by wealthy men, whose daughters do not walk along the streets after dusk, but who have a keen appreciation of any attack upon property or dignity. In like manner I consider the onesidedness of our legislation on marriage and divorce as the natural result of laws being made by men only. You allege the additional temptations to which man is exposed as a reason for leniency towards him. I will proceed to discuss the question whether this plea is allowed in cases of seduction. Let us take a typical case from the works of our great novelist, lately deceased. James Steerforth, young, handsome, wealthy, and at least intellectual and accomplished enough to dazzle and attract a simple country girl, goes forth "to conquer" (in the French meaning of the term). Many girls must he have seen as captivating as little Em'ly; how many young men has she seen fit to be compared with Steerforth? But after the catastrophe, what allowance does Society, in the shape of the austere Mrs. Grundy, make for the manifold temptations which have fluttered the heart of the rustic maiden? None. She is for the time ruined, lucky if she can hide her shame in a distant land; whilst at *him* Mrs. Grundy shakes her fan with very moderate disapproval and bids him not to be so naughty again.

Women's rights, I take it, were not discussed at all in the time of Queen Elizabeth, but the comprehensive mind of Shakespeare seems to have been struck by this inequality in the treatment of the sexes. Witness the reply of Ophelia to her brother Laertes, who has been giving her much good advice:

"Good my brother,
Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,
Shew me the steep and thorny way to heaven,
Whilst, like a puffed and reckless libertine,
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,
And recks not his own read."

I confess I see nothing in the point so much discussed, whether few or many women would take advantage of this particular clause. Certain unthinking persons have chosen to argue as if this clause would preclude women from the indulgence of the "sweet weakness, to forgive." To such I reply that this bill will no more compel a woman to get rid of a faithless husband, than a man to get rid of a faithless wife. Let four hundred and ninety-nine women pardon their wicked spouses seventy times seven times, if they like; but if there be only one wife out of five hundred to whom her faithless consort is positively hateful and loathsome, I hold it to be grossly unjust that such a one should be *compelled* to forgive, when that compulsion does not apply to the other sex. Forgiveness, *free* forgiveness is good on the part of a pure and loving soul, unwilling to condemn; but compulsory forgiveness—what is it but a hideous mockery? Nor do I feel aught but contempt for the man who can take advantage of a temporary separation to break through the obligations of a contract, any breach of which, on the part of his partner, he is prepared to visit with the severest penalties.

The constitution of my mind may be peculiar,—but I own that I prefer justice to generosity, equality to privilege; and I look forward to the attainment of legal and political equality by women as the greatest reform of the coming time. Why need our ears be vexed by endless discussions as to whether woman has a brain as large as that of man, even as in the days of American slavery it was an endless subject of dispute whether the negro is inferior to the white man. What is that to us? Give all a fair start; woman with man, black man with white man, Mongolian with Caucasian; and then all questions of inferiority and superiority, moral, intellectual and physical, will be settled by experience. Are women fit to be M.P.'s? try them, and you will soon find out. Were I in England, I would sooner vote for Miss F. P. Cobbe than for 600 out of the 658 members of the House of Commons. Meanwhile, to treat women as rational beings (which I suppose they are) seems to me infinitely better than the fantastic politeness, the condescending kindness with which they are patronised and protected, like helpless invalids, or whimsical children of a larger growth. It is, I think, hard to over-estimate the advancement in civilisation that would spring from the establishment of rational feeling and mutual respect

between the sexes; still more hard to estimate the vast increase of moral and physical well-being in a community where the men, not seeking excuses for themselves in the theory of a lower moral elevation, should come to be as pure in word and deed as they justly expect their wives and sisters to be.
David Copperfield.

Editorial Notices.

THE cost of printing and publishing the *Free Religious Press* is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A.F.R.P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office may be made payable either to the Editor or to the Publisher.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—W.C.—H.B.—received.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, Nov. 7, 1870.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. II., No. 15. April 10, 1871.

Notes.

The proceedings at the Annual Meeting of the New South Wales Auxiliary, recently held in the Masonic Hall, were scarcely calculated to lessen our want of sympathy with that pretentious and misleading organisation—the Bible Society. The Report presented on the occasion bristles with the customary stupidities, and the speeches were, if anything, more than usually nauseating. That superbest of Sydney windbags, the Rev. John Graham, brayed forth his usual string of ear-tickling platitudes, and then collapsed—genuine *vox et præterea nihil* that he is—as only a windbag of his dimensions can. As for the Rev. Colin McCulloch's fiery denunciation of the whole tribe of bible-hating rationalists, it appears to have so affected the Rev. Canon Stephen, that this pattern of Christianity, with an exquisite gentlemanliness which his admirers will appreciate, must needs avow his determination to treat the next sceptic that crossed his path as he would treat a cur that should bark at his heels. But the speech of the Rev. W. Kelynack was decidedly *the* speech of the evening. Aghast at the appalling fact that we are living in a time "when our most cherished convictions are regarded as a traditionary faith that has come down to us from a too credulous past, and when the Book that, beyond all other books, gathers round it our deepest reverence and our strongest affection is sneered at and reviled," he, it seems, can so far forget himself as to allude to the leading religious thinkers of the day in terms which, it must be confessed, would have come with better grace from one less notoriously distinguished than Mr. Kelynack is for shallowness of intellect. Massive-minded and far-searching Bishop Colenso, for seeking "to overturn the Old Testament," is denounced by this conceited pigmy as "a sciolist theologian." But, in spite of the bishop and his co-heretic, "the brilliant Frenchman," the Bible, as Mr. Kelynack has decreed, shall not be overthrown. "When it was his happiness to live in the Illawarra district he sometimes gazed upon a scene which would illustrate his meaning. He had seen the heavens curtained with a majesty of thunder clouds, and flashing with fire; he had heard the howling tempest as it swept over the sighing forest and across the seething sea; he had seen the raging billows lift their haughty crests and roll themselves along the shore. But by-and-bye the elementary war ceased, and when the storm and clouds had passed away, the bright sky above and the green earth beneath, the mountain range in the background, the sweeping valley in the foreground, brightened with new beauty by the cloudless sun, rejoicing in the benison of rest and peace. Thus would it be with the Bible. Blessed Book! they say thy morals are tainted, that thy spirit is cruel, that thy circulation is an injury; and if we ask thee what thou hast to say to this, thy testimony is"—Be off with you, Mr. Kelynack; you and the rest of the imbeciles who,

under the pretence of protecting me, are stifling my life, and ruining my reputation. Turning from the speeches to the Report, we find the same stereotyped rigmarole of so much cash received for the printing and distribution of so many bibles, with, of course, the old fallacy cropping up in almost every sentence, that, by deluging the earth with bibles, humanity is to be redeemed from all its woes, and the Millenium is to be ushered in apace. Every form of faith but that of Evangelical Protestantism is bewailed as a soul-destroying imposture; infidels of every grade are either fiercely rebuked or solemnly admonished; while tint indefatigable and ubiquitous personage, the Colporteur, is lauded to the skies as a model of disinterested philanthropy; just as if, for another six-pence per day, his services would not, in nine cases out of ten, be readily transferred from the Bible Society to any Association that might be started for disseminating broadcast the works, say, of Thomas Paine. The expenditure item, too, of £173,476 2s., as against receipts amounting to £182,265 6s 3d., would look a good deal better, could we feel assured that the wretched price which the Society, desiring to render its gospel wares at the lowest possible rate, pays the large number of young women employed on bible-work, has never forced some of them to supplement their meagre resources by methods which we need not specify. But apart from these considerations, we must confess to our astonishment, that otherwise intelligent people can be so stupid as not to see that a community cannot be made wise and virtuous by merely flooding it with bibles, any more than a man can be made constitutionally sound and vigorous by merely stuffing him with food. Surely the ever-recurring fact that highly-civilised nations may be flagrantly immoral, and that their demoralisation may continue to increase, even when there are heaps of bibles in every house, affords no uncertain proof that the influence of the Bible is greatly overrated, or that the good which it might accomplish is left unaccomplished in consequence of our absurd notions of its origin and character. The want of our day is not bibles, but earnest, sensible and high-souled men and women, who, in devoting themselves to the social, moral and intellectual elevation of their fellow-creatures, will use the Bible, not as a power to enslave and bedarken the human understanding, but as a stimulus to the development of those faculties of our nature which minister to all true godliness and all true faith.

WHATEVER the shortcomings of the present Government, it undoubtedly took a wise step, and a step that has been generally approved of, in ordering the release of Mr. W. L. Jones. Some Sydney clergymen, it is true, were displeased thereto, expressing their satisfaction, as did the Rev. Canon Stephen, that "the majesty of the law, as recognising Christianity as part and parcel of the law of the land, had been vindicated," or clamouring outright, as did that Bull-of-Bashan, the Rev. Thomas Smith, for a confirmation of Judge Simpson's "righteous" sentence. We may venture to hope, however, that the action of the Government has convinced these would-be persecutors for opinion's sake, that the spirit of our time will not tolerate this disreputable mode of propping up their false and tottering dogmas, if indeed they do not stand self-convicted by it of having played the fool in the eyes of all sensible lookers on. The decision of the Government, then, was, we think, the best and the safest it could come to. There is, in truth, no knowing what might have happened had their decision been the other way. Certainly the age of miracles is past; but had Mr. Jones lived in the age of Peter the Apostle, we are entitled, it strikes us, to believe that the liberation of St. Lorando, like that of St. Peter under similar circumstances, would have been summarily effected without the intervention of a bulky petition and a formal response thereto by the powers that be. We can half imagine the consternation of the sturdy warders at Darlinghurst, at the vision of St. Lorando composedly stalking past them under the guidance of "a light," gate after gate swinging back on its hinges—awaking such a "morning echo" for our friend the *Mercantile Advertiser*!—at his approach! But ours, as we have intimated, is an unbelieving generation, no "sign," therefore, being possible for us but the release of Mr. Jones in accordance with a request from the Public, after entering into his own recognizances to keep the peace: a purely formal business, it seems, which, but for its being so, Mr. Jones, as a conscientious man, should and, we hope, would have declined to entertain. When Peter was released from prison, he was commanded "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." He was, in other words, requested to enter into his own recognizances to keep the peace! What answer did Peter make?" "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye." Mr. Jones, we take it, is, at this moment, in the fullest possession of that liberty of thought and speech, which is the inalienable right of every rational being, and on behalf of which, there are still some of us, we hope, prepared to sacrifice our civil freedom, and, if needs be, to shed our blood. Mr. Jones's imprisonment was no disgrace; and, whether Mr. Forster's Religious Opinions Bill becomes law or not, we mean to take care that it shall be no intimidation either to him or to any truth-seeking soul.

To the communication from Dr. Barry which appeared in our last issue, and which he thought proper to reproduce in the *Australian Churchman*, we had intended to reply at some length; but our able correspondent, Nicodemus, to whose letter we refer our readers, has generously saved us the trouble. Nicodemus, though a layman, is clearly no mean match for his clerical opponent; and it would, if we mistake not, take a doughtier controversialist than even Dr. Barry to keep the singularly weak position he has undertaken to defend. He attacks us for having said, in the course of our strictures on his lecture on the Reunion of Christendom, that

dogmatic Christianity has been weighed and found wanting, and that, forgetting or sinking our doctrinal differences as being of no vital importance, we should, therefore, cherish in our hearts a Christianity recognising nothing as fundamental but our duty to love and assist each other without regard to race or creed, and our duty to adore the one dear and good God. Dr. Barry, in reply, contends that the Christianity of Christ and of his immediate followers, as set forth in the New Testament, embraced, and regarded as essential, something more than these two duties. So far as the Christianity of Christ is concerned, we think Dr. Barry unaccountably mistaken. It is no doubt true that the Apostles and the Fathers after them, sadly distorted and impoverished the simple and beautiful faith of the founder of Christianity, but to say that Jesus attached any importance to, or that he was even acquainted with, the dogmas which a man, in Dr. Barry's opinion, *must* accept in order to be a Christian, is to say what is manifestly untrue. Have we not his idea of the sum and substance of piety in his ever-precious and unmistakeable declaration of the two commandments—the one of Love to God and the other of Love to Man? The opacity of the theological eye-glass will, indeed, challenge belief. Whatever his weaknesses and misconceptions, the great and imperishable glory of Jesus is that he discerned, as by a sublime intuition, that true religion should be based, not on dogma, but on character; that it should be rooted, not in belief, but love. We advise Dr. Barry to rub his eye-glass and look at the new Testament again.

FROM time to time within the last two years, the question of colonial labour between Fiji and Queensland has been more or less discussed. Opinions have run high, and the whole question seems hitherto to have been made rather one of party than one of seeking to find out a means that, while benefiting both employers and employed, shall contribute to the common good. There has been much recrimination, and little evidence; and the whole dispute has been so invested with absurdity and misrepresentation that we regret seeing the name of Bishop Patteson at all mixed up with it. The "Memorandum" of this gentleman, as recently reported in the *New Zealand Herald*, is not what we should have expected from one whose facilities for correct information should at least have suggested caution in his statements. This "Memorandum" seems a plaintive sort of charge from beginning to end—its matter puerile—its charges insignificant and unsustained—scarcely meriting notice but from the signature attached to it. But the whole subject of Queensland labour and its necessary supply by the natives of the Pacific, is of far too important a character to be treated in a half captious spirit. The circumstances of the whole case, it must be remembered, are such, that while labour is imperatively called for from the utter inability of the European constitution to encounter the attendant fatigue, means can and will be found to introduce it, though at the sacrifice of some of those visionary and sentimental ideas more adapted to the working of some Utopia than to a work-a-day world. It would be folly, as it certainly would be waste of time, to dwell very critically on Dr. Patteson's crude and mischievous innuendoes. He gives us the impression of one who is by no means secure of his own moral standing. Unable to take an enlarged and comprehensive view of things, he splits straws and quarrels about a goat's hair. With all his professed interest in the labour question, he has never yet taken the trouble to visit the Plantations, when by so doing he could assure himself of the truth or not of the charges he seems but too content to take at second hand. He is ever open to native reports, though we confidently put it to any experienced colonist whether exaggeration is not a noted feature of the savage mind. He awards, it is true, some credit to the whalers, as a body, for their generally considerate treatment of the Islanders; yet he represents the European trader as, in nine cases out of ten, either a kidnapper or a covert rogue, with no more religion than what he carries on his sleeve, while the missionary is lauded as a pattern of self-abnegation, and as the only disinterested friend the Islanders have. Now, that Dr. Patteson should lend himself to misrepresentation of any sort is to be regretted. But careless as he may be in ministering to this delusion, we hold him far more reprehensible, and designedly mischievous, when we hear him openly advocating, as he does in his Memorandum, the presence of two small men-of-war to cruise constantly among the Islands, and specially in the neighbourhood of Queensland and the Fiji group, to intercept vessels bringing native labour, and of course to offer such other impediments in the way of trade as may suggest themselves to a class of men with whom might is for the time right, and the tedium of a cruise would receive considerable relief from the pursuit and vexatious overhauling of an unresisting trader. One might have thought the *Daphne* affair would have suggested some caution about undue interference, and the shelling and destruction of an entire native village by the transcendent valour of a man-of-war's crew, a too one-sided exploit to bear frequent repetition. These are circumstances far less likely to be forgotten than the petty abstractions of a few lawless marauders. By the Bishop's advocacy of force, over the effect of time and the operation of remedial measures, he has committed himself to he knows not what. The increase of power to himself by any possible calamity to others—for men's passions are not always under control, and a vexatious persecution may induce resistance—can never be a happy memory; or can the chance sacrifice of one life in such a cause add to the honour of his episcopate. Hoping, however, for the best, we would merely observe, it is something more than religionism that must civilise the natives of Polynesia. They need an intercourse with foreigners that shall give birth to artificial wants, both humanising and raising them in the social scale. They may not be found worse

traders from having set a catechist at nought, and from not hypocritically professing what they cannot understand. The Bishop may count his nominal disciples by thousands—they may be eulogised and petted at public meetings—and the yearly "Report" may absolutely burst with the number of its teeming disciples. But let any prospect of bettering their condition present itself—even with all the denials and hard-ships it entails—and your pattern converts will cast aside all their teaching by rote as easily and completely as they would throw aside their mat or blanket, showing how small a sense they entertain of mere religion unconnected with personal profit, and to what shallow depths it has penetrated their minds, either from total ignorance of the subject taught, or else from indifference and keen observation of the distinction between precept and practice among those who take it upon themselves to instruct.

WE have recently had our attention directed to some strictures of Mr. Alexander Gordon on the common School System of America. We should not, perhaps, have taken the trouble to notice their unfairness and narrow tendency but from some remembrance of this gentleman's recent contest with Mr. Parkes about the latter's Education Bill. Apparently, the Public School System has survived the onslaught of Mr. Gordon's heaviest columns : so, raising the siege, he has gone across the Pacific, and fallen foul of the "Common School System of America" as a system promotive of crime, and of the violation of law. Hit high, hit low, there is no pleasing the learned barrister, when riding his own special educational hobby. There seems to be such a twist in some minds that they must measure every mortal thing by their own standard. The recent Elementary Education Act, drawn, as it undoubtedly is, from Prussian sources, is gravely censured, because, discarding everything in the shape of a Denominational Creed, such religious instruction only is given, as shall, from its general and therefore "colourless" nature, readily secure the sympathy of all, by running counter to the religious prejudices of none. And consistently with that scarcely deserved moderation that has constantly marked the Imperial Education Board, Denominationalism is allowed to work itself out, on the same principle that we would consign an old horse to a paddock, or refrain from shooting a toothless hound. As to the victory of the Denominationalist over the Secularist candidates in the election of the Boards, it need scarcely excite surprise, when we reflect what a staff there was no one side of trained teachers ready to act at a moment's notice, and adapt themselves to circumstances, while on the other side was an almost total inexperience of school routine, and of the ordinary exigencies of such a position. Of course, under such teachers as the former, "mere Bible reading" may be thought an impossibility, and religious confusion may be held in more esteem than the catholic and simple faith that is taught in few words and fewer doctrines. But when we begin to connect Denominational teaching with biblical explanation—to dwell on the varied interpretation of each sect, and the doctrinal peculiarities of each persuasion—when we reflect that all are vehemently insisted upon—while all cannot be true—we are lost in amazement at any one conceiving a bond of unity being wrought out of so dissimilar material. It appears to us as if our friend had an educational hobby, and would persist in riding it to death. Why should Mr. Gordon go out of his way to tell us that the schools of America exercise a corrupting influence, and that there has been an immense increase of crime over the whole surface of the United States since the introduction of the Common School System? The fair way, and one that would evince a far deeper acquaintance with the subject, would be to take the average of increased crime during a certain number of years, and then to compare it with the tables of a preceding period. We should then, perhaps, see how small cause one religious system has, in this respect, to laud it over another—and how much that is laid to the charge of any one system, may with far greater justice be laid at the door of man's natural proneness to error, whether he be as civilised as a denominationalist, or with no more sense than a beast. Mr. Gordon's views, both on religion and education, are harsh and unconciliating. He is far too apt to carry the severity of the advocate into whatever he examines, forgetting to temper his remarks with that spirit which has the charm of engaging, and yet of not compromising. He must by this time have learned what small consideration is netted to those who will obstinately withstand the progress of the age they live in, and who fondly suppose that its impulses are to be checked by forms and fashions of thinking as obsolete as any old and musty statute. While making all allowance for that natural repugnance to enter on a new groove of thought, and to forego even the teachings of so enlarged an experience as may be gathered within a four-walled chamber, and among associates with views and cast of thought similar to his own—still, he will either have to do this, to remove the mental furniture of a bygone period, and substitute other, more adapted to the age, or he must be henceforth content to incur the polite indifference of all who cannot, and will not, dwell on the maunderings of a dreamer, or on the pertinacity of one who will struggle on and do battle with the tide that is hurrying him and hundreds of others such as he, like motes, away with it.

A GENIUS of discord, in the shape of the Rev. Fergus Ferguson, of Dalkeith, has recently thrown the apple among the fair United Presbytery of Edinburgh. The apple seems, *in transitu*, to have changed into a crab, since none of the learned Presbyters would have ought to do with it. The reverend culprit appears to have launched out to that degree in the "Church Court," that the very fathers of the Assembly were for a moment paralysed and knew not what to do. And indeed we are scarcely surprised at their hesitation. Milton's fallen angels discoursed of "predestination and free will," and "found no end in wondering mazes lost"—in fact, had their

labour for their pains. But this young smatterer would be hand-and-glove with St. Peter, and is as glib about Christ preaching to the spirits in prison as though he had made friends with Cerberus and had the key of the Elysian fields. What his "presentation of the truth of Christ in the world to come to those who have not received the Gospel in this" can be, we are unable to make out. Such a tissue of nonsense throughout we have seldom encountered; seasoned, as it is, with the wondering and mysticism of the German school, with all the wit and cleverness left out. We hate coming across such balderdash. As to the young man's introducing among the Presbyterian ministry "speculations or opinions going beyond the line of Divine Revelation"—about this we can say little, being but slightly acquainted with the length of the Presbyterian tether. We are only surprised that such case-hardened doctors can be at all put out by such a Jack-a-Lantern, when he takes up his parable like a modern Ezekiel. We can fancy venerable Doctors getting on their legs, and urging the dangerous tendency of Mr. Ferguson's remarks about a future dispensation, from their weakening the motive to missionary exertion! All in confusion, and at their wits' end, they finally move the previous question in debate—in other words, they make it their business to let him alone, and let those tackle him who may have the hardihood to try it on. But, good Lord! if Mr. Ferguson must speak, let him speak sense, and not weary and mystify us with his rhodomontade. He may, for all we care, be as free as that chartered libertine the wind; but we cannot stand arrant nonsense. What between the unintelligible questions of the Presbytery, and their reported "ambiguity" by the delinquent, we can only arrive at the conclusion that all parties retired about as wise as they came. The sensitiveness of Mr. Dodds, the promoter of the charge, is not the least ridiculous feature in the affair. Himself and his shop door are somewhat in character. The laughter that seems to have attended the examination is fit accompaniment for so absurd an exhibition; and a solemn assemblage of aged and; learned men owes small thanks, we think, to this young and egotistical acolyte for placing them so unexpectedly in so undignified a position, propounding dark subjects that he cannot throw light on, and is yet too restless to leave alone. If he desire to flesh his young doctrinal sword, and come down like a shell upon the disunited Presbytery, let him deal with the dogmas ready to his hand, and open enough, goodness knows, to his critical thrusts. There is ample room and verge enough for any reforms he may suggest, or have pluck enough to carry, without further adding, by his silly conceits, to that already perplexed who of Presbyterianism that would demand, by this time, more than mortal wit to unravel.

THE first number of a Periodical styled the *Watchtower* has just been forwarded to us from New Zealand, edited by the Rev. Mr. Elmslie, a Presbyterian minister of Wanganui. We regret to say that we cannot sympathise with him in the general tone of his religious Magazine. Inferring his holding it no compliment to speak otherwise than we think, we confess our disappointment in this age of reason and of public institutes, at seeing what might become an organ of social advance and of religious enlightenment, sliding into the old worn-out groove of obsolete creeds and exploded matters of thought. Agreeing with him at once in the all-powerful agency of the Press, we differ from him *toto coelo* about the influence of the Pulpit. The benefits of the Press are sensible and obvious, while those of the Pulpit are at the best both recondite and inappreciable. And how again can the former be too highly estimated, or how can the latter escape indifference, when the wisdom of the one is a matter of daily gathering, and the sole profit of the other doubt and mental weariness. If, as the reverend gentleman observes, "the state of the Colony calls for the Bible's defence from the attacks of a swaggering liberalism," its champions had need have their weapons in order, and buckle on a well tried armour of proof; not venturing on its rescue with their pigmy arguments of straw, where there is a call for a very Goliath's sword. We wish the Editor of the *Watchtower*, once for all, to understand that we feel no interest whatever in that style of argument that grounds itself on a basis to be first proved sound. In a question of religious evidence a *petitio principii* has no weight with us. We can well content to incur all the *onus* of not seeing divine things through an evangelical lens. If "colonial indifference" to so-called "divine realities," and its imputed "flippancy and trifling" were the result of studied impiety, we should regret such a state of things as much as Mr. Elmslie. But convinced, as we are, that the fast increasing scepticism, and open unbelief in Scripture, may be laid at the door rather of those who rush with professional but indiscreet zeal headlong to defend it, than in the assaults of others who would be equally good with far less enforced belief—we can see no good in fettering the mind, and keeping it in the leading strings of a bygone epoch. Religious opinions are as opposite to one another as light is to darkness; and this being so, we can readily make allowance for the thousands who do not believe what Archbishop and Curate, what Moderator and the meanest Elder, squabble about equally. Respecting the "Phases of Infidelity," about which the *Watchtower* discourses so dolorously, we have seen and heard so much of this sort of thing before, that at this time of day we hardly feel interested in a study which is little more than secondhand. About the structure and literary arrangement of the new Journal we deliver no opinion. It will stand or fall by its own merits. The few remarks we have made are naturally drawn forth by the wide difference in our religious views, and are meant neither to trench on social politeness, nor to embrace more meaning than seems warranted by the occasion.

OUR attention has been taken by a series of advertisements, or rather oracular intimations, emanating from

the Rev. Dr. Wazir Beg, and announcing the delivery by this singular specimen of the Lord's Anointed of a set of lectures on Infidels and their various shortcomings. Dr. Beg, it seems, would have us conceive of an infidel as one who is wholly incapable of behaving himself as a politician, as a citizen, as a husband, as a father, in any decent capacity whatever in fact, and who, after living the wretchedest of lives, dies of necessity an agonising death of remorse, and is then sent to Old Bogie to be for ever pitchforked to and fro by his ministering demons. And in order that there might be no mistake as to who the infidel is, our unctuous Presbyterian priest is reported by one who heard the utterance to have prayed thus: "God, I thank thee, that my congregation does not contain a sceptic, or an unbeliever, or a scorner of thy revealed will, or a secularist, or one of that worst form of infidelity—a Unitarian." Dr. Beg probably remembers what happened when two men, on one occasion, "went into the temple to pray;" and, which of the two it was that, at the conclusion of their devotions was "justified rather than the other." No doubt Dr. Beg has often read this suggestive story for the edification of his congregation, but, besottedly indifferent to the lesson it inculcates, he has evidently yet to learn that he, and many such as he, will, at the final casting up of human accounts, be deemed unworthy to stand in the presence of myriads of brave and noble souls who, though deemed infidels (as Christ himself was) while in the flesh, will, as disembodied spirits, be found nestling in the bosom of the Father. Mince this grave matter with Dr. Wazir Beg and the like of him we certainly shall not. Utterly disgusted with the mawwormish, unchristian spirit he has on several occasions exhibited, and the sickening cant which invariably characterises his utterances, we should like him to understand that a strutting mass of clerical pomposity wrapped in an atmosphere of pharisaical super-sanctity is insufficient to make even a man, still less a Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene. Dr. Beg, lament as he may the progress of infidelity, is, we venture to say, personally responsible for no small portion of it. The authoress of *Felix Holt* was not far out when she hinted the existence of thousands who, as often as they wish to think of Jesus Christ, instinctively shut their eyes for fear they should see a parson!

Bell's Life in Sydney has had an unexpected, nay, a quite unprecedented, windfall in the recent religious prize-fight; and in the columns of that journal, discredibly enough to its editor, the loathesome particulars of this devilish transaction are to be found. For ourselves we touch it, and touch it only, with extreme reluctance. It would not over distress us to know that two bull-dogs in human shape, sashed, the one with orange and the other with green, had met by appointment, after the manner of professional pugilists, and, in the presence of a herd of fellow ruffians, battered, and maimed each other—but for our conviction that the disgusting occurrence forms a portion of the first-fruits of the forth-coming crop of sectarian hatred and intolerance, the seeds of which the members of the Protestant Political Association and of the various Orange Lodges have for some time past been pertinaciously occupied in sowing. The P. P. A. fraternity and the "Black Preceptory" gentry, will doubtless disavow their responsibility in the matter; but that they *are* responsible for the of late years rapid growth of a spirit which, infusing its venom into the minds of even young children, is visibly widening that gap between the two main sections of Christendom, and destroying that neighbourly respect and brotherly love which, whatsoever our religious beliefs, should underlie all our social relationships—no discerning person will doubt. May God forgive those who, daring to call themselves ministers of Christ, are demoniacally urging on this Protestant Crusade. Utterly unable to appreciate the trusts and inspirations which lie at the root of every religious creed, and as utterly incompetent to deal with the pressing and momentous problems of religious thought, these men, headed by the viperous crew of the *Protestant Standard*, have to earn what pay and what reputation they can by trading on the lowest passions of human nature. We are unwilling to include so respectable a man as Dr. Barry among such: and it is therefore to be regretted that his letter to the *Mercantile Advertiser* in defence of Orangeism, should, to some extent, identify him with an abominable sectarian rabies, having about as much religion in it as there is friendship in the grip of a python.

The Protestant Dragon.

WE can believe that the Rev. Colin M'Culloch counted himself happy in his illustration, when, at the recent annual meeting of the Bible Society, he likened that "despised and blasphemed book," the Bible, to the Ark of the Covenant when it fell into the hands of the brave and patriotic people who so sturdily, and for a long time successfully, resisted the swarms of Hebrew filibusters, who, under the pretence of taking possession of a land promised to them by the Lord, had the impudence to invade their territory. Our readers will remember that the Ark, on the occasion referred to, was quite equal to the task of vindicating its sanctity; afflicting as it did its sacrilegious custodians with a painful and obstinate disease which eventually forced them to relinquish their troublesome war-prize; and slaughtering as it did more than fifty thousand of the inhabitants of Beth-Shemish, because some of their number had impiously dared to glance at its contents. Over these wonderful occurrences, the Rev. Colin M'Culloch, in his anxiety to defend the Bible, or rather his theory of the Bible, from the

aggressions of modern religious thought, is, as we have intimated, exceedingly jubilant; though whether modern unbelievers are in danger of the emerods (hemorrhoids) which the Hebrew Jehovah, as patron of the Ark, so profusely distributed among the inhabitants of Ashdod, Gath and Ekron, or of the still more terrible calamity which befell the people of Beth-Shemish, he does not undertake to say. Assuming Mr. M'Culloch's view of the Bible to be the true view, and that those who cannot see with him are consequently amenable, in some way or other, to the divine displeasure, it certainly is not easy to understand why the unbeliever should, as a rule, be superior to the believer in grasp of intellect and the amount of his information; unless, indeed, it be that, as divines assure us, the simple and sublime verities of the Christian faith are inappreciable by the "wise and prudent" of this world, and that God, whose "word" the Bible is affirmed to be, punishes those who reject or cavil at the authority of his revealed will, not by afflicting them with "hemorrhoids in their secret parts," but by the much humaner method of endowing them with larger and more penetrating minds. We are unwilling, however, to lose sight of this little discrepancy, and to admit that our friend's illustration, in spite of its connection with an absurd and disgusting fiction which he unpardonably treats as a piece of genuine history, is not at all a bad one. Truth and goodness, oppose and defame them as men may, arc, in the long run, self-vindicating; nor can any force of error, prejudice, or superstition withstand their ultimate enthronement in the affections of an enlightened and elevated humanity. As Mr. J. S. Mill, in his work on *Liberty*, concisely illustrates by a number of memorable instances, truth may, and frequently does, fight a losing battle for centuries : yet the present, with its manifold triumphs of moral and intellectual progress, is but the accumulation of victories thus slowly but surely won in the past; as the future, in turn, will prove to be the unfolding and popularisation of truths—the truth, for example, that the Bible is not an idol to be worshipped but a treasure to be prized—which, despite the fanatical clamours of some and the selfish indifference of others, are in our own clay silently but visibly pushing ahead. We rejoice, then, to believe, with Mr. M'Culloch, that every truth, or system of doctrine founded on truth, is inherently and, in the fulness of time, inevitably self-protecting; and believing, as we further do, that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures—due allowance being made for their many serious defects—are incomparably the richest literary inheritance the world possesses, or is likely to possess, we can confidently anticipate the final verdict of mankind respecting these writings, and, for that very reason, be willing that they should be submitted to the freest critical scrutiny. But by Mr. M'Culloch, as by every bibliolater, the application of any such criticism to the Scriptures, especially when it leads to results that conflict with the popular notion of their origin and character, is, unfortunately, regarded as a sin. His doctrine—a doctrine in support of which neither he nor any man living can advance the shadow of a valid argument, it being based on the merest ecclesiastical assumption—is, that, during the period of the world's history dating from the time of Moses to that of John the Apostle, certain persons were specially and exceptionably qualified to produce writings divested of every description of error; that the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments are in substance, if not in detail, the same as those thus supernaturally vouchsafed and authoritatively handed down; and that to find fault with the Scriptures is, therefore, to find fault with Him under whose inspiration they were given, and to involve ourselves in the approach of repudiating the only authentic revelation he has made of himself to man. To increasing multitudes of earnest and independent thinkers in the present day, the monstrously illogical character of this method of procedure has become startlingly apparent; nor can it be doubted that in years to come an enlightened Christendom will deem it incredible that rational beings should ever have erected the dogma of biblical infallibility on the assumption that the Almighty selected a few individuals of the human race to receive from him an infallible communication, and that the Bible, as being the record of this communication, is, in very truth, his "Word." By the many, in those coining days, as in our own day by the comparatively few, it will be clearly seen that for determining the truth or falsity of doctrines, whether religious or otherwise, there never has been, and never will be, any higher court of appeal accessible to us than that of Reason and Conscience; and that to their tribunal, therefore, every human belief must be brought for final adjudication. We are aware that in occupying this position we expose ourselves to the charge—a charge that has on several occasions during the last few weeks been publicly hurled against us—of hating the Bible, and of aiming to undermine the sanctities of religious faith. But the real difference between ourselves and our opponents, as the authors of this self-refuting caumny must secretly be aware, is, that we are labouring, with such influence as we have, to liberate the wheat of truth from its traditional husk of error, while our opponents, the defenders of orthodox Christianity, are, to their great detriment, persistently beat on swallowing both.

We submit, then, that Mr. M'Culloch's Ark-of-the-Covenant illustration is rendered pointless, forceless, and therefore of none effect, by his assuming the Bible to be what it clearly is not—namely, a body of moral and religious truth unadulterated by the slightest infusion of error. It so happens, however, that a portion of the very narrative from which his illustration is taken so exactly indicates the relation of the Bible, or rather of the dogma of biblical infallibility, to the highest religious philosophy of the age, that we gladly avail ourselves of it on the chance of throwing a little "more light" on a subject that has hitherto been shrouded in an almost

impenetrable darkness. We find, then, on referring to the fifth chapter of the first book of Samuel, that, prior to its hemorrhoid-distributing and death-dealing peregrinations, the Ark was temporarily located in the temple of one of their deities—the celebrated Dagon. Dagon, as might have been expected, was much annoyed at this proceeding, and, taking the first opportunity, remonstrated with the audacious parallelopiped on its unseemly invasion of his fane. The parallelopiped, resenting Dagon's impertinence, appears to have answered him sharply; and a something more than verbal contest ensuing between the august disputants, the famous fish-god, getting decidedly the worst of it, was found next morning—not, we suspect, without a stout leverage from behind, some zealous partisan of the Ark having slyly so managed it—flat upon his nose. Dismayed and indignant at this signal and undignified discomfiture of their deity by a contemptible wooden box which the chances of war had thrown into their hands, the Philistines, in the full belief that a continuation of the contest would sooner or later yield better results, lost no time in restoring Dagon from the prone to the perpendicular position. To their unspeakable disgust, however, "when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground before the ark of the Lord; and the head of Dagon and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the stump of Dagon was left to him." Poor old Dagon! He, then, it was clear, with the maimed trunk of him prostrate on the floor of his own temple, was no match for the God of his people's filibustering enemies. In his first nocturnal encounter with the Ark, the latter, exhibiting a decisive superiority, had thrown Dagon upon his nose; in their second combat, it had both levelled Dagon and deprived him of his head and hands; what might the Ark do to Dagon if the struggle were allowed to go on? What but pulverise him outright; grind him to powder; and, perchance, scatter his dust to the winds! Dagon's position, therefore, was critical in the extreme. The national faith, too, was imperilled; for, with the Ark of the Hebrew Jehovah confronting him in his own temple, there was no keeping Dagon perpendicular to the plane of the horizon. Down, do what they would to bolster him up, on his face he would go. So to save their deity and the national faith from any further humiliation, the Philistines wisely determine to remove the Ark from Dagon's temple, and subsequently, by the aid of their priests, to restore what, from their experience of the hemorrhoids, they had come to regard as an intolerable nuisance, to its original proprietors. Our readers will, we think, find no difficulty in noting the resemblance between the Dagon of this singular story and the Dagon we have placed at the head of our article—the Protestant Dagon of Biblical Infallibility. A few sentences anent this wide and important subject are as much as, on the present occasion, we can undertake to pen.

For a period extending over fifty generations the Bible has been regarded by the ablest and wisest portion of the human race as a book *sui generis* : as a book, that is, distinguished from all other books, not only by the illimitable and essential superiority of its contents, but also, and chiefly, by the purely exceptional *modus operandi* of its preparation. Every subscriber to the dogma of Biblical Inspiration is supposed to believe, not merely that the Bible, as the noblest collection of writings in existence, meritoriously occupies the summit of the world's pyramid of literature, but that in its service, and on its behalf, the mysteries of providence and the secrets of destiny were graciously disclosed, God thus breaking the eternal silence with the only utterance of His voice that has been, or ever will be, heard. And so, as we have said, the Old and New Testament Scriptures have, for a period of seventeen hundred years, been read, consulted, studied, and worshipped, as the *ipsissima verba* of the Almighty. If we ask for the evidence on which this incredible doctrine is based, we are referred either to the authority of the Church and the decrees of the Councils, or to the assertions of the biblical writers themselves : to the assertion, for example, that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;" to the statement, again, affirming that "Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" or to numerous expressions in the Old Testament—"The Lord spake unto Moses," "Thus saith Jehovah," etc.—which appear to indicate the writer's conviction that the persons alluded to had had direct and veritable converse with God. We pause not to comment on the gross misunderstanding and misapplication of these statements; and would merely observe, that, supposing them to affirm the dogma under consideration, their testimony, *as being that of a witness to himself*, is simply inadmissible, as, on the other hand, more ecclesiastical testimony, unsupported by reason and historic probability, is simply *nil*.

Marvellous to think that this utterly incredible dogma of Biblical Inspiration should have domineered for centuries over the human mind and conscience without one stalwart and independent soul starting up to smite at and demolish it. Receiving it from the Fathers, the churchmen of the Middle Ages did but confuse and mystify the patristic idea of Inspiration by enveloping it in a cloud of metaphysical distinctions and definitions; no; when a brighter age began to dawn, did it occur to the minds of the pre-Lutheran reformers that their defence of the rights and privileges of the soul against the encroachments of ecclesiastical power was but a phase of the great struggle they had so nobly initiated. As for Luther himself, preeminent as were his services in the cause of religious freedom, it must be admitted, that, by delivering the souls of men from the keeping of a corrupt ecclesiasticism, and by fixing their faith on the Scriptures as a supreme and unerring authority on all questions of doctrine and discipline, he confirmed rather than relaxed their stultifying bondage to the mere letter of a book, which was thenceforth to be the religion, and the sole religion, of Protestantism. Luther, however, if not that

light, was, at any rate, sent to bear witness of that light which, in the fulness of time, was to come into the world, and which did come into the world in the century which gave birth to Spinoza and Locke. Neither Spinoza nor Locke, it is true, was a disbeliever in the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Yet the former, in his celebrated *Tractatus*, explains the doctrine away; while "the Father of English nationalism," annihilating at a stroke the crowd of assumptions in which theology is in the habit of taking refuge from the attacks of reason, prepared the way for the fearless and uncompromising school of biblical criticism represented by the English Freethinkers and French Encyclopedists of the following century. By Blount, in his "Oracles of Reason;" Toland, in his "Christianity not Mysterious;" Collins, in his "Discourse of Freethinking;" Shaftesbury, in "The Characteristics;" by Tindal, Morgan, Leland, Chubb, Bolingbroke and Woolston; by these and other powerful writers of the school of English Free-thinking, the Protestant Dagon of Biblical Infallibility was more or less unsparingly assailed, and, in spite of the frenzied efforts of his votaries to keep him steady, unmistakably shaken on his traditional pedestal. Later on, under the blows of Hume, Gibbon and Paine, this oscillatory movement became truly alarming; thousands upon thousands inclining to the conviction—so strong had the sceptical spirit become towards the close of the eighteenth century—that the Author of the "Age of Reason" had administered the *coup de grace*. Possibly, he did so. The influence of the work with which he belaboured the Protestant Dagon at any rate was, and still is, at least in certain circles, very great. Yet, with the mass of educated persons, the *Age of Reason*, considered as a refutation of the Inspiration theory, has been long since superseded by the writings of men who, while wishing to purge the Bible of its manifold errors, are as anxious to recognise its inestimable and imperishable truths as Paine, under the influence of strong reactionary feelings, seemed anxious to ignore them. It is, there can be little doubt, this feature of modern religious thought—this considerate and discriminating treatment of the prostrate Protestant idol—which so disturbs the equanimity, or arouses the consternation, of his votaries, under the ill-disguised suspicion that the glory, the *false* glory, of the Dagon of Protestantism has, no less surely than that of Ephesian Diana, been doomed to an irrevocable *Ichabod*.

A hundred times, if once, during the last quarter of a century, has the dogma of the Inspiration of the Scriptures been assailed and, in the opinion of all unbiassed persons, demolished, by writers identifying themselves with one or another of the Christian denominations. A deplorable fact, in the eyes of all true believers, no doubt; and one, too, with which, as we have intimated, they scarcely know how to cope. Your modern preacher, melting away under the influence of a real or affected pity, or "shivering with horror," as did Judge Simpson when passing sentence on W. L. Jones, can no longer confine the attention of his hearers, when descanting on the fearful sin of [unclear: unbelief], to the "ribald blasphemies of Paine and Voltaire"—of which he in all probability knows little if anything whatever—but must also drag through the mire of his silly utterances such [unclear: men] as Colenso, Davidson, Cranbrook, Voysey, Martineau, and [unclear: the] authors of *Essays and Reviews* : men, be it remembered, [unclear: entertaining] a profound admiration for the noble portions of the Old Testament and for the still nobler portions of the New: [unclear: men], too, imbued with a profound reverence for the person and [unclear: work] of Jesus of Nazareth : irreproachably good men, moreover, [unclear: and] occasionally, as in the case of James Martineau, without an [unclear: equal] in the field of intellectual research. We say nothing of [unclear: the] legion of German heterodox religious inquirers; nothing of [unclear: the] multitudes of educated laymen both in England and in Germany, and in every country, who, secretly or openly, disbelieve [unclear: the] Bible to be what all orthodox churches declare it to be; as [unclear: our] particular object is to fix the attention of our readers on the [unclear: fact] that the irreparable overthrow of the Protestant Dagon has been accomplished, not by the avowed foes, but by the avowed friends of the Bible and of Christianity.

For an able and accurate statement of the now virtually [unclear: concluded] controversy concerning the Inspiration of the [unclear: Scriptures] we gladly avail ourselves, in bringing our remarks to a [unclear: close], of an admirable passage or two from Mr. W. R. Greg's *Truth versus Edification*." He says :

"Many of those doctrines of Christianity, as ordinarily preached, which [unclear: lost] perplex and try the faith of sincere believers, and most effectually repel [unclear: from] the threshold of belief thoughtful, pure, and earnest minds of all classes, [unclear: depend] for their authority mainly or solely on special texts and passages, [unclear: which] are often at variance with the general tone and tenor of the book, [unclear: these] special texts and passages are considered conclusive, and all men have [unclear: been] required to fall prostrate before them, and submissively accept their [unclear: reaching] merely on the strength of that dogma of verbal inspiration which [unclear: Dr]. Colenso so effectually overthrows. It cannot be too strongly stated that [unclear: nearly] all the difficulties which have stood in the way of the cordial reception [unclear: of] the pure-religion of Christ, whether by foreign heathens or by native [unclear: aepctics], have been gratuitous, artificial, and the creation of Christian [unclear: ministers] and divines. Thousands upon thousands would have accepted the [unclear: Rich] essentials of the New Testament readily and joyously, who could not [unclear: accept] the legends, the dogmas, or the speculative propositions which were [unclear: affirmed] to form part

and parcel of Christianity, to be inextricably bound up [*unclear: on*] its nature, and to be inferentially involved in its reception. It is not the [*unclear: noble*] poetry, and the sublime devotion, and the unfailing trust of Job, and [*unclear: David*], and Isaiah; it is not the fascinating character, the solemn grandeur, [*unclear: the*] elevating, enriching, guiding, glorious career of the Saviour while on [*unclear: earth*]; it is not the satisfying, comforting, strengthening, convincing views of [*unclear: our*] relations to God our Father, which he first taught and made us [*unclear: comprehend*]; it is not those grand and far-reaching hopes, nor those grave, sad [*unclear: earnings*], nor those ineffable and inspiring consolations, which we may gather [*unclear: from*] every page of the New Testament and from many pages of the Old :—it [*unclear: is*] none of these things that have deterred the thoughtful and the good, or [*unclear: even*] the careless and the critical, from accepting Christianity on their knees [*unclear: with*] gratitude and with submission as the greatest boon ever offered to, [*unclear: struggling*] and aspiring man. All these things would have been attractive— not repellant; and these things are the essence of the faith which Jesus taught, and for which he lived and died. But the angel that has stood with flaming sword at the gate, and has driven men away from the Eden of Truth and Hope, in which they might have found rest for their troubled souls, strength for their feeble knees, and a lamp for the dark and thorny path, has been this very doctrine of verbal inspiration and *textual correctness* It is *on the authority of this dogma, and on this alone*, that educated and rational men are required—as the very condition, as it were, of their admission into the Temple—to accept as true the six days Creation, with all their rude errors and singular misconceptions; the tree of knowledge, the apple and the fall; *two* statements as to Noah's Ark and the animals that entered it, utterly contradictory, and both incredible; the ingenious legend of the Tower of Babel; the literal version of the plagues of Egypt, and the crowded miracles of the Exodus, the passage of the Red Sea, the sojourn in the Desert, and the establishment in Canaan; the strange and more than strange stories about the Patriarchs; and, to crown the whole, the *directly divine* origin of Levitical instructions. No one, of course, would dream of accepting these as [sacred] history, if not constrained to it by the dogma of verbal inspiration; nor, were it not for this dogma, would any one feel them a serious obstacle to the reception of all that the Old Testament contains of noble, and elevating, and true, in its teachings of the ways of God to man."

And again :

"An ordinary believer—pious, sincere, not knowing Colenso, and having not been 'insensibly' inoculated by the subtle emanations of the *Zeit-Geist* (or 'spirit of the time'), but trained in the common doctrine of biblical inspiration—is often put to sore suffering and trial. A man in sacerdotal robes, brought up at the feet of the most accredited Gamaliel, stamped as sterling by the image and superscription of the National Church, addresses him thus:—'You are bound to believe—for it is all written in the Inspired Books and endorsed by the Church—not only that God created man; called Abraham; led the Israelites out of bondage, and set them apart and trained them as a peculiar people; revealed His true character and relations through a succession of prophets; and finally completed the purification and redemption of man through Jesus Christ;—but also that He directed the construction of Noah's Ark, and sent all living beast therein; aided Jacob in a filthy fraud; sanctioned the basest treachery; commanded fearful cruelties and unmerited penalties; permitted the flogging of slaves to death, provided only they did not die upon the spot; showed His back but not His face to Moses; and dictated the veracious narrative of Balaam and his ass. You must accept the one set of statements as not only equally true, but as equally valuable and instructive, with the other; for what are you, that you should dare to choose between one and another deed or word of the Most High, or place one on a higher level than another? You must receive all these things, on peril of damnation; for they are all written in the Word of God; everything written there is inspired; and to reject or doubt the true sayings of God is damnation.'—An ordinary Christian, thus addressed, either succumbs or resists. If he succumbs, his reason is outraged and bewildered, and his moral sense is shocked and injured. If he resists, he is made miser-able by doubts, misgivings, and tormenting fears. The same man, in sacerdotal garments, comes to Mr. Matthew Arnold, and addresses him in the same words. But the Professor, serene and unassailable in his double armour of natural intelligence and perfect culture, waives him aside with a gesture of supreme and ineffable disdain, saying, "Pooh, pooh, man! don't talk that stuff to *me*."

Here, for fear of diminishing the force of these unanswerable arguments, we finish. They precisely indicate the aim and work of our journal with regard to the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures; and it is to be hoped that those who, like Mr. M'Culloch and other speakers at the Bible Society's meeting, denounce us as "sneerers" at, and "revilers" of the Bible, will not permanently remain in ignorance of the distinction between a reckless and unwholesome trampling upon things for ever sacred, and the "removing of those things that are shaken, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."

J. P.

Absolution and Apostolical Authority.

To absolve and *Absolution* are words to be found in neither Testament. In the Liturgy of the Church of England they occur several times either in the rubrics or in the text. And it is here we find a meaning given to these words not fairly borne out by any Greek or Latin author whose works are ordinarily quoted as of any classical authority. But steering clear of what might have the semblance of pedantry, and of any however brief grammatical disquisition, we would go at once to an ecclesiastical source for an ecclesiastical interpretation. With this intent we turn for the orthodox meaning of absolution to the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick," wherein, after the sick person shall have been moved by the minister to make a special confession of his sins, he is then and there, after profession of repentance and belief, at once absolved by said minister from all his sins, by virtue of some authority alleged to have been divinely trans-mitted. The absolution here is meant to be as plenary as the assumption of its exercise is gratuitous. In the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer the mechanism of the absolution is somewhat different. In the office for the sick, absolution is *direct*; in the two latter, as well as in the Communion service, it is *indirect*. Instead of the authoritative "I absolve" of the former, it is the "he absolveth," the "may be absolved" of the latter. In the absence of any satisfactory reason for this singular discrepancy, we shall not, we think, be very wide of the mark if we impute it to a nervousness and reserve on the part of the liturgical compilers. They might on the principle that *voluptates commendat rarior usus* naturally enough reflect that what might not be too strong for the enervated mind and suffering body in its seeming hour of mortal trial, would be apt to become too hackneyed, stale, and cheap, when bandied about on every ordinary occasion. To some persons the distinctions we notice may appear trivial; but they are not so. There is a great difference between "I absolve" and "he absolveth"—between absolution directly imparted and the merely bare statement of its efficiency. And none are more aware of this than the clever fraternity who arrogate to themselves the right of pronouncing it. If the necessity of being fully persuaded about things indifferent is urged by apostolic precept, we may form some guess at their dilemma, who in so grave a matter as that of absolution are often in doubt about the sufficiency of their own credentials. To the candid and conscientious man this is a weighty thought—the being invested with powers he may be in doubt about: in doubt, we mean, as to how far his "learning and godly conversation," his "detestation of Home's damnable doctrines," and "his being inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost" to take Orders, and with them, perhaps, a charge of a hundred a year and the church fees—should *ipso facto* qualify him for absolving another's sins, when he is fully convinced he has so many of his own. Absolution, if it means anything, means complete not partial release from sin. The penitent enters some sacred precinct, and, after confession of error duly made, is then and there absolved. He is supposed to leave his hinder wallet there, and to quit the place of worship with his soul as smooth and as clean as the palm of his hand—perhaps cleaner.

But here, if we state the matter correctly, in what degree does the Protestant *shibboleth* differ from the Roman Catholic's else than in the former being to some extent suggestive and covert, while the latter is confident and outspoken. Yet what has been more abused than Romish absolution? What more undutiful and virulent enemy has Rome ever had than the very child of her own loins, who would insist upon her portion of goods, and set up a rival Establishment. But with all this hostility—this having nothing to do with the shop over the way—their tenets are often, as in this instance, one and the same—repudiated per-chance in their integrity from some low and unworthy motive, but invariably and harshly insisted upon when any object is to be accomplished, either in the shape or worldly position or of sordid gain. And here is the stumbling block to many a Protestant priestling. Dwelling on the prestige of a venerable Catholicism like that of Rome, and lingering over its time-honoured memories—sympathising as openly as he dare in its bold maintenance of its dogmata, and in its decisive line of action—strongly prejudiced (from personal egotism or what not) in favour of a faith that prescribes small limit to priestly power, and evinces no hesitation about the value of its own prerogatives the Protestant slaveling of the thirty-nine Articles often looks afar from some mount Nebo of his own on the favoured land he may not set foot in, and timidly asks himself in tones of regret and bitterness of spirit—"Are not the very gleanings of the grapes of Ephraim better than the whole vintage of Abiezer!" But interest lays on him her iron grasp. Home ties bind him with chains of adamant. What is the poor wretch to do? He is looking one way and rowing another, with just mind enough to breed self-torment, but with insufficient to be honest and single-minded. Unlike the patriarch of the land of Uz, he forgoes his integrity at the appealing look of a fond wife and increasing household, and his deepest and long-cherished convictions are thrown broadcast to the winds, when brought face to face with the stern realities of life. We need not look far for men of this stamp. Their measure has been long taken though they may know it not; affording, as they do, ready examples of saintly dishonesty, and exhibiting by their demure life and conversation the compatibility of orthodoxy with the loosest and most grovelling sense of religion.

But reverting to our more immediate subject, how did such an idea as this of absolution come about and grow into vogue, and what is the authority for its enunciation? It is not our purpose here to enter on any profitless field of discussion. The question of apostolical succession has been argued, as our readers well know, again and again; but always with indefinite results and small satisfaction. Like many another fondly-cherished

dogma, volumes have been written about it, only to render the subject more than ever perplexed. Yet, handled as it has been by many and proved by none, it is the only basis after all of absolution. If an apostolically-descended priest has not only the power to remit sins, but has also the power to retain them, we should like to know how the forgiveness of a brother until seventy-times-seven should be made at all dependent on the option of any individual. If we mistake not, human nature is pretty much now what it was more than eighteen centuries back, when—for all the teaching of a considerate and gentle master—even his own personal disciples would call down fire from heaven to consume the harmless Samaritans; or later, when an Emperor of Germany was made to endure indignities and privation at the hands of an insolent pontiff; or much later still, when so many good and exemplary men were relentlessly persecuted and harried by an orthodox hierarchy in the reign of the virgin queen, and thrust out of their cures, beggars on the world. If these recorded instances of sacerdotal malignancy are only a few out of hundreds that might be readily adduced, we shall not rest content to consign such acts to oblivion, or affect to ignore them with the trite and silly remark that such exceptional proceedings as these in no way invalidate the efficacy of the power conferred, more than the unworthiness of a minister hindereth the effect of the sacraments. These little theological stereotypes have nowadays lost their virtue. They are apt to remind us of a once juvenile belief in *Jack and the Beanstalk*, or in the engaging adventures of *Robinson Crusoe*. If these latter must be admitted as deceptions, would that the former were half as innocent! But, in as few words as possible, what is this apostolical succession, from which absolution emanates? From whom did it spring, and how is it perpetuated? This succession, then, supposes not only the existence of some supernatural power in the founder of Christianity, but that he also transmitted such power to certain of his followers, who in their turn should delegate it to others, to be by them in succession handed down to all future generations. This, as we take it, is a fair statement of the case. Moreover, beyond the merely being sent out by their master to make converts by river immersion, after his own example and that of the Ethiopian eunuch, so far from any extraordinary powers having been conferred on the more intimate disciples, the inference is strong the other way, both in the doubt expressed by some of these very disciples after the events of the crucifixion, and in the apostles having, after the reported ascension, evidently left the word of God and served tables—that is, they had for some time past been devoting their time—as we gather from the two first verses of Acts vi.—to much more sublunary matters. There is a promise of power, undoubtedly, but no direct appointment, no supernatural authority delegated, no personal trust implied. And as to the *deus ex machina* that comes out on the stage on the day of Pentecost, we have had too many instances in history of what religious enthusiasm can do when it would compass an object, especially when bolstered up by dreamy and ambiguous prophecy, to attach any credence to these spasmodic revivals, where, under the meretricious impulse of a moment, so many are often deluded enough to countenance what false shame afterwards prevents their impugning. Vespasian's courtiers appear to have faced some similar difficulty without blinking. For when the Emperor, at Alexandria, was urgently solicited by some poor wretches that he would spit and tread on them, to cure one of blindness and another of his crippled condition, he ridiculed the very idea, till he was sagely told by his courtiers "*patrati remedii gloriam penes Cæsarem, irriti ludibrium penes miseros fore.*" Now this was taking a sensible view of the matter; not leaving the question like the service for "Curing the King's Evil" to be not long since surreptitiously withdrawn from the book of Common Prayer that weak minds might stand no chance of being scandalised by the possible inefficiency of the ordeal. Circumstances like these preclude a ready assent to ungrounded pretension. If a Comforter is promised the disciples in lieu of that national re-establishment, they were ever, as we well know, yearning after, it seems strange that nearly five-and-twenty years after some of them should not so much as have heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. Such unlooked for contrarieties tend to invest the question of apostolical authority with grave uncertainty. And if the so-called primary source be open to cavil, then the warranty for its after transmission must be equally so. Why no directly effective prerogatives should have been given to his more immediate followers by their lord and master, may be attributed to his fear of their possibly perpetrating some blunder, as in the case of the unhealed and spirit-possessed lunatic, whom they were unable to cure because of their imputed unbelief.

Lingering no longer on evidence which each one may easily sift for himself, and without entering on that barren field of controversy, whose very aspect is enough to parch the soul, and to deaden every motive of wholesome curiosity, we would carry the chain one link further and say—if there really exists ground for grave suspicion about the quality of the original grant, and the no less mistiness about its transmission, on what basis can this dogma of a pure and unadulterated descent be established, so as to come down to our clays under the character of an incontrovertible fact? Whether bishop or presbyter ordain, where can they show us any credentials beyond what custom has sanctioned in past ages, possessing, for that very reason in the minds of the orderly, some adventitious claim on respect, in the absence of anything more authentic. But much that may be allowed, need not be believed. The possible claim there may be on our indifferent approval is not all one with self-evident fact. Admitting, however, for the sake of argument, that apostolical succession is true, what church possesses the veritable transmission? If Rome has the veritable deposit, where is that of her apostalised

daughter? If the former has little, the latter must have less. Then look at the strange and startling vicissitudes this dogma must have undergone during the reigns of Henry, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. Now Rome, now Reformed; now this, now that; such bobbing up and down seem absolutely to remind one of your drowsy man nodding in his arm-chair some hot summer's noon, now waking up with a sudden start, now dropping off again with fatigue. Where would Succession be all this time? Between Romanism and Protestantism it must have had some difficulty in holding its own—leave alone bloody Mary's weeding and Bishop Bonner's unchallenged denial of the Protestant Orders—and the hushed up consecration at the Nag's Head. If Gladstone made the matter one of figures, and sought once to prove how not inconsiderable were the probabilities of its being true, we do not find ourselves cordially subscribing to this novel mode of proof. Babbage's machine, if we rightly remember, numerated exactly to one hundred million and one, and then, from some unaccountable reason, went off to one hundred million ten thousand and two. Who shall say there was no flaw in the embryo Premier's mathematics, like that in the calculating machine? In fact the whole affair of Apostolical Succession is a complete muddle, and our only refuge is in the philosophy of the sage of Samosata, who observes—"As for present affairs, I hold them in small account, and as to after ones, they are exceedingly worrying. I mean the general conflagration and destruction of all things. I am sorry for this, but it cannot be helped, for somehow affairs seem to be all jumbled about like lots in a helmet. As for delight and sorrow, they are one and the same—learning is ignorance—great is small—what is now up, is now down—ever dancing about and shifting in the whirligig of life."

The foundation of any dogma being unsound, the superstructure cannot be of any stability. What a bishop does not himself possess, he cannot well impart either to deacon or to priest. If he inherit by his office no power of plenary absolution, he is unable to convey what he never had. And what is the power? Can he see, touch, taste, smell, or hear it? Does the power go forth from his body like shocks from an electric eel, or does he feel himself foam at the mouth like Virgil's sibyl at the Cumæan cave? By a bishop's being asked thrice, as he will have been at consecration, whether he is fully persuaded of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, we may reasonably opine that his affirmation as deacon and priest went for nothing, and that there may be less doubt about his loyalty, in the omission of the oath of the Queen's supremacy, than about his orthodoxy. Yet in spite of all this suspicious supervision, a heterodox bishop will, as we have lately had experience, now and then jump the fold and scab the pure merino. To ask a person seriously if he feel himself inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, seems no less absurd than is the "trusting" recipient's imparting it to a congregation. For a bishop to convey the Holy Ghost to a priest by the joint imposition of his own and presbyter's hands, and to tell him *totidem verbis* whose sins he forgives they are forgiven, and whose sins he retains they are retained, is only one more instance of what superstition can do, and how custom comes to sanction what is utterly ridiculous. To be sure people are now come to view these and such like proceedings rather as matters of form than cases of conscience. And even the very indifference is becoming irksome to many, from an implied reflection on their own common sense. Let some zealous cleric venture to obtrude his absolatory claims on the man of education in the more genial hours of life, and while he may meet with the respect thought due to his position in society, it will be *that*, and that only, that secures him from contempt. In what pulpit is Absolution discussed? It is true the subject is now and then glanced at, but very rarely brought openly before an audience. Such remarkable avoidance of this topic, such a gingeriness in dealing with it, reminds us of swallows on a summer day skimming over the surface of the water, apparently all but dipping but never really moistening a wing. And so it is here. The bishop may have muttered his Cabala, but the neophyte has never yet found the key to it. If it could be, he thinks he would be even content to be less inspired on the condition of being better loved: not for ever moving about in a false position, scarcely secure from the half-disguised sneers of many who fail recognising any necessary excellency being attached to a black suit, or allowing any undue pretensions as current ground for respect.

Quilibet.

The Origin of New Truths.

THERE is a class of persons who identify Jesus with religion, because, as they assert, he was the first to teach its higher truths. The fundamental error of such persons can hardly escape detection. They have formed an idea of what Jesus said, not from a study of the remains which have been preserved, but in accordance with the theological theory of the Church to which they belong. The theological doctrines they take to be his, and hence their assumption that his teaching was peculiar and essentially new. The truths he taught were, however, the very opposite of what they conceive; for he was about the last of men to frame a system. He hated systems, because he knew how they operate to cramp the mind, and thus it was that he did not write out a religious code, or build up a Church. Had his successors imitated his example, we should never have had the tales of

persecution to read which now disfigure the pages of history. Calling themselves his followers, they enslaved themselves to a system and set of doctrines quite foreign to his conceptions and utterly at variance with his idea of a real religious life.

But apart from this, it must be objected, that they who declare he was the first who taught the higher truths of religion, either intentionally or ignorantly ignore the fact that the moral and spiritual truths to which he gave utterance had all been previously taught. Not the whole of them by any single person, but by many; one teaching of brotherhood, another of immortality, and so on. Jesus blended many into one system, but created none. Travelling through the Vedic Hymns, the ancient books of Persia, the Hebrew Psalms, the poems of Homer, the dramas of Æschylus, the discourses of Socrates and Plato, we glean every truth that he taught. Hence we are enabled to say that God is no respecter of persons or nations; for all who pondered the mysteries of Nature were enriched by discoveries. But even when these truths have been found, it is difficult for the inquirer to decide by whom they were first brought to light.

There is nothing so interesting as to study the growth and reception of a new truth, but to discover its origin is generally impossible. We are able distinctly enough to mark its progress after it has once taken form, and as it goes on widening its borders; but how and when it sprang out of nothingness into life, how and when as a floating indistinct idea it entered a mind to become a clear thought, it is hard and, perhaps, impossible to tell. Its rise and early progress lie, like the sources of the Nile, beyond our ken. The birth of a river is not loudly published by nature—it is not born in the presence of a crowd. High up among the hills it gushes forth as a little secluded spring, which sends its waters onward without noise or commotion of any kind, to grow at last into a mighty river. And so is it with the birth of every truth; they are all born in seclusion, and then sent forth to grow great; but not, perhaps, for many ages after they who sent them forth are gathered to their fathers. And they are not numerous who add more than one truth to the common stock. There are men who absorb many truths into themselves as a sponge absorbs drops of water, but let us not mistake the fact that 'having' does not necessarily involve the idea of creating. There have been men—Shakespeares and Homers—who have poured forth a mighty stream of wisdom, so rich and fertilising, that, even if it would, the world could not let it perish. We read, and feel as we read, that what is before us is not the product of one mind alone, but the concentrated essence of millions. Their thoughts, their truths, their hopes, their poetic imagery, their philosophy, their pious aspirations, have been moulded by the hand of the master worker into the exquisitely beautiful form we are surveying; and thus while rendering all honour to his lofty genius, we recognise also the value of their gifts.

Justice demands that the same be said of Jesus! Was there no religious thought before he began to meditate? Was there no spiritual utterance before he began to speak? As we know by the fragments which have reached us, Psalms and Orphic hymns of imperishable beauty had even then accumulated. And what can we know of those which have been lost? Jesus fed upon such food, and poured it forth again in a rich and living stream to strengthen and enlighten those who would venture upon using their reason and retaining their freedom. He gathered up into his own mind all the noble truths and spiritual aspirations of his countrymen, and when these had become a vital part of his mental self, he went forth to speak them to the common people, who heard him gladly. And we do him no dishonour in thus recognising his dependence upon others; while, at the same time, we avoid treating unfairly the great mass of good men who preceded him. He had the eye to see what was valuable amid heaps of formality; he saw through that old Hebrew system, and understood the nature of its good, the extent of its evil. He preserved only the sound parts, with which he incorporated the truths which had their birth in a foreign soil. But when men forget the sources while looking only upon the wisdom of the one, when they beggar the previous history in order the more to praise him, they are guilty of a double folly and injustice. They grope as blind men and avoid seeing the real sources of his knowledge and wisdom, while they fall down to worship an idol of their own creation, impressed with the false idea that humanity cannot transcend the object of their mistaken adoration.

As a rule, when treating of this subject, ecclesiastical writers have forgotten that the times in which Jesus lived were times of great religious excitement, especially in Palestine. The popular theory that the age was shrouded in thick gloom, mental, moral, and spiritual, can only be maintained at the expense of truth and in defiance of history. There was an inquiring spirit abroad that stirred men's hearts, and made them meditate upon the great mysteries of Life and its duties—Death and its prospects. Reformers had risen up and gone forth to preach earnestly to the people, but not so effectually as John the Baptist and Jesus preached. From the communities of the Essenes scores of men had been sent out to teach a practical Gospel of self-denial, honesty, and manliness, which, when acted upon, had brought comfort to the hearts of thousands; and through many successive ages it operated to preserve society from absolute ruin. These men, however, were not of the order of beings who are capable of perceiving grand principles beneath comparatively trifling events; they could not see mighty truths when wrapped up in simple words; and were unable to generalise great ideas from a number of dislocated and petty occurrences; hence the impossibility of their forming a new era, or in giving their name to a new order of things. They could work as labourers to prepare the way and no more; but when Jesus came

all was well; for although he created nothing, and was not able to perform the lesser labour, he put a new value upon many things, and gave humanity a fresh start onward.

Are we justified in saying that Brindley created canals; that Watt created engines; or that Stephenson created the locomotive? Were not all these the outcome of the toil and endurance, the study and observation of thousands of men? From the times of the earliest village blacksmith down to that when the great blast-furnaces and rolling mills came into use, how many comparatively trifling improvements were quietly introduced, by now unknown men, into the systems of working iron! Smutty-men tried their little experiments and were proud enough of their improvements; all of which were available for the common purpose of improvement, and in the quiet march of ages all were used up. Then, again, what changes were made in the formation of roads, in the modes of travelling, what progress in the knowledge of mechanical forces, and what knowledge was gained regarding the motive power of steam! It seems as if for thousands of years ironworkers and others in their several callings had been working away to bring the locomotive into existence. Each intelligent toiler and discoverer bound up his iota of improvement with the iron, and then lay down to sleep with his fathers; not to die, for in truth in his discoveries he still lives, and is a part of the great mechanic force of the age. When the due time arrived when all the separate improvements had been made, and all the principles had been accumulated through which the new machine became possible, the new man walked in, and put them all together to form the locomotive engine. He could not have done this work if all those who preceded him had not done theirs, and made their separate discoveries. He could not have accomplished what they did, but when their part was completed, his became possible, and it was wisely done.

Was it not precisely thus with Jesus? He was not one of the plodding men who are capable of the lesser and lower labours, but he could generalise and use up the lesser. He perceived in the Essene teachings a new truth which others saw not; and so with all which at various times, and by lesser men, had been discovered and established. They who had gone out to teach were, more or less, defective; even John the Baptist had fallen into serious errors; but, as by intuition, exactly as the true poet, moving in the world of nature, fastens instinctively upon the good and beautiful, Jesus perceived the deeper relations which the former teachers had overlooked, and comprehended truths which they were incapable of unravelling. But when or where the beginnings of those truths were first laid bare, who, now living, can discover? Far away from Palestine, and many ages before Jesus was born, meditative men had pondered the mysteries of Life, Death, and Human Sympathy, and had arrived at the knowledge of simple truths, which, eventually, formed part of his teaching. In the schools of Alexandria, as in a great moral and intellectual museum, the thoughts of the world's wisest men had been collected; from thence they had gone forth again to be as seed sown in foreign soil. They of the age of Jesus, who aspired to teach, had been influenced by this collective wisdom, and were capable of repeating it, but he of living it in all its beauty. He saw the deeper meanings; because he dared to use his own eyes he reached the truths which were hidden from them; and if, as I believe, he imparted a vitality to them, then, although we cannot be so unjust to his predecessors as to ignore their labours, it will still be our duty to study them in the unique form in which he gave them forth to the world.—*P. W. Perfitt.*

Poetry.

Oh, the glories of the future; oh, the joys in store above,
For the spirits who in earth-life choose to serve a God of love;
Not through fear of condemnation; but, with reason for their guide,
Fight against their nature's weakness, fight and win on Jesus' side.

Not a step would I take backward, though the present makes me grieve;
Though the past was bright and joyous, not an hour would I re-live;
"Onward, upward" is my motto, onward to my soul's abode,
Soaring upward, soaring ever, till I reach the feet of God.

Zeta.

Correspondence.

The Unity of Christendom.

To the Editor.

SIR,—In offering a few strictures upon Dr. Barry's letter published in your last Number, I think it only fair to acknowledge the satisfaction I have in dealing with an opponent who does not condescend to be abusive; who has enough of the angelic or archangelic temper to abstain from bringing "a railing accusation" against a theological adversary. Dr. Barry, as I understand him, objects to the admission of Unitarians into the Unity of Christendom, because, whilst calling themselves Christians, they do not believe in the Godhead of Christ. Now, in the first place, I can find nothing in the word "Christian" necessarily implying such belief. A man calls himself, or is called by others, a Wesleyan, a Mohammedan, a Papist, a Buddhist: does any sane man pretend to say that Wesley or Mohammed, the Pope or Buddha is regarded by even the most enthusiastic of partisans as God. But further, I beg, with all deference to Dr. Barry, to challenge his right to set up any such test at all. It has always been a puzzle to me that orthodox Christians, holding as they do such extravagantly exalted views of the nature and character of Jesus, seem nevertheless to attach no more importance to the very words of their incarnate God, than to the sayings of Paul or Peter, or even to the mysterious vaticinations of the writer of the Apocalypse. Coming, then, to the very words of Jesus, we find him exclaiming: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, *if ye have love one to another.*" Such was the "basis of comprehension" announced by Jesus, and the "brand" by which his followers were to be recognised. Not a word is said about holding the Trinity in Unity, or the Incarnation, or any theological dogma whatever. In fact no such word as Trinity or Incarnation is to be found in the Bible. I think I have a right therefore to claim, as the criterion of membership for Christendom, love toward mankind, or, as the writer of *Ecce Homo* terms it, "the enthusiasm of humanity."

Dr. Barry does indeed favour us with a text for a proposed sermon which (even according to the version of Mr. Martineau) he clearly regards as a crusher. Granting, however, that this and other passages in the New Testament afford some ground for the ordinary doctrines of orthodox Christianity, I may without hesitation affirm that there can be found at least at many which tell on the other side. And surely in the case of doctrines so incomprehensible, involving so many palpable contradictions and absurdities, we might fairly expect an overwhelming weight of evidence before we feel ourselves bound to accept them. That Jesus should be both God and man in one person was a doctrine to challenge credence eighteen centuries ago; when therefore the evidence of the New Testament writers is not more in favour of that supposition than it is in favour of the more rational hypothesis of his humanity, common sense will surely urge us to give the verdict on the side of the rational as against the supernatural.

Dr. Barry is no doubt familiar with such texts as the following: "My Father is greater than I."—"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the son*, but the Father."—"[ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God."—"Jesus increased in *wisdom* and stature and in favour with God and man." I might go on quoting texts which are certainly hard to interpret on the hypothesis of Christ's Godhead, but I would rather remind Dr. Barry that bandying texts is a work as dangerous as it is unprofitable; dangerous, for if once the outside public become aware how easy it is to pile up quotations on either side for or against these speculative points of doctrine, they might be led to one or other or both of these conclusions—"that the Bible is full of blunders, incongruities and contradictions"—to quote the words of Mr. William Lorando Jones—or else that these mysterious questions are of no importance at all.

Dr. Barry is very indignant that his arguments should be ignored on account of his education as a clergyman, and alleges his status as a member of a learned University. He quite fails, however, to see that the treatment he complains of has no reference whatever to his rank as an educated gentleman, but to the fact that, as an ordained clergyman, he has pledged himself to maintain the whole budget of theological dogmas comprised in the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles. To these a clergyman of the English Church, frequently when quite a youth, gives his unfeigned assent and consent. Now, suppose such a man, newly inducted into a comfortable living, to engage in controversy with some well-educated and intelligent layman of a sceptical turn of mind, what is likely to happen? The parson may convert the layman, and the layman in a worldly point of view remains what he was before. But supposing the layman to shake the faith of the parson in ever so slight a degree, the latter, feeling the unsatisfactory nature of the arguments on which his doctrines are based, must perforce shun all further inquiry, or else make up his mind to risk one of two things: he may either go on as a conscious hypocrite, preaching what he does not believe and performing rites which are to him no better than a mockery, or he may feel himself bound in conscience to give up preferment and social position and to begin the world afresh. A group of intelligent laymen discussing the Mosaic account of the Creation, or of the Fall of Man, or of the Deluge, etc., will be sure to treat these stories, not as history, but as mythology. But no such license of interpretation is possible to the clergyman. He is bound, or is supposed by the least

intelligent of his hearers to be bound, to believe the Bible in its entirety; and although Bishop Colenso, by reason of his rank as bishop, escaped with no worse fate than that of being sneered at and prayed for as "poor Bishop Colenso" by his episcopal brethren, he would be a bold ecclesiastic who should venture to calculate on a like immunity.

Dr. Barry cannot understand prayer for spiritual good any more than for physical good, unless on the supposition that such prayer is to be capable of altering the course of events. Now, let us suppose any man to have lately parted with friends or relatives embarked for a long voyage. What can be more natural than for such a man frequently to express his hopes that those he loves may have a successful and pleasant journey? How often will he say "I trust my friends have escaped the varied perils of the deep, and I long to hear that they have reached home safe?" Yet surely these expressions are not expected by the utterer to drive away the icebergs or to pacify the storms. He loves his friends, and longs to hear of their safety, and how shall such longing fail to vent itself in words. Now, to carry out this idea, I imagine a man of enlarged mind, full of deep sympathy with his fellowmen, one whose soul is thoroughly suffused with the "enthusiasm of humanity." He looks about him in the world, and finds inevitably much that is hollow and unsatisfactory, mean and degraded, vicious and brutal, and he yearns with a profound and passionate yearning for that good time, which we all, I suspect, are inwardly desiring, when there shall be no more wars and rumours of wars, when nation shall no more rise up against nation, and they shall no more hurt nor destroy, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. If, further, he has a strong imagination, and the religious sentiment ardent within him, is it wonderful that he should pour forth these his aspirations in his closet before that God whom he believes to be ever about him?" "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept when we remembered thee, O Zion." Did the children of the captivity suppose that their tears would restore them to their beloved city? Certainly not. The tender-hearted weep over the past, not with a view to results, but because they cannot help weeping. Even so, I think, men of strong religious feelings pray, not for effect, but because a passionate impulse prompts them, and pray they must. And yet this same habit of prayer may serve as an exercise of the religious sentiment in the soul as physical exercise may strengthen and develope the body.

Dr. Barry wishes for the Unity of Christendom, and yet is loth to surrender dogma. Let him look around him on the wide wide world, and see if there ever was a time when the attempt to form such an union on the basis of dogma was ever more hopelessly impracticable. Even the boasted union of Roman Catholics is in great danger of being shivered into pieces; and as for Protestants, their dogmatic differences seem to be more conspicuous and more ostentatiously asserted than ever. Moreover, the particular "platform," which Dr. Barry occupies, is the one which is the most likely to sink altogether out of sight. There will always be feeble souls, that require support, who desire nothing so much as to be relieved of the irksome necessity of thinking for themselves, and for such what can be more suitable than the organisation of the Roman Church and its gorgeous ceremonial. But for bold spirits, who *will* think for themselves, what chance is there that they will contrive to make their convictions run in the exact groove marked at for them by Articles of Religion framed 300 years ago? An infallible look will not mend matters, for what is an infallible book without an infallible interpreter? One man professes to find in the Bible ample warrant for the existence of bishops, priests and deacons, while another can trace in it the Westminster Confession and the Larger and the Shorter Catechisms. A third feels sure that the New Testament forbids all swearing and soldiering and titles of rank; while a fourth cannot read therein a word to justify infant baptism. Every one appeals to the Bible and every one is sure that he is right and that all his opponents are wrong. But casting aside dogma, let us take up two or three of the great social plagues which disfigure and desolate this world of ours—war, slavery, drunkenness and prostitution,—and let us suppose that on and after a certain date all the pulpits in Christendom were to ring with able and earnest expositions of the horrors of war, and of the duty of governments to try the experiment of an international court of arbitration, composed of the best and wisest men of all nations, which should meet promptly at the very beginning of a dispute, to secure an amicable Settlement of the same. Surely such a combined effort could not fail to do some good. So of drunkenness, prostitution and other forms of human degradation: we all hate them, and allow them to be moral nuisances which squire to be abated; and if there is any influence at all in preachers and preaching, some good could not fail to be done by the united action of all pastors urging on all their flocks towards some definite end.

Dr. Barry probably would be in favour of some such course if once he got Christendom united on his own plan. But our objection is that on his plan we may wait a very long time, and meanwhile these moral plagues are slaying their thousands and tens of thousands, and making of this fair earth a howling wilderness. The Creeds have had their day, and they have neither stopped war, nor slavery, nor any other hideous thing that oppresses man-kind. Let us, then, drop them and try whether a little more *practical* Christianity, a little more of the spirit of Christ, who gave no Creeds, nor Catechisms, long or short, might not help to forward the time "when the kindly earth shall slumber lapt in universal lace."

Nicodemus.

Biblical Contradictions.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have no kind of pretension to be thought a man of learning, or one at all capable of efforts involving severe mental analysis. I am—possibly from the fact of having been connected with legal pursuits when younger—extremely literal in all I say, do, or think. Many of my friends, who know my opinions best, aver that I am rather sceptical on essential points of religious orthodoxy. I certainly never was one of those who could throw reason overboard at will, and believe, as a sequence, that *black was white*, simply because such decision was delivered *ex cathedra*.

In truth, I have a knack—an unfortunate one, some will say—of calling things by their right names, and of submitting subjects requiring investigation to the ordeal of my own private judgment. I have lately, Sir, become a rather diligent reader of the Bible; and my search after "*more light*" has resulted in my being charmed by the beauty of the language of the Bible—the marvellous power of the imagery displayed and the lofty morality inculcated therein. Yet, in the face of these excellencies, I find opposing elements which appear to set at nought the justice and the goodness, as well as the omnipotence and omniscience, of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. I became sorely puzzled. Here was a work before me,—"*a light to lighten the Gentiles*"—the very Alpha and Omega of salvation—which the whole Christian world had, for centuries, stamped as infallible, and for whose accredited truths numbers had shed their best blood on the altar of martyrdom—and now strong doubts as to its divine origin were entangling me in their meshes, presenting no reasonable outlet for escape. The following biblical quotations will illustrate my position :—

Passages that are opposed to our idea of the Divine Omnipotence:—Judges i. 19 : "And the Lord was with Judah; and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountain; but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron." Matt. xix. 26 : "But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, with God all things are possible."

Passages which deny the omniscient character of God :—Gen iii. 9 : "And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, *Where art thou?*" Num. xxii. 9 : "And God came unto Balaam, and said, *What men are these with thee?*"

Passages which reflect upon the Justice of God :—Exodus xii. 29 : "And it came to pass, that at midnight *the Lord smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt*, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the firstborn of the captive that was in the dungeon; and all the firstborn of cattle." Hosea xiii. 16: "Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God : they shall fall by the sword : their *infants shall be dashed in pieces, and their women with child shall be ripped up*"

Passages involving contradictory statements :—Malachi iii. 6 : "For I am the Lord, *I change not*" Gen. vi. 7 : "And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it *repenteth* me that I have made them." John i. 18 : "*No man hath seen God at any time:*" Exodus xxxiii. 11: "And the Lord spake unto Moses *face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.*" Matt. xxvii. 5 : "And he (Judas) cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and *hanged himself.*" Acts i. 18: "Now this man (Judas) *purchased a field* with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst."

I quote, Sir, no more. "*More light*" on the question of biblical infallibility is assuredly much needed, and your efforts to shed its rays are sure to be crowned with success.

R. E. B.

Orthodox Christianity and Modern Thought.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I send you a copy of the *Wanganui Watchtower*, one of those curious publications which every now and then appear in out of the way places, and which show at once the strength and the weakness of the popular creed. A glance at its contents will prove that its appeal is made not to the reason and knowledge, but to the feelings and prejudices of its readers. Its Editor is a sincere and earnest man who, as an M.A., is sufficiently educated to know that the attacks on orthodox belief are becoming serious, but not sufficiently well read to understand that they cannot be met by pious twaddle, or that ridiculous assumption of moral superiority which insinuates that all "true believers" are good, and all "sceptics" more or less wicked. It is a curious fact, however, that even so pious a publication as the *Watchtower* had its origin in what to the carnal-minded appeared very like a personal quarrel between the Rev. Mr. Elmslie and the Editor of a local paper called the *Evening Herald*.

A brother clergyman had given what he was pleased to consider a scientific lecture upon the use and abuse of Alcohol, which lecture the *Herald* criticised in an article which was certainly slashing, but not altogether undeserved. To have "the cloth" held up to ridicule was more than Mr. Elmslie could stand, so he rushed into print in the columns of the *Wanganui Chronicle*, denouncing the *Herald* in very strong language indeed, but with a practical straight-forwardness which it was refreshing to see in a clergyman. He indicated that the *Herald* and its Editor were the devil and all his works, which he would do his utmost to destroy; and in fact displayed a good deal of that Christian hatred which sometimes surpasses the bounds of virtuous indignation. The Editor of the *Chronicle*, who is a sort of amateur preacher himself, backed up his friend, and a battle royal raged between the two papers. Whether Mr. Elmslie had over-rated his own influence, or did not think proper to carry out his threat of injuring the *Herald*, certain it is that the circulation of that paper continued as great as ever, and what was worse, its whole tone was purely secular and utilitarian, as well as decidedly clever, while at the same time it carefully avoided anything that would violently shock the prejudices of its readers, many of whom are Scotch Presbyterians. To counteract this insidious influence, against which all the efforts of the *Chronicle* were powerless, its Editor and the Rev. Mr. Elmslie started the *Watchtower*. So far I have not heard of any one being in the slightest degree affected by its arguments. The "enemy at the gate" ignore its existence; in fact the blows of the champion of orthodoxy are too feeble to be worth guarding against. Still, as I began by stating, the new journal is useful as affording an additional proof that ignorance and prejudice are in all parts of the world the broad basis on which rests that strange mixture of monstrous error, immoral doctrine, and noble sentiment, which is called "the Christian Faith," and which, like an iceberg, drifting into warmer seas, is slowly but surely melting away by simple contact with the "great ocean of truth" which surrounds it.

New Zealand.

Editorial Notices.

THE cost of printing and publishing the *Free Religious Press* is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A.F.R.P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George-street, Sydney.

Yearly Subscription : Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office to be made payable to the Editor, who will be happy to receive Subscriptions for the New Volume, and to supply back numbers.

Well-bound volumes of the Free Religious Press, price 7s. 6d. each, can be obtained at the Publisher's, or from the Editor.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, April 10, 1871.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*.

Vol. II., No. 18. July 10, 1871.

Notes.

ASSUMING no editorial oversight, the appearance of Rabbi Wise's alarmingly heterodox estimate of Jesus of Nazareth in a journal of such orthodox proclivities as the *Sydney Morning Herald*, is in itself a proof that, religiously speaking, we live in progressive, if not in revolutionary, times. Both editor and proprietor of the oracle in Hunter Street are reputed and professed believers in Jesus as the Son of God in a sense in which this appellation can be applied to no other man that has ever lived. They are known subscribers to the doctrine which affirms that God, for the accomplishment of his inscrutable purposes, determined that Jesus, as a pre-existent and celestial being, should be born into the flesh of an earthly woman by conception of the Holy Ghost, or in other words of Himself, and that in Jesus—by believing in and accepting Jesus, that is, as the

miraculous and, of course, morally and intellectually faultless revealer of the will and attributes of God to man—guidance, truth, salvation and future happiness are alone obtainable. Believing all this, however, Messrs. Fairfax and West, deferentially we presume to the spirit of the age, are prepared to incur the responsibility of circulating broad-cast such propositions as that "Jesus of Nazareth was not the author of Christianity"—that he was "a Pharisean doctor, an eminent patriot, a fervent enthusiast, determined to rescue his country from the clutches of a bloody despotism"—that he was "crucified by the Roman Authorities, to the chagrin and profound regret of the Jews"—that the notices of his life as contained in the Gospels, are "few, meagre, contradictory, and overloaded with miracles, stories of exorcism, and wonderful cures"—that Jesus reluctantly fell in with the idea, first mooted by impulsive Peter, "that the best catchword for a political revolution would be 'Messiah,' and that he accordingly allowed himself to be proclaimed as such among his disciples and followers"—that "the scheme was ingenious but highly impracticable"—that nevertheless, with a view to its accomplishment, they (Jesus and his disciples) resolved to "appear suddenly and unexpectedly before Jerusalem, and accomplish a *coup d' état* that would change the face of things"—that they in this manner hoped "to surprise and confound the priests and Roman officers, take possession of the temple, proclaim the kingdom of heaven, and regenerate the whole government before the priests and Romans could recover from their surprise"—that the kingdom of Heaven," as understood by Jesus and his co-reformers, was a purely political and republican conception, signifying "independence of prince and priest, independence of foreign invaders and home corruptions, freedom, equality, and the sovereignty of God's laws"—that Jesus, with a view to precipitate this kingdom of Heaven, "rode on an ass as Jewish superstition wanted the Messiah to come, and was led in triumph to the city, the disciples shouting Hosannah, waving their palm-branches, and pouring forth all the enthusiasm of their souls"—that "the thing wouldn't work"—that Jesus thus "played for high stakes and lost"—that "he knew that his lofty project had failed, and that he must die"—that he passively "accepted the situation," and that "the Romans captured and crucified him as thousands of Jews were crucified in those days by the same Pilate." We, of course, are far from complaining that the *Herald* should have found a place in its columns for Rabbi Wise's lecture : rather would we congratulate our Contemporary on his having, inadvertently or otherwise, shed a little *More Light* on what the mass of emancipated religious thinkers consider to be "the truth as it is in Jesus." With satisfaction, at any rate, will our readers reflect that the time has at length come, when a journal like the *Herald* may, in spite of its private doctrinal leanings, be found propagating the rankest doctrinal heresies, without raising a storm of pious indignation on the one hand, or at all disturbing the editorial conscience on the other. As for the Rabbi's theory of the origin of Christianity, we have just now neither the space nor the inclination to criticise it closely. We dissent from his statements bearing on the early life of Jesus, such evidence as we have going, in our opinion, to show, that up to the time of his commencing to labour with the Baptist, his co-reformer, he was one of the humblest and obscurest of his countrymen. With the Rabbi's doctrine in the main, however, we cordially coincide. We agree with his conception of Jesus as a lofty-souled patriot, who yearned for the redemption of his people from the grip of the despotic Roman invader, as well as from the moral and religious degeneracies—the formalisms, the hypocrisies, the mammon-worship, the sensuality, the reverence for a traditional, to the distrust of a living, God—under which the national character had long been deteriorating. The Gospels themselves undeniably authenticate the statement, that "Jesus was one of the many who were baptised by John, who saw in the youthful enthusiast the man in whom God's spirit was well pleased, who should bring to perfection the work of restoring the kingdom of Heaven and the redemption of Israel." Strong too is their testimony in favour of the statement, that Jesus after the death of the Baptist, as a "fugitive sage and patriot, with all the great pain in his soul, which the misery of his people, the decline of Zion, and the rise of Rome inspired, with the enthusiastic zeal on his lips to save God's people and God's word, to verify God's promises, attracted the attention of the multitude which followed him to his distant retreats, caught sparks from his fire, and the spirit of John was resurrected with tenfold vigour. 'I must save my people and its sacred heritage : I must restore the kingdom of heaven to Israel,' was the great thought, the sublime ideal which elevated persons to that high stand-point where the earth and her charms are forgotten, peril, danger and death lose their terror, manhood and Godhead meet as closely as the finite and the infinite can touch, and man excels himself." The latter sentences of this quotation sufficiently indicate the extent to which Rabbi Wise, doubtless representing a large and increasing section of his co-religionists, has broken away from an ancestral faith which can only conceive of the Jesus as an aspiring but contemptible impostor who was deservedly put to death. Nor can it be doubted that the liberal and progressive Judaism of the present day is destined to assist, and that largely, in alienating orthodox Christianity from a pernicious superstition which, by relegating the Reformer of Nazareth to the realm of the superhuman and the supernatural, is notoriously a stumbling block to thousands.

It is in most cases more easy to tickle with a straw than to strike down with a sledge hammer. There is usually far less labour in picking to pieces another's theories than there is in giving us something better in their place. And so we may well allow Buttevant's wit to pass, and permit him to be as facetious as he will respecting

the "Descent of Man according to Mr. Darwin." In the meanwhile let us confess we were scarcely prepared for an antipodean criticism on this European ornament of Natural Science, howbeit, by this time, somewhat accustomed to the temerity of genius that blinks at nothing, and holds it contemptible to be wanting in that verbiage and flow of idea that may possibly be accepted by many as a substitute for more worthy matter. And we might suggest to Buttevant that, as Man's Descent must be a subject of great interest to every intelligent person, there is the more need to treat it with a becoming sobriety, and to discard any approach to flippancy as out of place. The desire of man to magnify his descent does not give him one whit more of supernatural origin. Nature, so far as we can gather, is in the habit of working according to fixed rides; and we have no more reason for supposing peculiarity in the descent of man than we have in that of any other animal on the earth. If Mr. Crosse's well-authenticated and guarded experiments could produce live worms out of matter previously subjected to a life-destroying heat, and deposited in air-tight cases, by the sole power of chemical combination, why should we infer the defect of any organs in an artificial creation, where the weight of testimony would prove just the contrary? There was no ground for supposing the absence of such organs as the eye, mouth, ears, even before ocular evidence was fully furnished of their existence. And so we see no absurdity in supposing the eye to have been developed from some simple atoms under some sort of chemical combination, and ever retaining, after the first result, a more and more perfect type of the original. After the discoveries made of late years in chemical science, we are scarcely justified in limiting the skill of Nature's great laboratory. For aught that we can gainsay, man may have existed millions of years before any memory of ours; and the present race may be a gradually deteriorating stock, to be in the course of further ages developed into some lower type of being. Looking at the animals of a long bygone era—at the Megatherion, the Megalonyx, the Plesiosaurus, the Mastodon, and the Moa—what are the brute creation of the present day compared with the colossal forms of many ages back? And by parity of reasoning how can we do otherwise than suspect that the corporal build of the present generation may be far more puny than that of ten thousand years ago, and that diminution may be gradually but most assuredly going on in obedience to a law whereby every phase of the present is yielding to the stern fiat of decay. To attempt to connect the links that unite us to the first principle of being, would be an impossibility. We, so far, have named some of Mr. Darwin's ideas mere theories. But with all their licence they are entitled to our respectful attention as containing the germ of a great deal both to interest and allure. There is no occasion for man to plume himself on any peculiar anatomy, while the bones of the ape, chimpanzee, and gorilla, amply testify against such assumption. The secrets of Comparative Anatomy are no longer veiled, but speak to us with a force that only ignorance or prejudice is found to withstand. And what does man's atomic and chemically-combined formation infer? Not necessarily that he is excluded from the operation of one fixed law that affects, so far as we know, the whole universe; but on the contrary, that Fate idealised into Divinity subjects him to the same evanescent condition as the meanest annelids. Again, if, without at all countenancing the scriptural accounts of extreme patriarchal longevity, we may be allowed to believe, on the authority of historical statements, that human life was once of somewhat longer duration than now—if myth and fable, we repeat, tell us how Nestor lived thrice the life of man, and Scripture, that men in remote ages considerably out-spanned the term of living at present vouchsafed to us—how else are we to account for the alteration than by supposing that our modern human frame is not so strongly knit together as it once was, or so able to resist those outward aggressions, whether in the shape of toil or pleasure, that are constantly battering and deteriorating the human organisation, rendering it less able each succeeding generation to bear the shocks incident to worldly existence. Our humanity may and should feel comfort in the persuasion of a divine superintendence, although such supervision may not be especially directed towards man more than towards the rest of the animal world over which man claims dominion. In fact the feeling may be very ill-defined, and strongly bordering on that which moved the old poet:

"Omnis enim per se divum natura necesse est
Immortali ævo summa cum pace fruatur,
Semota a nostris rebus sejunctaque longe;
Nam privata dolore omni, privata periculis,
Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,
Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira."

Feeling, as we have already observed, no inclination to follow Buttevant into the more humorous portion of his criticism on Mr. Darwin, we trust, in conclusion, we shall not offend him by asking him to exhibit in any future remarks he may offer on the Descent of Man—in any future attempt he may make summarily to demolish in a column or so of the *Herald's* largest type, the "wild dreams of Darwin," and all such "speculations of Science, falsely so called, which, like other follies, have their day"—to exhibit, we say, less

drollery and more judgment—less conceit also, perhaps, and a somewhat more respectful attitude towards intellects that tower immeasurably above his own.

IN his rejoinder on the Note and Letter which appeared in our April issue, Dr. Barry, New Testament in hand, reasserts, as our readers will observe, his inability to think of a Unitarian, or of any unbeliever of the Antitrinitarian type, as a Christian, taking, moreover, as he therein does, the liberty of congratulating himself on our having, with Nicodemus, conceded the very position for which he contends : the position, namely, that Christianity requires something more, as a basis of comprehension, than a belief in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Dr. Barry, adducing the recorded teachings of Christ in evidence, defines this "something more" to comprise belief in the dogma of "New Birth by Water and the Spirit," in that of "Eternal Salvation by believing in the Son of Man," in that of "Christ's Messiahship," of his "Sole Mediatorship," of his "Pre-existence and Second Advent," which, with the dogmas of Atonement, Final Punishment, Resurrection, etc., were deemed essential by the immediate followers of Jesus at the very time when, in Antioch, they first assumed the Christian name as their distinguishing characteristic. All this may be true enough in the main, yet without being much to the purpose. We readily concede—if such be the concession to which Dr. Barry alludes, and we assuredly make no other—that the New Testament represents Jesus as holding and teaching doctrines which to the highest and devoutest minds appear both morally and philosophically objectionable. In doing so, however, we hold ourselves bound to investigate as to whether our New Testament is or is not a reliable transcript of the original writers; as to whether, supposing this point determined in the affirmative, the original writers, in recording the teachings of Jesus, did or did not consciously or unconsciously adulterate them with doctrinal peculiarities of their own; and as to whether, lastly, the first preachers of Christianity, an undoubtedly honest and well-meaning but ignorant and fanatical class of men, did or did not "distort and impoverish" the pure and simple faith of their Master by connecting it with deteriorating theological notions. Ignoring or undervaluing these to us all-important considerations, Dr. Barry is seemingly prepared to hold the Founder of Christianity responsible for every statement of morals or of doctrine which the New Testament ascribes to him, and these, again, as a full and unerring exposition of the will of Him whose Son Jesus is assumed to be. For ourselves, on the contrary, we insist on the Gospels and other writings of the New Testament being submitted to the freest literary criticism, uninterfered with by any dogma of inspiration or revelation, with a view to discriminating fact from fable, myth from history, truth from falsehood; and, in the last resort, on the teachings of Jesus, however unquestionably ascertained, being themselves brought for final adjudication to the bar of that Reason and that Conscience which constitute our highest court of appeal. To take an illustration, there can be little doubt that the New Testament represents Jesus as propounding that false and uncharitable article of the orthodox creed which affirms, in terms so dear to orthodox divines, that *belief in him (Jesus) as the Son of God, the promised Messiah, and the Redeemer of mankind, is essential, and the one thing essential, to Salvation*. "He that believeth," Jesus (Mark xvi. 16) is made to say, "and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This language is no doubt explicit enough; but Dr. Barry, in preaching from it as a text, would probably deem it unnecessary to inform his hearers that the twelve concluding verses of Mark's Gospel form, on the authority of our oldest Mss. (the Vatican and Sinaitic), a spurious portion of that composition, and so allow them to believe that Jesus—in "a passage which, were it not happily spurious," as Mr. W. R. Greg remarks, "would suffice to *damn* the book which contains it"—actually countenanced and inculcated a dogma alike repugnant to devout reason and, fortunately, to the general spirit of his own teachings. To repudiate this abominable tenet, with others named by Dr. Barry as the essentials of Christian faith, is, according to him, to profess a Christianity wearing a "false brand;" the genuine brand being reserved for those, we presume, who, in their allegiance to New Testament orthodoxy, can be uncharitable and callous enough to contemplate "damnation" as awaiting those who cannot think of Jesus as the promised Messiah and their atoning Saviour. It is something to feel that Christianity, as we understand it, involves no such gloomy choice of alternatives; and that pass as we may the New Testament records through the alembic of critical research, there still appears in the person of Jesus of Nazareth—commanding our love, reverence, and, if we so choose, our discipleship—the noblest human soul that has yet worn flesh. As for the propriety of our assuming the Christian name, Dr. Barry will not expect us to consult *him* in the matter, any more than we should expect him to consult Dr. Folding as to the genuineness of the Evangelical "brand." It may be well, however, to remind Dr. Barry that the upshot of his sectarian exclusiveness, if generally acted upon, would be to discharge from the Christian communion the leading thinkers and doers of these and future times, to the eventual retention of none but puny and uninfluential intellects. *Absit omen*.

HESITATE as we may about ranking the Rev. John Graham with those proverbially foolish persons who, in speculative matters, are accustomed to "rush in where angels fear to tread," we assuredly cannot hold him guiltless of a disposition to deal in a much too glib and familiar style with topics of human destiny which minds of a purer religious type than his either scarcely venture to touch, or instinctively pass by in solemn silence. We are referring to the delivery, as announced in an advertisement that has just taken our eye, for at least the

twentieth time since Mr. Graham's arrival in the colony, of his by this time famous stock lecture on "The recognition of friends in Heaven;" a subject, we feel assured, which none but an essentially irreverential and unspiritually-minded person would think of formally investigating, still less of reducing to a set of cut-and-dried propositions to be periodically aired in some public chamber. We do not question the validity of man's conviction of a hereafter,—of a life that is to be when all his connections with time and mortality shall have been dissolved; yet we hesitate not to say, that neither Plato's reasons, nor Paul's rhapsodies, nor Wordsworth's "Intimations," nor even the statements of a supposed heaven-vouchsafed and unerring revelation, can do aught else than elevate this conviction into "a sublime possibility, round which meditation and inquiry will collect all the probabilities they can." And precious as it may and should be to us as a matter of hope and earnest desire, a true religious as well as philosophical humility should withhold us from any rash or prying attempt to fix the conditions of the future life, or otherwise pierce the impenetrable darkness that surrounds, and will continue to surround, it until we have done with terrestrial affairs. But the Rev. John Graham, probably from having so completely set his affections on heavenly things, has evidently mastered the mystery of death in all its details. Heaven, as we gather from the title of his lecture, is a *place* where one's friends are to be recognisable and recognised by such characteristics as Mr. Graham, in the exercise of his profoundly penetrative spiritual foresight, is able to specify: and a place, too, involving, by implication, the existence of another *locality* where earthly friendships will be renewed under very different conditions. As the pastor of a thriving and well-to-do body of believers, Mr. Graham, naturally stands high in the Church's list of those who are to be saved. Deservedly so we hope. He confidently thinks of Heaven as his future home. We trust he will get there. It may be, however, that even he before passing the celestial gates, will have to undergo a scrutiny of aims and motives for which he and millions like him may be anything but prepared, and that, as he will have his two localities, at least some of the recognitions he anticipates in the future life will have to be made from the opposite shores of a certain "great gulf" which, we are told, is "fixed" somewhere. We would at any rate counsel Mr. Graham to be as faithful as he can to known and present duties as the best possible preparation for what the future may, or may not, have in store for him; and, further, to abstain from presumptuous and irreverent speculations, which, to his disappointment, and possibly to his dismay, Eternity may scatter or reverse.

The Origin of Evil.

THE Origin of Evil has been ever a subject of deep interest. And in venturing on the discussion of it, our intention is not to wade into theological depths and be carried away by the currents of a philosophy and mode of religious thought fast going out of use, but rather to produce, if possible, such evidence of its origin, as shall not only commend itself on the score of probability, but invite our conviction of its truth by the test of each person's experience. And we would commence at once by saying, that Evil is not a disposition existing of itself, *per se*, utterly detached as it were from the action that gives it significance. We mean to say, that no conduct could have been styled evil, until experience of its effects should have justified the application of the term. It is the discovery of certain results both in morals and science that attaches any name to them. An endurance beyond the ordinary behaviour of man is called patience. A personal hardihood and forgetfulness of self, either in warfare or in the more stirring events of civil life, obtains the name of bravery. The insensibility to another's pain, combined with a propensity to animal torment, is branded with the name of cruelty. But in all these tempers, and in many more that a moment's reflection will readily suggest, the experience of the action must have anticipated the form of its expression. We could only arrive at a proof of what is evil by a well-considered estimate of an opposite course of conduct.

We would observe, then, that mankind, for its own guidance and distinguishment of impulse, has denominated certain modes of action to be evil, uninfluenced by any preconceived religious bias or theocratic dictation. The Greeks, who were the keenest thinkers of the world, knew nothing of evil personified. Their idea of evil was one simply in the abstract. Their *to kakon* inferred an act, not a person. As for the diabolos of ecclesiastical fiction, they knew nothing of it. Their verb *diaballo* and the adjective *diabolos* expressed one and the same meaning—that of deceiving and calumniating. Diabolos—in the sense of a fallen angel, a subtle serpent, the tempter of David as well as of the Founder of Christianity, the Evil Spirit "whose name is no more heard in heaven," described finally as an Old Dragon to be bound a thousand years—has no existence in any Greek or Roman mode of God's dealing with his creatures, but is confined to the realms of poesy, and to the creations of a fervid imagination. The *to kakon* is, and has ever been, something so essentially distinct from *agathon*, that no mistake could arise about principles in such direct antagonism. In the very earliest formation of human societies, we can suppose the value of peace to have been contrasted with loss and injury from violence—the beauty of order, with the misery of disorder—the rights of property, with the terror of

rapine—the charm of domestic ties, with the gross indulgence of roving appetite and indiscriminate lust. What experience found to be an evil was modified in the course of time, not by any supernatural communication of what was right and what was wrong, but because the genius of mankind recognised its own necessities of action, and on the score of self-preservation was impelled to subscribe to them. It is after this era that Superstition stepped in, and invested a before well-ascertained course of conduct with the garb of religious motive. Wholly based on the contrast between two kinds of behaviour, the notion of evil had nothing whatever in it of supernatural origin. It was reserved for the wit of a comparatively modern age to forge an incident to account for a fact. A cosmogony is introduced which, taking the origination of evil away from human conduct, assigns its source to a cause, that, but for some consideration due to the prejudices of others, we should hold equally credible with the marvellous fictions of King Arthur's Knights, and the Legend of St. George and the Dragon. We need not dwell on the garden of Eden—the creation of man—the making of woman—the temptation—the fall and the consequent curse. We view all these incidents as simply a foundation whereon it is sought to ground the origin of evil. Its most strenuous supporters may perhaps regret so brief a beginning has been accorded to the world. If evil dated its existence only from the first occupants of Eden, what are we to judge of the former tenants of a world who reckon their habitancy not by thousands, but by tens of thousands of years? If science and geology tell us these truths—truths that cannot be controverted from the constantly increasing evidence adduced in their favour—we must either suppose that evil preceded the cosmogony spoken of, or else that mankind was living in that golden age when there was no conception of guilt, and when aggression, hatred, and lust of rule were utterly unknown.

But passing on, we notice that tendency of the human mind to lean on something. We observe its frequent inclination to yield to an ideal bondage. In the more educated mind this inertness is not uncommonly the result of some disappointment in the virtue of the religious evidence presented to it, and subsequent after carelessness about further examination. Unwilling in the meanwhile to wholly discard the impulse of educational training, man would adopt a middle course, and be content with another's seeming proof of a doctrine or of a question of faith in place of his own moral conviction. He accepts the orthodox meaning and explanation of evil rather on the principle of obedience to a Church, or in despair of arriving at any more satisfactory testimony, than from any innate and conscientious persuasion. From observing the operations of Nature, its creative as well as its destructive powers, he finds his perceptions of evil getting misty and undefined. He regards the heavens, and the wonders of creation, and, while fully recognising his own insignificance, is too apt to impute that to supernatural agency which a more steady consideration of natural causes may deprive of any unusual importance. And if the man of education is under some bondage of this kind, the ignorant man is much more so. In him Superstition has an easy victim. Bull in intellect, and ready to take the very first impression that offers, the rude mind is very sensibly affected through the eyes and ears. The earthquake becomes the shock of some evil agency—the thunderbolt an embodied messenger of evil. And when ignorance has its fears indirectly confirmed by doctrines that teach the embodiment of evil, we can hardly be surprised if the untutored mind gets half-paralysed by what is so near a visitation, and at once gives up its independence. Professional cunning makes every provision against all emergencies. If less evil should take place than has been ecclesiastically declared, some power in the interval has been through a clerical medium propitiated: if greater harm take place to the religious votary than was anticipated, then some sin has been kept back, and the evil agency has had free way! Man then, from utter inability to compete with the unseen agencies around him, becomes enslaved to a belief in some evil principle, and, beholding the operation of certain physical laws acting ruthlessly and irrespectively of any conduct on his part, augurs, as he conceives it, some evil agency and the influence of a malignant power. And when we reflect on the potency of the imagination, and its oftentimes system of self-torture, we can fancy what strains the untutored mind endures. While leaning, as well as those more educated, on another's *dicta*, the more illiterate class have not the same amount of judgment in determining about the more gross attacks on their understanding. Whether the supposed author of evil be brought forward under the figure of the serpent, or of one constantly going to and fro on the earth, of Satan, Beelzebub, or the Spirit of Evil,—there is always some accompanying idea of a superior power, whose aid is to be solicited only through those who have been specially appointed to give it. Some churches, we may say, have a large stock of this imparted virtue, but a quantity after all scarcely adequate to the demand, if individual independence is to be laid aside and no anxiety to be felt about securing a more sensible basis of confidence. Supposing the same dispositions to have existed among early humanity that hold now—and we have no reason for inferring that any peculiarity of cerebral formation does more than suggest a few peculiarities of conduct—we may fairly conclude that experience became the gauge of moral action, and that its policy was determined, unconsciously as it were, by its effect on the interests and passions of those likely to come within its more immediate influence. Distinctions of character there may well be. The Celt may be lively and sociable—the Teuton may be phlegmatic—the Italian warm and amorous—the Briton undemonstrative—the Lapp of a cold and sluggish temperament in character with the region around him; but with all these marked characteristics, the main

impulses of our nature are the same, and are little influenced by either clime or creed. The hardships attendant on the earliest stages of existence were borne by all in their different fashions. Man had to exercise his craft and his ingenuity. The wilderness had to be redeemed, and be brought into some sort of cultivation. The savage beast had to be driven back into further solitude, and its skin furnished the first covering of gradually-becoming-civilised man. Though territory in early times might not have been of the importance it now is, yet the *O si angulus ille* was no doubt as powerfully effective then as it is apt to be now. So far as we know, no preponderance of one sex over another existed; yet a chance meeting would then as now engender the seeds of passion, and prompt the making use of every endeavour to deprive another of what strong desire had selected for itself. If fortune dealt out with lavish hand to one, and appeared ever niggard to another, the invidious comparison was as potent then as it is now. And even though idleness and want of energy might often have more to do with the latter's condition, than any character of fatality, yet the results would be often one and the same thing in creating hostility and in the waiting opportunity to injure. It was under these and similar circumstances that society for its own conservation was obliged to step in, and enact those laws and regulations that might at least check the evil they could not wholly prevent. If evil was seen to be making rapid progress through the very agencies that were bringing about an increase of civilisation, it only remained for an incipient legislation to be guided by experience, and to deal with the various effects of evil as they came before it, viewing it, in fact, as the creation of circumstance, and in no way dependent on any ideal and supernatural taint.

"Whatever may be urged by a theological system to make man worse than he is, there is no verified depravity of disposition that leads him to say that evil is good, and good is evil. It is all very well for religionism to magnify human abasement that its healing may reflect more credit on clerical empirics. But man needs little information touching his inclination to evil. While he is aware of its constant aggressions through the medium of his unguarded desires and appetites, and is disposed enough to wage battle with it from a previously gathered experience of two opposite lines of behaviour, he will not, if true to himself, be inclined to engage such an adversary with weapons chosen from any theological armoury whatever, but to encounter it with the resolution to try and act in such a fashion as to secure his own self-commendation, and the tacit approval of the society around him. For it must be further remembered that though society may be somewhat lax at times in its combined action, it will not admit of individual disorder; or refrain from severely animadverting on vice when introduced within the range of public notice. And what necessity is there for religious bugbears and the terrors of superstition? What advantage in picturing the horrors of hell and of an everlasting fire? The consequences of evil are quite enough scaring, without subsidising the torments of an idle superstition. Have murder, lewdness, drunkenness, perjury, cruelty, and idleness no attendant punishments? Is snapping the thread of human life and driving it headlong into an unknown future, no subject of bitter reflection? Does that indulgence to vicious appetite that grows more powerful in the body by the meat it feeds on and never gets wholly extinguished, possess no after drawbacks either by entailing a shattered constitution, or imbecility of mind? Has drunkenness no after recoil in the loss of health and self-respect? perjury no moment of blasting conscientiousness? cruelty no avenger? idleness no self-torment?

"Magne pater divum, sævos punire tyrannos
Haud alia ratione velis, cum dira libido
Moverit ingenium ferventi tincta veneno;
Virtutem videant, intabescantque relicta."

No superstitiously grounded deterrence from evil can have force equal to the exhibition of evil itself, when temporarily revelling in its deformity and filth, or under a masque of beauty; reminding one not inaptly of the Sirens of olden story, or of the alluring and treacherous damsels of Tasso at the Fountain of Laughter. It is easily seen, then, how what from experience of evil had become a confirmed idea in men's mind—namely, the necessity of securing a common good by individual restraint—how this idea, we repeat it, became reduced to a science; and how the original motive for so acting gradually became mingled with the false glosses of a priestly fraternity, who were glad to see the original motive-influence drift away, and after a while be lost in the spiritual claims of a clergy, and in their bold enunciation of divine communication. The *ignotum pro mirabili*—the tendency of an uninformed mind towards the marvellous—was a great aid open to clerical enterprise. It was not to be neglected. While the principles of evil itself could not be gainsaid, its incitements could be insidiously attacked; and its ingredients either diminished or added to—either made stronger or weaker, according as it might agree with the policy of the moment, or be instrumental or otherwise in upholding the worldly interests of a holy brotherhood. The for the most part simplicity of life that marked the Church previous to the reign of Constantine, was far too tedious to be endured any longer. Self-denial had had its day, and had accomplished its intention. The grand and high-motivated acts of old Roman and Greek virtue

were flouted. The exercise of principles that had enabled them to govern half the world was held a mistake. The impulses that prompted them to the noblest sacrifices, and urged them to incomparable deeds of patriotism were misrepresented. A new era was to open up.

"Jam nova progenies cælo dimittitur alto."

There was to be peace in all the world. The leopard was to lie down with the kid. War was to deface the Earth no longer. The sword was to be beaten into a ploughshare, and the spear into a pruning-hook. But no times like these ever came in the memory of man. So as an event could not be forged like an Epistle or a Gospel, these pious tricksters of a religious charlatanism were fain to postpone the happy event *sine die*, or else allow it to be realised at some future period, whereabouts they talk so much and know so little. After the age of Constantine, past the days of Charlemagne, and up to nearly the close of the thirteenth century, religious society was being drilled into its belief. The old landmarks had been sedulously cleared away, and the quality of good and the enormity of evil were solely to be measured by ecclesiastical approval and church censure. These were the dark ages, and dark they indeed were—the period of damnatory Creeds and False Decretals: a season fruitful in every manoeuvre that would tend to darken the mind and leave it no chance of healthy action. And even when the obscurity somewhat cleared away, and mankind began to realise the folly of many of those delusions by which it had been so long overridden, it found itself in the condition of that long-imprisoned man who had got to lose every taste of freedom, and whose very return to liberty was viewed with no sense of enjoyment. The mind, from having been so long enslaved, had become used to its fetters; and in a kind of despair of being really persuaded about any religious truth, was content to barter liberty away, and take its convictions at second hand. Then did human malady in its hundred forms come in as an agent and confederate of Superstition. If it made speedy way and the patient was fast sinking under its virulence, then divinity had been offended; and the only means of spiritual reserve remaining, was a liberal bequeathment of worldly goods to a class who alone kept the keys of the gates of salvation. Whatever occurred was readily met. The talent and quick wit of the priesthood were equal to every emergency. If they were sometimes met with a determination equal to their own—their claims resisted, their status disputed—the disobedient member was burdened with the displeasure of the Church, and threatened with immediate judgments. If nothing then transpired of an injurious character, he was told the long-suffering of divinity was great, but that penalty would sooner or later follow. If punishment suddenly came (in the shape of accident or of illness arising from natural causes), great was the glory of the prophet: if nought took place the delinquent became invested with the interest of a modern Damocles, with the sword of judgment suspended in the air! And so it has come to pass that man is really lashed with the scourge of his own making. He need fear no other. The weaning oneself from the unfounded prejudice of being possessed more or less by some malignant power, or of being invited to do what our moral perceptions forbid being done, should be our devotional aim. It is something to get rid of these hobgoblins of the mind, and to feel conscious while we stand within the charmed circle of moral law, that no harm can befall us. It is further advantage the being able to now and then take stock of our belief, and to rid ourselves of superstitious incumbrances: and above all to purchase independency of mind, at no higher price than those prejudices that have long been fostered and handled with nervous terror. If each one may be called the artificer of his own happiness, it is incumbent on him to play no tricks with his understanding, but to keep persistently to that one interpretation of evil which common sense proves to be the right one. As to any peculiarity of bodily formation leading to some corresponding fashion of conduct—any dislocation in the system arising from physical causes acting almost imperceptibly on our power of action—these would be points that besides being very difficult of definition, might, unless incontrovertibly established by the knowledge of others than ourselves, be likely to imperil watchfulness and demeanour, and lead us to think lightly of our independence. An undivided homage towards what is good, is far better than an unmeaning faith frittered here and there in a sort of mechanical and heartless service. All may not be quite clear, even then, from inability to grasp what perhaps is beyond our ken in much that we see about us and the contrarities we detect. Still this so-far-secure half-knowledge must be after all broad noon, beside the darkness we have escaped from, and the grovelling extravagancies of a past age.

Quilibet.

The Political Future of England.

As that of Nottingham is one of the most radical of English constituencies, so is the Honorable Auberon Herbert one of the most radical of English reformers: a political affinity which readily accounts for the former's choice of the latter to represent it in the British House of Commons. Democratic Nottingham, moreover, without receiving or even soliciting pledges on the point, appears to have cherished the belief, that, in the event of a proposed Parliamentary marriage-grant to any member of the Royal Family, their democratic

representative would be found voting with the Noes. A matter, as it turns out, in which Mr. Herbert is unable to accommodate a doubtless small but decidedly demonstrative section of his constituents. With the rest of England's legislators—not even Mr. Fawcett himself at the last moment dissenting—he voted for the dowry of the Princess Louise, and, in nowise reluctant to render an account of his stewardship, met his disappointed Nottingham friends early in April last, and addressed them in defence of his reasons for voting as he done. Lying before us, in an issue of the *Nottingham Journal*, is a report of the speech he delivered on that occasion : a speech which has not, we believe, been reprinted in any Australian newspaper, and which, therefore, with a view to putting our readers in possession of its truly admirable contents, we are transferring to the pages of the *Free Religious Press*. The usual preliminaries having been gone through, Mr. Herbert said:

"My friends, I hope that you think I have done right in keeping the promise I made to you in coming to speak to you to-night on the subject of the Princess Louise's dowry. I always feel that whenever it happens that a member of Parliament gives a vote which goes against the feelings of his constituents, he owes it to his friends to come down and meet them, and to meet them face to face, and to tell them what were the reasons which induced him so to act, and there and then, like a man, to expect from their hands either censure or forgiveness. And now I am sure I shall not ask in vain for indulgence on one point. I have no doubt that in the course of my speech I shall probably say things which are sweet to some and bitter to others. I think that I shall succeed in setting the teeth of all my friends, whatever their opinions may be, on edge to-night before I have done speaking. But still I do believe that you will, out of your old kindness to me, grant me this favour, that, you will hear me patiently through, and then judge me. And now let me here say that I never can feel any resentment as to whatever may be your political conduct towards me. I will never quarrel with men for preferring their own principles to anything else. I admit, in the most decided way, that there is no such thing as good nature in politics. Politics are much too serious a business for that; and I would only wish you to cleave steadfastly to what you believe to be right, and not to care at all how that may affect me or any other person. To give you an example of what I mean, let me say that there is no man in the House of Commons whom I respect more than Mr. Forster, yet I think that his constituents the other day did perfectly right when they passed what amounted to a vote of want of confidence in his conduct. I think they were perfectly right in preferring their own principles to the kindly feeling which they had towards him. Of myself I can only say that much as I think this present Government in many ways is worthy of our respect and support, I should not hesitate for a single moment in casting my own vote against them if I thought they were doing anything which I believed was not perfectly right for the interests of a country. And therefore I own I think it is only right that you should apply the same law to me as I have applied to Mr. Forster and to the Government, and that you should not hesitate to condemn me to-night—and I go so far as to say to turn me out as your representative—if ever I stand in the way of deep firm-seated conviction in your breast. We shall, I think, play the man by each other. I intend on every occasion to speak what I believe to be the truth to you, and I expect that you will act in the same unswerving manner towards me; and in that way I am sure we shall best fulfil our duty, and act rightfully towards our country. I am going very briefly to consider two arguments which were used by many of my friends against the granting of the dowry. One was what I will call the Parliamentary argument—it was the argument used in Parliament—and the other was that which was used outside. It was said in Parliament that we ought not to grant the dowry to this Princess, because dowries had only been given to compensate for what we call 'political marriages' that is to say, that when a princess was married to a foreign prince her own tastes and inclinations were not consulted; it was, in short, a political marriage, and therefore this sum of money was given to her as compensation for that happiness which it might be supposed she would lose by contracting such a marriage. Well, I asked myself, would such a plan work? and I saw that if we were to grant dowries only to our princesses for political marriages, the tendency of our doing so would be to encourage them to form these bad, unnatural, and, to my mind, hateful marriages; and that we should punish them or fine them for contracting a reasonable, sensible, and natural marriage. Well, there was another argument used outside Parliament, and that argument was this, that we ought not to make any national payments except in return for work done and services rendered. I do not think I am very far wrong when I say that that is the reason which generally fills the mind of this meeting. I have no hesitation in saying that I accept and agree with that principle. I think the principle is a right and a just principle; I think it is one for the country to adopt, and that a great deal of harm is done because we neglect it. But I was unwilling, and am unwilling, to apply that principle during the lifetime of the Queen to her and her children. I consider that we are absolutely free to make whatever arrangements we like with him or her who succeeds to her Majesty. I reject altogether the theory that the Crown lands are private property. I hold that they are the property of the nation. I hold that we may make what ever bargain we choose hereafter, with that person whom we may make chief officer of this country. I want to express this feeling to you—I don't know how many may share it—a feeling of gratitude towards the Queen herself. I have that feeling for two reasons; first of all, because the influence of her reign has been a good and pure influence; and secondly, because I know of no king or queen in history who has accepted as she has with the same readiness

and the same loyalty those great popular changes, those great revolutions, which have placed power in the hands of the people. I say I feel grateful to her for her conduct in that matter. Now, my friends, let me look a little forward. I want to look at what comes after. There are some of us who will draw a long breath at the word 'after.' It is rather a dangerous subject for conversation. Shall we break off our conversation here? Shall we venture to have a little glimpse at the future, or shall we break up our meeting and go home and early to bed, like children who are afraid to go up a dark lane because it is said there is a ghost at the end of it. Well, if we are to look forward, we had better ask what is our present position? Our present position is this, that, as I understand it, and it seems to me a great misfortune, by our present system it is not allowed us to have a voice and a choice as to who is to step into the first place at the head of this nation. We live in days in which we have learnt to accept nothing unless we can reconcile it to sober reason and to clear intelligence; and I for one will take this opportunity of stating that I think it a great misfortune that there exists in this country no guarantee whatsoever that we should not have an extravagant, an idle, and a corrupt court. We possess no guarantee that a person who is totally unfit shall not be placed in the first place we have to give. I venture to say that for us who are a free nation, who for many years have been learning to govern ourselves, we on whose soil and in the air of whose country the free spirit of freedom and of self-government has been born and has been nurtured and has gone forth from us to teach other nations, I say it is an unfortunate thing for us that such a penalty and such a risk should hang over our heads, and that we should not take a step to free ourselves from a great and possible danger. I hate anything which approaches to scandal. I will not tread in the slimy and slippery paths of that. I will not join those who would hunt down a particular man who may not perhaps be very worthy of respect; but who may after all be better than we ourselves are, and who may have many temptations which we have not. I say that I cannot and will not do anything of that kind, but I place this matter on a broad and clear ground; I adopt it with you on the ground of principle, and I say that it is altogether a wrong and an undesirable thing that any man, be he whomsoever he may, should come to the throne of this country without first, securing the free consent and approval of this people. Some of my friends say that this means a Republic. I have heard some of my friends say 'Republic' is a very naughty word. I don't think we need be frightened at a word. But what I say to-night is this, that whether it means Republic, or not, I for one, do insist upon the right of this nation taking those responsibilities into its own hands, and deciding for itself what is right and whom it will place in its first seat. If the nation decide that we should have a King, well and good; the nation has taken the responsibility on itself. If it decide not to have a King, but to become a Republic; well, it also has taken the responsibility on itself, and I, for one, shall not venture to say it has badly chosen. My friends, what I am struck with in this matter is the way in which men reason but little when they are afraid. I find a great many of my friends cling very much to the present system, because they think it defends them from some great, terrible, and unknown dangers outside. It seems to them to be like the thin plank which divides the sailor from the howling sea outside him. But I would venture to say a word to you. You have seen on a calm summer's day a good ship lying on the waves, and then her painted figure head looking well enough; but when the storm came and the tempest descended in fury upon that ship, I want to know, did the crew look for assistance to the painted figure head? Was not their confidence rather given to the stout hearts which manned the vessel, and that pilot who stood at the helm and did the work. This I will venture to assert, that nothing which is unreal, and which men knew to be unreal, could have afforded safety or protection. There is only one real barrier in this country against dangers of any kind. There is only one barrier against violence or against unreason, or against disorder; there is only one barrier, and that is the intelligence and right feeling of the people themselves. To that I will trust; on that I will put my reliance, and when that fails, God help us all, for there is nothing left. I shall now venture very shortly to point out to you some of the advantages which would result from a change in our constitutional system. I think that if that change were to take the form of a Commonwealth or Republic we should gain a much greater impulse to deal with real evils which exist amongst us. I think we should get a great increase of force and energy to deal with that poverty, that crime, and that want which are great burdens to this nation. And I say that for this reason, because I think that men's minds would be carried in a simpler and more straightforward direction. What I notice now is this, that much of the force that there is in this nation is wasted. We are all broken up into parties. There is a party which wants to maintain the Established Church. There is a party which wants to remove the Established Church. There is a party which wants to remove the House of Lords. There is a party which wants to preserve it. There is a party which wants to preserve a monarchy. But what I want to notice is, that whilst we are split up into all these parties; whilst we have all these centres of difference and divisions, the real work of the country cannot be done. I believe that the real art of politics is to take out of our politics those unnecessary causes of difference, and to give us a simpler system, so that we may unite together; that we may merge all these parties and distinctions, and really set ourselves to do the one thing that is needful to improve the moral and social condition of the people. Well then, my friends, I cannot help noticing that any court system prevents us from looking to the standard of real and simple industrial life. To my mind simplicity of life seems to be closely allied to nobleness of life. And when you come to the pageantry, outward show, and

outward glitter which always surround court life, you mislead the mind of a nation and carry it in a wrong direction. I never can take up our newspapers and read those wonderful descriptions, which sometimes fill whole columns, of some ball or court reception, and the kind of dress worn on the occasion—I say I never can read such rubbish without feeling that there is a fountain of folly playing amongst us, and making us more foolish than we need necessarily be. What we want to do is to bring out the earnest serious thought which is within this nation. We want to bring out only worthy objects of effort, and we want to teach every class in this nation that life does not consist in the dress which a man wears, or the carriage in which he rides, or the house in which he lives; but that life, in the noblest sense, consists in what he really is. I have spoken out on this subject frankly and openly to you, and I have done so because I believe that nothing is or ought to be sacred to an English Liberal. I believe we are bound to test and examine everything which concerns the prosperity of our country. And I have also been influenced by this feeling that to my mind this is the only hope of avoiding disorder and revolution. I believe that where free speech exists there violence and disorder can find no place. I believe violence exists only in sealed up, pent up, places. It is like the bad gases which form in your mines; down in the earth these gases are formed because they are apart from the fresh air and sunlight. And just so violence, disorder, and revolution exist because there is not perfect freedom and frankness of thought and speech. Moreover, of this I feel very sure, that for many years—years that are coming—there will be much that many of us will have to endure, and to endure patiently in this country. I cannot promise you a golden future immediately; I should be deceiving you if I were to do so. You cannot build up a country in a day; you cannot replace that which is bad by that which is good in a single hour. It is a long work, and it is slow work. And whilst we are rebuilding this country and making it a better and a purer place, it will require much forbearance and much patience at your hands. But I for one shall never shrink from asking you for that, if at the same time I speak always that which I believe to be the truth; if I never ask you to support and reverence that which is not really worthy of your support and reverence; and if I never place before you a sham in the place of a holy and real object of reverence. And now I would say, in the last few words I am going to address to you, that if you do wish to see that great change brought about in this country, I say let us work for it in that spirit which has distinguished any revolution apart from other revolutions in other countries. Let us have self-control; let us use the weapons of reason and argument; let us advance it by moral force; and let us avoid doing everything which can shock unnecessarily those who differ with us, and let us, I would say, try to avoid the use of harsh and bitter expressions. My friends, the longer I live the more I feel that violence never works sensibly to its end. If I look across at the picture of France at the present moment I see something which is unutterably sad, and what makes the picture of the country so sad to my mind is this, that unfortunately all the parties in that country seem to me to be ready to have recourse to violence. What I believe is this, that no victory which is won by violence can last. What violence crowns to-day, that violence will discrown to-morrow. Violence always contains in itself the seeds of its own destruction, and I can only say, that to me the one bright spot which I see on this world of ours—which has much that is dark and painful—is the supremacy of moral force. I believe that if we have only faith in moral force it must win at the last. Let us fight this battle with the weapons of reason and argument; let us have the strongest and most unfaltering faith in the belief that there is nothing in the world strong enough to resist moral force. I have only one word to say in conclusion, and it is this; just as we have already destroyed many an old custom, and many an honoured institution; just as we have entered into many a sanctuary and broken many an idol, so in this future which lies before us, if only we serve the same cause, if only our hearts are pure and our minds unselfish, we may advance, without any misgiving that our strength will not be sufficient for the work before us."

In reprinting Mr. Herbert's address, we have purposely disconnected it from the strong and even boisterous exhibitions of political feeling with which, as our readers will easily imagine, the delivery of it was accompanied. The hall of the Nottingham Exchange, it seems, resounded and again resounded with groans for all dynasties that have ever been, and anon with cheers for the English Republic that is to be; while the names of persons occupying the highest positions were unsparingly associated, now humorously and now seriously, with the most uncomplimentary allusions. Little, if any, importance need, perhaps, be attached to this. We know the length which political partisanship, under exciting circumstances, is capable of going; nor do we doubt that the famous midland town, her "lambes" and would-be "Reds" notwithstanding, is still tolerably well enamoured of the British Constitution as at present established. Divesting, then, Mr. Herbert's explanation of all such fortuitous adjuncts of political feeling, we make bold to say that it does him infinite credit, if, indeed, it does not indicate the inauguration among English politicians of a new and vastly-improved order of moral insight. Few, we should say, will refuse admiration to the masterly manner in which he deals with a confessedly difficult subject, and still less to his constant and earnest appeal to a code of social and political ethics which, if generally recognised and acted upon, would purge society of more than half its evils. Mr. Herbert, although decidedly Republican in his political sentiments, is for law, for order, for "the supremacy of moral force," and will countenance no change, no reform, whatever which is not to be accomplished by means of these. Mr.

Herbert pays deservedly high tribute to the character and virtues of the Queen of England: yet monarchical institutions, as he feels, have a fearful progeny of evils to answer for, and must, as he says, in order to have continuance and stability, be more and more founded in the virtue, the justice, and the public usefulness, which can alone commend them to the growing intelligence and right feeling of the people, and deliver nations from the burden and the scandal of "an extravagant, an idle, and a corrupt court." Unimpeachable, too, is Mr. Herbert's political principle, that there should be no national payments made except in return for work done and services rendered; nor is our bold and sagacious seer in anywise doubtful of the eventual, if not speedy, dawning of the day when gilded shams of every order will be dethroned, and the respect of men will be reserved, not for persons of wealth and position, not for those who have and can exhibit, but for those who are and can do: for the brave and experienced hearts that man the ship, not for her "painted figure-head." But we need not particularise. We prefer that our readers should, apart from any comment of ours, "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest" for themselves the admirable new "lesson for the day" we have submitted for their instruction.

J. P.

Sacred History: its Influence on the Conscience.

WHATEVER respect may be professed for the Bible, whether as an authoritatively inspired book, or as a precious monument of the religious archives of humanity, every one must, on reflection, be struck with the strangeness of this anomaly;—that the first social model diligently set before the minds of European children of the nineteenth century, born in a free and Christian country, should be a type of private and public life, borrowed from the most remote historic and pre-historic periods of an oriental people; and, especially, that both the institution and the record of this model should be presented to them as a direct revelation from God! Whether we will it or not, children must and do thence derive many erroneous ideas, which it is always difficult, and often impossible, afterwards to eradicate. We do not mean that erroneous ideas are directly inculcated by teachers; but children will and always do form *for themselves* from sacred history more than from other lessons, because in general none take such hold of their imagination, wrong ideas which, often without being distinctly formulated, become deeply graven on their minds.

It is precisely these ideas, inevitably formed by a child for himself, and not those which a learned theologian might recommend him to, form, which we do not hesitate to blame as the chief source and cause of the atheism, materialism, thoughtlessness, iniquity, and misery, which unhappily abound in our midst. And we beg those who, from religious, conservative, or professional motives, are inclined to think otherwise, to consider calmly, whether, in fact, they are not obliged, in teaching children, to adopt one or other of the following alternatives:—

You either teach them sacred history according to the texts taken in their literal sense as that has been understood and accepted by Jewish and Christian tradition up to our own days : and then, you are forced, *since you cannot contradict the Bible*, to approve as facts a multitude of mythical stories, which you cannot yourselves accept as you cause the children to accept them, to approve the most bloody massacres as willed and commanded by God, to approve as extolled in the Bible, the perfidious atrocity of a Jael or a Deborah, to approve as a divine institution, the unsparing murder of thousands of little children, to approve the Semitic idea of *holy war*, to approve the interventions of God under forms the most repugnant to common sense and to morality, and to approve a theocratic social state, in which God commands intolerance, tolerates polygamy and slavery, and absolutely interdicts all liberty of investigation, of inquiry, of doubt, and of discussion.

Or else you make for them a sacred history of your own invention, in which you arbitrarily suppress whatever you disapprove, making a selection among the miracles and legends, retaining only what can be reconciled with modern morality, denying or dissembling the idea of absolute predestination without which *sacred history* ceases to have any meaning, and omitting, curtailing, or falsifying the stories which are too characteristic: and then it is no longer the authentic biblical history, but it is Judaism spiritualised as anything whatever might be: it is an ambiguous and indefinable mixture of history and symbolism, a kind of instruction even more dangerous than the other, because it retains essentially the same spirit and the same general tendencies as the old popular sacred history, while it is deprived of those rude and primitive features, which might sometimes have served to put the children on their guard, and which furnish the best clue by which to escape from the murky labyrinth of superstitious belief.

Both proceedings alike appear to us very far from being in accord with the requirements of modern education. However skilfully it may be attempted, there can never be produced a *manual of sacred history*,

which shall be at the same time sincerely in harmony with the biblical narrative, and with the moral ideas of our time. There is only one consistent course for us to take. It is to teach not sacred history, but *Jewish history*, in its own chronological place, exactly as other histories are taught, which are commonly called *profane*, but which are certainly not more so than that which we are discussing.

Until this course shall have been adopted, there must always remain at least one inevitable danger and disadvantage, even supposing that all the others may have been removed by means of skilful editing and curtailment. It is that children are trained and accustomed to have *two weights and two measures*, to judge of the past by one rule and of the present by another, and to extol there what is detested here. Hence, instead of believing in one single and universal moral law, their faith is divided between the rule and the exception. There are in each of them, as it were, two minds and two consciences: the one stamped with the character of the antediluvian world, or cast in the mould of the Jewish patriarchs and prophets, believing in the witch of Endor, the speaking ass of Balaam, with an entire phantasmagoria of superstitious images, dug from the oldest and lowest strata of human civilisation; the other, on the contrary, stamped more or less with modern intellectual and scientific culture, utterly opposed to the marvellous, the despotic, and the absurd. Thence it comes that in our days there are still to be seen so many people who will loudly condemn persecution, or tyranny, or the slightest individual or national intolerance in modern times; but who will not dare to say that the same things were wrong in Jewish antiquity. They firmly believe that duty is now the only rule of conduct, that all men ought to be regarded as equal by the law, and that mankind is a brotherhood, all being sons of the same God; but many of them, nevertheless, believe in some kind of special favours, graces, and privileges, reserved by the decrees of God, for His own *elect* few.

We are convinced that the contradictions and inconsistencies of individual opinion and character, which are so very common, proceed in great measure from the still almost universal teaching of sacred history. Suppose you take an opportunity of conversing with a child, who has just been learning sacred history in the school or Bible-class. Ask him what he thinks, for example, of the massacre of the Canaanites, of Samuel hewing a prisoner in pieces, of the aggressive wars in honour of the true God, of the capital punishment inflicted for this or that religious offence, &c. You will see whether he does not approve of them; you will see whether he answers you regarding them with that frank and natural indignation, which would be aroused by the same acts anywhere else than in biblical history. You will see whether he has not, instinctively, become impregnated with ideas at which even his teachers may be surprised, and of which they will say, we have never taught him that. You will see whether, even amidst the purer and juster ideas in which he is otherwise educated, sacred history has not filled his young mind and imagination with strange conceptions of God, as the God of armies, who commands massacres and blesses the murderers—a God of election, predestination and partiality, who governs the universe, not by laws, not according to justice, but by a series of miracles and *coups-d' état*,—a God, sovereign and supreme, but not always a just God, and still less a God of love,—a terrible and jealous God, who will not have his creatures to say about every thing—*is it really true?—how and why is it true?*—an all powerful God, who punishes doubt as a crime, and who takes vengeance by eternal torments upon his enemies, that is to say upon all unbelievers and rationalists! Make the experiment, and you will see whether, before any ulterior education, the place has not been taken and filled in the child's mind by these phantoms of a former age! You will see whether sacred history has not, in more than one respect, had the effect of "*changing the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man!*"

Friends of progress, liberals, radicals, reformers, believers or free-thinkers, do you wish to put an end to those anomalies, to those anachronisms, to those incongruities, to all those remains of former ignorance and iniquity, which still continue to disfigure even the most advanced societies? Do you wish, where freedom is already triumphant, to assure for it a future? Do you wish, where it is not yet victorious, to hasten its advent, by suddenly diminishing in a tremendous degree the number and influence of clerical and other obstructives and reactionaries of every shade? Then the most simple and obvious, and assuredly the most urgent of all reforms to be obtained,—from the law on the one hand and from public opinion on the other,—is that there shall no longer be given to your children, by way of their first and social education, the examples which come to us from the remote antiquity of a people, who were doubtless great in their own time and way, but whom humanity has long since outgrown and surpassed.

The advocates of the Bible will point with an air of triumph to the fact, that the nations, which are at present most distinguished for their freedom, prosperity, and enlightenment, are precisely those which, being Protestant, are most penetrated with the influence of the Bible; and will argue thence that its influence cannot but be good.

Tell them not to forget that Protestantism brought to those nations *two things*, then inseparably united, the Bible and *liberty*. Bid them remember that the Bible was *then*, the symbol, the trophy, and almost the synonym of liberty; and that the appeal from the Church to the Book was then the vindication of individual reason, free thought, and private judgment, against dogmatic and traditional authority. Ask them whether, if the Bible *with*

liberty has done much good, the Bible *without liberty* has not also done much evil. Point also to such *facts* as that, if martyrs have gone to the scaffold with the Bible in their hands, it was no less with the Bible in his hand that Calvin sent his free-thinking *friend* Servetus to the stake; and that if some heroic emigrants with the Bible founded the United States, their persecutors also had the same Bible.

If they say that the abolition of the Bible would herald a return to Paganism and the total overthrow of all moral and religious culture; tell them that we have no such prophetic opinion, but that, far from proposing to *abolish* the Bible, we only desire to have it read, studied, and taught like other ancient books, in a manner worthy alike of Protestantism, and of modern science, with full liberty of conscience, of intellect, and of investigation. Finally, remind them that Abyssinians and Catholics also have the Bible, only they read it under the sanction of, and in submission to a supreme authority; and that *Protestants* forfeit that name, unless they read it to judge for themselves, *without any such submission and with their reason and their conscience perfectly free* to examine every part of it upon its own merits, without any prejudice or foregone conclusion.

Inhabitants of a free and progressive country, you know that there can be no security for progress in society, unless its influence be at work in the school. The school is the nursery of society, the society of the future the heir of that of to-day. Those who have any care for the future of society ought, above all things, to look well to the school; for, even though we may be driving the intolerant and despotic spirit of the past more and more out of our political institutions, it is vain to imagine that any permanent or safe success has been achieved, until the last vestiges of that spirit shall have been banished from our schools. If, then, you have at heart the continuance of progress; if you do not think that the point which we have reached is already so high that we ought now to halt in our course, and to set up the motto "rest and be thankful;" then see to it that your children shall constantly breathe, in the school as well as in the family, the atmosphere of freedom; take care that they learn to speak, and thus to think, much and early about right and duty, about patriotism and philanthropy, about human liberty, equality, and brotherhood. Beware lest the first language to which their ear becomes accustomed, be one in which the ideas of ancient times obscure those of to-day. Guard, most especially, against letting any man teach them to abdicate a portion of their conscience or of their reason under the pretence of purifying it, or under any pretence whatever. It is high time that a new spirit should breathe in our schools, and that teachers and pupils should no longer live there with their eyes fixed behind them upon a small corner of Ancient Syria; but that they should have their minds and their hearts equally open to everything generous, good, and true, from whatever point of the human horizon it may come. *Be very suspicious*, for your children's sake, of every-thing which forbids or limits investigation, or in any other way restricts the free exercise of reason; of everything which recalls, even indirectly, exclusive privilege or arbitrary despotism in heaven or upon earth, in the past or in the present; of everything like subtle or sophistical distinctions, when employed against simple, direct, and strong convictions, in matters of morality; of everything which prescribes, under any kind of pretext, exceptions or restrictions to the common law of natural justice. And, as the first application of these principles, restore, in the elementary education of your children, the Jewish people to their legitimate rank, which will still be a high one, among other nations in the annals of the past:—abolish *Sacred History*, and put in its place *The History of Humanity*.—*Mr. Thomas Scott's Series of Papers*.

Correspondence.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

To the Editor.

SIR,—After our last flood, I picked up, on the bank of the creek, a tin-case, such as botanical students use. In this case was a manuscript. The water and mud, however, having penetrated the case, had thereby effaced several words in the beginning, middle, and whole pages towards the end. I will send you an instalment monthly of this MS. as far as I can decipher it; *i.e.*, if you see fit to publish it. Connected with tins, however, I would like to have your opinion, Mr. Editor, on the following query. Supposing Grandmamma "Herald" had found this production, would she have inserted it in her senile columns as a "*Relic of Pompeii*," and put the "*Inverini*" brand upon it? She might, *Quien sabé?*

Audialterampartem Creek.
Urtica Urens.

REMINISCENCES OF ARGUMENTATIVE

CONVERSATIONS HELD AT SUNDRY TIMES BETWEEN JAMES AULDIGHT AND JOHN DUBIOUS, MOSTLY REGARDING THINGS SPIRITUAL. WRITTEN AND COLLATED BY ME THE AFORESAID JOHN DUBIOUS.

(An obliteration in the MS. here, both as to date and locality.)

CHAPTER I.

AFTER several dry and caustic remarks regarding the state of the weather, the early wheat crops, and the affectionate solicitude of our paternal Government in leaving us to "mend our ways" and bridge our difficulties the best way we can, my friend James, on this occasion, informed me that he had spent the early part of the day in going over our Lord Bishop's unfinished Palatial Residence with a view to flooring it, or at least putting in a tender to that effect. Now, James being a lineal descendant of that irascible old lady in the First Charles' time, who, when Episcopacy was attempted to be made the State Religion in Scotland, hurled her stool at the officiating clergyman's head, with the naive remark, "Wad ye sing mass at my lug, scoondril?" James, therefore, I say advisedly, inherits a great deal of his ancestress' antipathy to all matters Popish or Episcopalian.

This doubtless accounts for Mr. Auldicht's brief and bitter summing up of our Bishop's character, abilities, and new Palace. This worthy, he says, puts him in mind of Paddy Kelly's boarders, who never missed a meal and never paid a shilling, inasmuch as he, the Bishop, never missed a pay-day, and never preached a sermon; and here I must remark, that James speaks the truth, as many of his lordship's own flock have testified "that he is a dumb dog which cannot bark." As to the Palace, James avers it is only a bit of empty pride—a pitiful attempt to found and bolster up lordly demesnes and ecclesiastic benefices in this fair young land of ours; that such a gingerbread, expensive building cannot well be for the promotion of Christianity, else this sanctified Jeremy Diddler would have built, or tried to build, a Cathedral *first*, and an unpretending residence *afterwards*. How different such conduct appears, from either an "in" or "ex Cathedra" standpoint, when contrasted with that of the meek and lowly one of Nazareth, "who had not where to lay his head," and of whom his Lordship would fain make people believe he is a humble copyist, and zealous servant. I thereupon reminded James that these matters did in nowise affect him—a staunch Presbyterian; as to how his Lordship got through with his arduous duties, or whether he did any duty at all. I also recalled to his recollection an occasion when he, the aforesaid James, made use of some expressions not one whit more liberal than those frequently uttered by his Lordship, the sum and substance of which was—that there was no morality out of orthodoxy—and that Christianity was spreading and not fading before the light of scientific knowledge. Regarding these momentous statements, I forthwith read to James an extract from a work of the Rev. George Gilfillan's, a celebrated divine of his own church. This close observer of the times says that there is a profound spirit of doubt among Christians—that many churches are visibly shaking—that the bonds of confessions and creeds are loosening—that a habit of examining all things, and of taking nothing upon trust, is growing—that *morality is acknowledged to be among the heterodox* as well as the orthodox, and sincerity not dependent on creeds or formula—that the silent frozen seas and colossal icebergs of an ancient era of thought are breaking up, and another era is succeeding—that some of the defenders of the present morbid and feeble state of Christianity are abandoning as untrue, or ignoring as obsolete and unmeaning, the stupendous signs and wonders which gather around its cradle—and that those strange signs, so long a terror to the adversaries of Christianity, have actually become a terror to its friends.

On the present influence of the Christian Religion, he remarks—that it has descended below other influences which sway our age—that the oracular power and virtue, which once dwelt in the pulpit, have departed—that sermons are now criticised, not obeyed—that when our modern Pauls preach, our Felixes yawn, instead of tremble—that the thunders of the pulpit are heard only in the agitation of despair, or where the preacher is determined to be popular—that the private influence of the clergy, which formerly sprang from a general belief in Christianity, is lost—that the Christian Sabbath is regarded with passive indifference, and its observance enforced by legislative enactments, and other means, which serve only to excite hatred against the day—that those who attend public worship, in most cases, do so from another motive than to hear the Gospel preached—that the conversions of the present day, except those of the grossly ignorant and debauched, are

mockeries of solemnity—that revivals, nowadays, are Pentecosts without the Holy Ghost—that Infidelity, from a cowardly, puny tiling, hiding its head under historic innuendoes, or skulking under the cloak of fiction, has become a monster of Briarean magnitude, meeting us at every point, and in every field, which is a fact openly avowed by thousands, secretly cherished by thousands more, and circulating besides through our literature, art, science, and philosophy—and that few intelligent and liberal minded Christians hold their religious tenets with the sincerity and warmth of their forefathers.

This Author also shows, at large, that the written documents of the Churches have lost their influence, and that their study is superseded by that of ancient medals, fossil remains, and *Combe's Constitution of Man*; that even the Bible has become a dead letter, has suffered from the analysis of the age, and has lost the awful reverence which once encircled its every page.

In reply to these great staring facts, James declared that any man who firmly believed the prophecies of Christ, need be under no apprehensions as to the ultimate success of Christianity. Whereupon I proposed that we should each express our views of the New Testament Prophecies, more especially the fulfilment, or non-fulfilment, of that remarkable one (Mat. x. 23., xvi. 27, 28, xxiv. 3, 29 to 42) respecting the Destruction of Jerusalem according to orthodox views, and of which the arguments, pro and con, are set down in dialogue form in Chapter II.

(To be continued.)

Infidels and Infidelity.

To the Editor.

SIR,—“When Jupiter hurls a thunderbolt, it may be mercy in the God to veil his glory with a cloud; but we can only view with contemptuous lenity, the mischievous varlet who pelts us with mud as we are riding by, and then hides behind a dusthole.” Such was the reply of an author, still living, to an attack made upon his character and creed by a political opponent, and some such reply, I felt to be due to the Rev. Dr. Beg, after reading his brilliant effusion in reply to your comment upon the Pharisaical spirit displayed by him in the pulpit upon a late occasion, when he is reported to have thanked the Lord that his congregation did not contain a sceptic, or an unbeliever, or a Secularist, or one of that worst form of infidelity, a Unitarian.

In your neat and telling note of thirty-four lines published in April, you very properly condemn (as Christ himself would, were he now among us, though assuredly in much stronger terms) the bigoted and unchristian spirit thus displayed; and in reply to that note, you are treated to an epistle containing one hundred and forty-five lines, six texts of Scripture, twenty-nine interrogations, and thirteen repetitions of the words “Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene,” either ignorantly or wilfully quoted as referring to yourself.

How you could have allowed a correspondent, whether an M.D., LL.D., or D.D, to occupy so much of your valuable space with such unmitigated balder-dash, I cannot understand, unless, indeed, you thought it desirable that your numerous readers should know how completely a Christian minister, and a servant of the Lord, with all the distinctive honours of a University at the end of his name, may, when he likes, make a never-mind-what of himself, and so work out, not his own salvation, but his own punishment.

Either Dr. Beg did use some such expressions as those referred to, or he did not. If he did not use the exact words imputed to him, but other words conveying the same impressions to his flock with regard to Unitarians, why does he not honestly admit that he did say so, and, if he can, defend his statement? If he did not by word or implication, convey any such impression to his hearers, then why does he not manfully deny the charge, and not disgust your readers with his contemptible quibbling?

I do not know whether you intend replying to his twenty-nine questions, and his six texts of Scripture. I will, at any rate, Mr. Editor, with your permission, take upon myself to state what I conceive to be the answer to some of them, and the sense in which they are used by you.

(1.) The word “Unctuous” I take to be used in the sense of “oily” or “slippery,” and when used in a personal sense, to mean that the individual referred to, if charged with making unchristian or false statements, would, by quibbling or some other disreputable artifice, try to slip out of it. (2.) As for “Presbyterian Priest,” I understand you to apply these words not ignorantly, but contemptuously to any person calling himself “ordained Pastor,” but who may notwithstanding be wholly unworthy of the position. (3.) The word “Cant,” Dr. Beg informs us “is used in many senses,” although he supplies but a portion of one of Webster’s meanings, viz., “a whining or singing manner of speech”—a characteristic which he disowns. Your would-be castigator, however, has managed to overlook Webster’s definition of “cant” as “The whining speech [why not in the pulpit as elsewhere?] of BEGGARS, as in asking alms, or in making complaints of their distresses.” The “lexicographer” again identifies cant with “whining pretensions to goodness,”—your own use of the word, Mr. Editor, if I mistake not. Lastly, “Unchristian spirit.” Dr. Beg, beat the bush as he may, knows well enough what you mean

by these words. His "lexicographer" will, at any rate, inform him that they imply something "contrary to the laws of Christianity, as an unchristian reflection; unchristian temper or conduct." Surely Dr. Beg's temper or conduct cannot be so very Christian, when we find him describing and denouncing Unitarians and others—persons every bit as good as, and, as a rule, much better than, himself—as infidels of the worst kind.

Dr. Beg complains of the absence of "Intellectual arguments and Reason" in your cutting note of April last, from the effects of which he is evidently still suffering. As a learned doctor, however, he should not be ignorant of the treatment prescribed by King Solomon for a particular class of persons, to which I am not at all sure Dr. Beg does not belong.—Prov. xxvi. 5.

"In conclusion" (to use Dr. Beg's own words), "the length of this correspondence debars me from entering on particulars" . . . "but suffice it to say that on the authority" of some Parsons of modern times, I could readily show—"from their opinions and lives"—that a Parson can be as bad a husband, as bad a father, as bad a citizen, etc., as the worst infidel of Dr. Beg's acquaintance. Says one of our poets:

*"For Forms of Faith let graceless zealots fight,
He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."*

Is Dr. Wazir Beg prepared to question the truth of this noble couplet? If so, I "pity" *him*.
A Unitarian.

The Disciples were called Christians First in Antioch.—ACTS XI. 26.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Being much engaged, and not in the way of seeing your publication, I did not know until to-day of your reply and that of Nicodemus to my letter. You seem quite satisfied with Nicodemus's answer, and say that my position was quite indefensible. Very strange, then, that neither you nor Nicodemus, although both wrote, has attempted at all to assail it.

My position was this, that the name "Christian" required something more than a belief in the "Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man"—your basis of comprehension. Nicodemus, instead of assailing this, assaults another proposition of which "Unitarians" are the objects. Another time, perhaps, that proposition may be discussed; meanwhile my present position has been merely avoided, and remains perfectly impregnable.

Indeed you have altogether conceded it. For you have admitted that the Apostles and immediate followers of Christ regarded the dogmas I referred to as essential parts of Christianity. Surely, then, there is nothing more for me to contend for. If any men ever existed who knew and could authoritatively say what Christianity meant and necessarily included, those were the men. For any man at this day to say that he has the proper conception of Christianity, and the Apostles had not, is an amount of presumption beyond all belief. It was while these Apostles, &c., were asserting these dogmas as essential, that the very name of "Christian" was assumed as being characteristic of those who held them (Acts xi. 26), and even though we could bring ourselves to believe your utterly incredible theory that those Apostles immediately after the departure of Jesus "sadly distorted and impoverished" the faith of their master; still, the name of "Christian" was determined to be expressive of that doctrine which they preached while anathematising all change (Gal. i. 8). So it has continued since: and for those who interpret the teaching of Jesus in an opposite manner (even though it were in a better manner) to adopt the name, is, I repeat, to adopt a false brand; more plainly so if they do not think it essential to believe of Jesus that he was "Christ (the Messiah) at all.

"A man," says Nicodemus, "may call himself a Wesleyan, a Mahometan, a Papist, &c.; but does any sane man pretend to say that Wesley, &c., is regarded as God?" Nay! thou ruler of the Jews: "but will any sane man pretend to say" that he may be a Wesleyan, a Papist, &c., without professing the peculiar tenets of the Wesleyans, the Papists, &c.? Should some man get up and say, "these doctrines which have been known and settled as characteristic of Wesleyanism, Popery, &c., I deny, yet am I a good Wesleyan, a Papist, &c.," he would simply make a fool of himself. So likewise does the Deist who calls himself a Christian.

Both you and Nicodemus tell me that the "basis of comprehension"—the "criterion of Christianity"—announced by Jesus was, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one toward another;" and that he required no dogma, and did not require belief but love. Now, your memory must have sadly failed you. A part is not the whole. Certainly "love" was part of the criterion; but Nicodemus should have been the last to forget the discourse addressed to one of his name.—(John iii.) Is it not to Nicodemus repeatedly insisted on, that the dogma of the new birth by Water and the Spirit is absolutely necessary? Is there not, in the same chapter, taught another dogma about eternal salvation by *believing* in the Son of Man? Is this not repeated—reiterated here and elsewhere, *e.g.* (John vi. 24, 35, 40; vii. 38; xi. 25; Mark

ix 23; Luke viii. 12, 13; xxiv. 25). Does he not make the belief in his Messiahship a necessary dogma?—"If ye believe not that I am he ye shall die in your sins."—(John vi. 24). Does he not found his Church on the confession of a dogma?—(Matt. xvi. 16, 18). Is not a dogma the very formula of baptism with his society?—(Matt. xxviii. 19). In truth, if you exclude what is dogmatic in the requirements of Jesus's teaching, you make some new story, and, as St. Paul says, preach "a new Jesus" and "another gospel." Finally, he told them that the future of the society should be dependent on a Paraclete (John xiv., xvi.) under whose teaching they should be able to master the truths which he said they were then not able to hear (John xvi. 12, 13), although he had already taught them, in addition to those I have mentioned, such dogmas as these: His own resurrection (Matt. xvii. 9); our resurrection (Matt. xxii. 30, 31; Luke xviii. 33); final punishment Matt. xiii. 49); atonement (Matt. xx. 28); second advent and judgment (Matt. xxiv., xxv., xxviii. 19); application of Isaiah liii. to himself (Luke xxii. 37); sole mediatorship (Matt. xi. 27); pre-existence (John vi. 58); his fulfilment of the prophecies by his suffering and re-entrance into glory (Luke xxiv. 26-27 and 44 to 47), &c.; and beside all this, there is at all events the claim continually urged by the Apostles that what *they* taught was what Christ bid them preach and not their own.

I do not like to charge Nicodemus with want of candour in his application to me of the words "bandying texts;" but he is perhaps unintentionally unjust. I hate the process; but as my object was to show what was considered essential to Christianity at its foundation by its authorised founders, I had no other course but to consult their writings and their acts while so founding it. I could not, of course, to you, assume their inspiration and infallibility; but only that they gave us what was their criterion of Christianity.

He is forced to admit that "Phil. ii. 5-8, and many other passages, afford some ground for (he might have said assert positively and unmistakeably) the ordinary doctrines of orthodox Christianity;" but he affirms that "there can be found at least as many on the other side." Does he mean that there are any: which contradict the orthodox creed, or that any contradict this passage—Phil. ii. 5-8. Certainly I know of none. The passage and the creed equally assert that "He having equality with God divested himself of it, and took the nature of man and the form of a *servant*" While so divested, of course he, in that, form, was inferior to the Father, and they were to "rejoice because he was going" to assume equality. While so divested of course he grew as men grow. What contradiction can there be in repeating a part of the very same truth? The other side he gave them when he said, "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father;" and, "I and the Father are one." Doubtless Nicodemus finds the New Testament a jumble of contradictions, simply because he rejects the dogma which reconciles them. This however is not necessary to my argument, for I am not discussing the Unitarian hypothesis.

If you are satisfied with Nicodemus's explanation of *prayer*, I am sure you are very easily satisfied. To hope and wish for a thing and to ask God for it without any idea of his paying the slightest attention to your requests—"not for effect, but because he must"—appears to me to be a combination of absurdity and insult. How often does Jesus say, Ask that ye may receive? Now by a parable he recommends importunity—to get at last by asking long—now he compares it to a child asking a father for food, and getting it. But to ask without a thought of receiving—never. We are, according to Christ, like children asking for bread, in order to receive it. We are, according to "More Light," like children crying to our father for the moon, which we hope not to get. Nicodemus says, men are to pray "because they must, not for any effect." Christ and the Apostles *incite* men to pray when they will not, and in order to receive. Like the rest of the fabric, this may be very wise; but at all events it is not "Christian." It is directly contradictory of Christianity.

Why should it be so great a matter to give up the name when you oppose the thing named? Is your retention of it a reluctant homage to the beauty and glory of the thing you have abandoned (for a while only, I trust), until a deeper candid investigation lead you back to the safer and certain path?

Yours, most faithfully,

Zachary Barry.

Biblical Contradictions.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have neither the ability nor the time to continue a controversy in your columns; but as I stated in my last letter that the Bible contained a Key to its own interpretation, I shall supply one, and only one, example in support of this assertion. Permit me, however, first, to assure Rob Roy that I am not a "worshipper" of the Bible, and that I do not "maintain it to be the very word of God." I look upon the Bible as—what Jesus Christ pronounced it to be—a *Testimony* of the Word; God himself being the "very word." Such being the case, and believing that the Bible was given by inspiration, we only claim for it, what is not denied to everything else in

the universe, an internal structure, not visible to a merely casual observer, with the unassisted eye. Every one who can read may see a certain amount of light in the letter of the Scriptures, as all who have eyes may see light in the stars and beauty in the plants; but it is only by the study of Astronomy and Botany that we can discover the real dimensions and nature of the one, and the organisation and uses of the other. I need not pursue the analogy farther.

In giving an example of this inner meaning of the Bible, I shall not accept the suggestion of Rob Roy by explaining the passages quoted by him, and for this sole reason, that it would take up more of my time and your space than either perhaps can well afford, to place their true meaning intelligibly before your readers; I shall therefore (and without the aid of Dr. Bayley) select the very first passage that now meets my eye on opening the Bible, and which can be explained in fewer words than either of the passages referred to you by your correspondent. We read in Psalm cxxxvii., verses 8 and 9: "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall lie be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." This, your correspondent will doubtless say, is not morally right, and—if construed literally—so say we. But when we bear in mind that Babylon denotes—all through the Bible—a false and perverted condition of the Church (as Jerusalem denotes truth, or the true Church), we have a Key to the whole passage.

By *daughter* here is not meant a daughter, but affection. Affection is the characteristic of woman, and therefore it is so represented in the Scriptures. Hence the true church is called a Bride and a Wife; the false church is called a Widow and a Harlot. We read of the *Daughter* of Zion and the *Daughter* of Jerusalem, whereby Zion is denoted the Church as to good, and by Jerusalem the Church as to truth; and by the *daughters* thereof are signified the affections for those things. Now, by Babylon, as stated above, is denoted a false and perverted condition of the Church; consequently by the daughters of Babylon are denoted affections for such perversity, and by her little ones are signified all the progeny of false principles which thence arise. This being the case, we at once see the happiness which must result from their destruction.

Queensland, 30th June, 1871.

P. R. G.

Jesus the Mediator Between god and Man.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I am a subscriber to your Free Press and am often much pleased with it. It has a good many readers here. I have much sympathy with the cause of Religious Reform in which you are engaged, although I cannot go your length in exposing the shortcomings of the Bible. In saying this I must admit that the defects in that volume are many and serious—I mean in the Old Testament. Still I do feel conscientious scruples about being able to draw the line between the true and the false, knowing my own incapacity to judge, and fearing that by misjudging I might lead others astray. True to my own self, I think for myself, and if I am wrong I cannot help it. I wish others to please themselves. Tales like that of the Apple in Eden Jonah and the Whale, and Samson and the Jawbone, I most seriously suspect: in fact I do not credit them, and I think it is of no moment to anybody whether these stories are true or not, or whether they believe them or do not. It is a matter of moonshine to my mind at any rate. I cannot but admire your attempt to purge the Scriptures of indisputable errors: yet, as a Christian, I base my faith on the teachings of the New Testament, and willingly make a present to the Jews of the Old.

One reason which weighs powerfully with me for resorting to Scripture in the present instance is that the doctrine of the Trinity is *scripturally* untenable; that Unitarianism, in other words, pervades the very volume which is generally considered to teach the opposite.

One question which, before all others, must be settled in the mind, is that which Christ put to His disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" Notwithstanding that we have an answer given, times innumerable, in the New Testament, it is still necessary to put the question again, even at this late hour of the day, and press upon an incredulous community the acceptance of the plain, intelligible reply given by Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This simple truth being lost sight of in the teachings of popular Christianity, owing to the conjectures and opinions of men being superadded thereto and resulting in a confusion of ideas, the Mediatorial work of Christ has been converted into something most inexplicable, the very mysterious bearings of which, we are told, form evidence of its truthfulness, and we are cautioned not to attempt to pry into it.

To prove the Trinity, by cutting out a few short passages of Scripture and declining to read them along with the context, is not only to read in utter defiance of the rule adopted in all other cases, but it is dishonest and sinful, inasmuch as it seeks to find what evidently is not meant, and refuses to admit what evidently is. Let us examine the best of these passages :—

John x. "I and my Father are one." Pray, one what? We are not told that it is *one person or one God*, and we cannot accept a conjecture of this kind as a basis of an important doctrine. We ask for proofs, and want no conjectures. The context demands that the passage be understood, "I and my Father are *as one*." But Paul and Christ himself have placed this beyond dispute;—they have expressly said the meaning of the phrase is not oneness of being or essence, but oneness of purpose or character. 1 Cor. iii. Paul who planteth and Apollos who watereth are one. This does not mean that these two persons were one person. The sense is the same as conveyed by—"They twain (man and wife) shall be one flesh," or as one flesh. Again, John xvii., Christ prays to His Father that *all* his disciples might be *one*, "even as we are one." Here is indisputable proof.

John i. "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God." The correct rendering of the last clause is, "And the Word was *of* God, or *in* God or *a* God." He was "In the beginning" or when God made heaven and earth and before; but how long in the previous eternity it is none of our business to inquire. We see that the most delicate examination of this proof is its destruction.

Romans ix. "Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever." The question here is, whether the comma should be before or after the word "God." If after, this may be a shadow of an argument, but is the comma inspired, and is its position the same? A doctrine founded upon a comma !

Hebrews i. "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." A doctrine founded upon the letter "O!" It should read, "*in* God."

Revelations xxii. "I am Alpha and Omega" This is a quotation from the vision of Saint John, to interpret which satisfactorily the greatest scholars confess themselves unable. Why not give us plain proofs from such a volume of plain, intelligible teaching as is contained in the previous part, of the book? It is of no use to offer conjectures. *He is* Alpha and Omega of the Church and the Worlds.

John xii. "He that seeth me seeth Him that sent me." We are asked to read the passage thus:—"I am He that sent me." This will riot do. Is there no plain teaching at all in such a large volume as the New Testament?

A careful examination of these passages, and many others which are supposed to favor the same views, leads to the conclusion that these are no proofs at all—that they will not bear interpretation by the established rules of interpretation—that, when they are taken as component parts of the chapters in which they are given, they, one and all, read the opposite way. If it were allowable to cut out passages and read them by themselves, in defiance of the surrounding matter, it would be the easiest thing possible to bring out incredible doctrines, never meant. For instance, Transubstantiation would sink into comparative innocence before the literal rendering of John vi. 51—58. The reader must see the absolute necessity of consistency in studying Scripture. The Bible, like the kaleidoscope, may be made, by turning and turning, to reflect images as various as you please.

Truth is always consistent with itself, and all known facts. That God and Christ are two distinct persons is proved to a logical demonstration by the scriptural expression which forms the heading of this paper. The simple word "Between" ought to be sufficient of itself to shut out all controversy.

The most extravagant opinions ever set up have always had a basis of some kind, real or pretended. The Trinitarian fabric rests upon a something too, and we see what that something is. Now measure the breadth and examine the solidity of the foundation, and see whether it is a rock—"the Rock of Ages"—or a shifting point—a dubious, hazy something, having neither dimensions nor substance. Let us take the evidence, such as it is, for and against, and cast it into the scales and weigh it. There must be an overwhelming preponderance in either scale.

Appearances are often wholly deceptive. Sophistry in letters is what gilding is in metallurgy. Examination is fatal to either. The dexterous reasoner may invent a plausible argument to make it appear to superficial understandings that "God manifest in the flesh" means actually "Jehovah incarnate;" but no amount of talent can hide that this must be sophistry, inasmuch as he who prayed "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," could not have been his own Father, to whom he prayed. Again, Christ says "I ascend unto my Father and your Father—to my God and to your God," a man would now a days be thought beside himself to maintain that these *two* Beings were the *same* Being. If then they are not the same, they are different. They are either the one or the other, and nothing but either sophistry or wilful misrepresentation is able to confound them.

In passing from the Scriptures to the volume of Nature, we should not allow our inability to fathom the Universe and its Author to shake our confidence in the little we do know of both. Although the mind were indefinitely enlarged, confidence in much that we know, beginning with self-evident natural principles, instead of being weakened, would only be strengthened the more. Truth is truth, independently of time, place, capacity, or person. No discoveries will upset Euclid or Scripture. The key of knowledge has been lying about, but mankind have been slow to discover its usefulness in revealing the accessible Unknown. The better we can read the unwritten Word in nature and nature's laws, the more harmony will be found between that and the other work of God. In the scientific world, a few of the simplest of truths, from their extreme simplicity long treated as being practically valueless, have led to works which have revolutionised the face of the earth. Even so in the

religious world, some of the simplest natural principles, or laws of God, unimportant-looking in their very littleness, may work out a similar good. By extending the range of our thoughts to the universe around us, we may hope to catch better, brighter, holier, more ennobling, glimpses of Jehovah, than by confining our gaze to one particular limited portion of His works. Not that we, worms of the dust, may know God. He dwells in light inaccessible beyond the veil, which mortal man dare not lift and live, yet we may, by the legitimate and extended use of our faculties, come to detect errors in our own minds and in the language we employ in speaking of Him. For this reason are we authorised to bring a human creed to be tried both by the volume of Nature and Scripture—for this reason do I appeal to natural to confirm revealed truth.

Taking a leaf of that volume, are we not as certain as we are of our existence—

1st. That no two beings can be the same being, *e.g.*, is it not nonsense to say, "the Governor's son is the Governor himself?" Two distinct natures are union, not identity. If a thing is not the same it is different, and *vice versa*. If Father and Son are the same being there is no Son. Take any chapter in the New Testament, substituting Son for Father and Father for Son, and read it. Or, if it makes any difference, transpose the word God and Son of God, or God and Christ, wherever they occur, and read it. If the pre-existent Christ is the Son of God, that is a fiat denial that he is God, and if he is God himself, that again is a flat denial that he is the Son of God.

2nd. That, where only one object is concerned, there can be no equality? To maintain that they are but one Being is to deny all those passages of Holy Writ, which ascribe to the Son a (constituted) equality with the Father.

3rd. That the terms Father and Son cannot imply coeval being, but priority and subsequence?

4th. That, if there be one Infinite, there is not a second? If the Saviour on the cross was "perfect God and perfect man," the *Intercessor* now, and Judge (appointed) hereafter, is which?—the humanity born of Mary—a man! and the pre-existent Son of God disappears! Infinity, upon this hypothesis, resolves itself into "perfect humanity!"

Lastly, because a thing is possible is no proof that it happened. That God might become incarnate, no one is so insane as to dispute, but did He? Had He not a purpose for sending another instead?

The necessity for reformation, then, how urgent! But let us seek reformation indirectly, by seeking restoration in the first place. Let us make a fresh start; error has assumed too many phases to be successfully met by a direct appeal. Let us discard all human creeds, founding upon the Bible, and it alone; and, by struggling for restoration, reformation will follow as an unavoidable consequence;—the partition walls, separating the worshippers of God, will crumble gradually away of themselves, and we shall then verily have one fold and one Shepherd.

W. C., Dunedin, N. Z.

Editorial Notices.

THE cost of printing and publishing the *Free Religions Press* is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A.F.R.P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the Readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street, Sydney.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George-street.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office to be made payable to the Editor, who will be happy to receive Subscriptions for the New Volume, and to supply back numbers.

Well-bound volumes of the Free Religious Press, price 7s. 6d. each, can be obtained at the Publisher's, or from the Editor.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—E.W., Waterloo.—An Advocate of Free Thought.—received. Dr. W.B.—in our next.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 420 George Street, Sydney, July 10, 1871.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on

Notes.

WE are perfectly satisfied that, with a fair field and no favour, the at length terminated controversy between Rabbi Davis and the Rev. John Graham would, if continued, eventually leave the latter, in the judgment of all intelligent and unbiassed onlookers, without even the ghost of a leg to stand upon. But, then, who does not see that no such field is furnished by the columns of a newspaper, and least of all by those of a newspaper of the stamp of the *Sydney Morning Herald*? Mr. Graham, it is true, assures us, that, "conscious of writing under an All-seeing Eye," he would be the last to treat an antagonist unfairly, or, as he graciously puts it, to "injure a hair of even an arch-heretic's head." We suspect, however, that his conscience, with all its sensitiveness, will not so readily acquit him of designedly levelling arguments—to say nothing of taunts and reproaches—against his "good friend Davis," which, as he must know well enough, the *Herald's* unimpeachably orthodox editor would not suffer to be dealt with, unreservedly, from the Rabbi's religious stand-point. When, therefore, in our last issue, we asked Mr. Davis to think the matter over before continuing his contest with Mr. Graham, it was assuredly from no misgiving on our part as to the Rabbi's ability to meet and demolish such arguments or accusations as the Minister might advance, but from the feeling that he was entering an arena where, being powerless to return the compliment, a wily opponent, knowing his advantage, could and would smite him on the cheek *ad libitum*. Uneasy at length under this felt restraint, and further embarrassed, as we gather from his last letter, by a reluctance to say "a single word that might be hurtful to the feelings of his Christian fellow-citizens," Mr. Davis, in reply to Mr. Graham's hollow rant about "sacrificial expiation through a suffering Messiah," "faith in the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world," etc.,—has, accordingly, to content himself with the quiet but weighty observation, that the Christian orthodox verities of a Triune Deity, Atonement, Mediatorship, Conception by the Holy Ghost, etc., had better be tested by the to this day unanswered and unanswerable *Leben Jesu* of David Friedrich Strauss and other such works. An enlightened Christendom, again, fume and bluster as may Mr. Graham to the contrary, is in perfect accord with Rabbi Davis when he affirms that the teachings ascribed to Jesus are in nowise essentially superior to those of "uninspired" sages who taught before and after his time; that the so-called Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament do not in any one instance refer to, and were not at all fulfilled in, the Founder of Christianity; and that there is not the slightest retributive connection between the treatment Jesus received at the hands of his country-men and the national misfortunes by which they were subsequently over-taken. Mr. Graham is, of course, amazingly eloquent on the "one dire crime and mistake" which has caused the "desolation of Israel" for nearly two thousand years. For ourselves, however, we fully believe, with Mr. J. S. Mill, that the mass of evangelical Christians, had they lived in those days, would have acted towards Jesus precisely as the Jews did: and for the rest, we would simply ask upon what principle of equity, either divine or human, a proceeding which secured the redemption of the human race from the wrath of God and everlasting perdition in the only way in which it was to be secured, can be regarded as a crime! Had the Jews, instead of immortalising Jesus by a public crucifixion, contemptuously ignored him, as their Roman masters were disposed to do, and pooh-poohed him back into his original obscurity as an ignorant but well-meaning disturber of the public peace; where then, we are curious to know, would have been the Cross of the Saviour and the "efficacy" of his Atoning Blood? and where, consequently, the Great Salvation which, as is generally believed, alone prevents humanity from rushing headlong into the jaws of the Devil? We challenge Mr. Graham to show that the Jews, so far from having committed a crime in crucifying their countryman, are not, according to the Christian theory of pre-ordained Salvation for the human race by the sacrifice of the just for the unjust, entitled, as the chosen instruments of Heaven for the accomplishment of a divine purpose, to our eternal gratitude.

In a letter recently addressed to the *Argus*, the Rev. James Jeffries, of Adelaide, bewails the estrangement which, while on a visit to Melbourne, appeared to him to exist between the Press and the Pulpit of that city; and the *Australasian* of August 5th, in an admirable and outspoken article on the subject, not only admits the accuracy of Mr. Jeffries's observation, but is convinced that the estrangement in question is likely to go on increasing. And for the reason, mainly, as our Contemporary remarks, "that the Press sets religion above theology, while the Pulpit sets theology above religion. The latter attaches an exaggerated importance to forms of religious belief, to dogmas, creeds, and ceremonies; while the former looks only to the spirit of religion. . . . In order that God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven, the Press holds that it is absolutely necessary to ascertain what are God's laws as revealed to us in Nature, in our own selves, and in the constitution of Society; and, having ascertained these, the Press seeks to popularise that knowledge, and to apply it so as to promote the health and happiness of men and women individually, to develop the resources of the earth on which we live,

to perfect the political institutions of the community to which we belong, to inculcate the morality which underlies all true religion, and to qualify human beings for a higher state of existence hereafter by indicating the path of duty here, and by pointing out the temporal advantages as well as the lasting wisdom of steadily pursuing it. . . . The Press keeps abreast or somewhat ahead of the march of average human thought, sympathises with and stimulates the more exalted conceptions of Almighty Wisdom and Almighty Love, which have replaced a good deal which passed for religion in former centuries, and encourages the substitution of an intelligent belief in God's laws for the unintelligent worship of antique dogmas established by sincere but uninquiring minds. The Pulpit on the other hand, with some honourable exceptions, turns its face to the past and its back upon the present. It is afraid of Science; as if there could possibly be any antagonism between God's laws and the Maker of those laws. It denounces Reason; as if the Divine gift were in reality conferred upon mankind by some diabolical Arimanes, and discourages in human beings the growth of that feeling of reverence for their own souls, which naturally expands into a sentiment of reverence for the Creator of the soul." These statements sufficiently indicate our Contemporary's attitude towards the venerable institution which, whatever its influence in bygone times, has, in his opinion, both done its work and had its day. Demur as we may to this sweeping verdict, we must at any rate allow that the Pulpit—partly from the action of constitutional but not, we believe, ineradicable defects, and partly from the increasingly enormous influence exerted in the present day by the several departments of literature—is the merest shadow of the power it formerly was. Maintaining a close and living contact with the realities of thought and feeling, and appropriating the spirit of religion to the disregard of its ecclesiastical husk, the Press is in a position to administer, constantly and directly, to the social, moral, intellectual and religious well-being of Society, while the Pulpit, with its distrust of human nature and fondness for mumbling over antiquated dogmas, is much oftener than not a veritable obstacle in the way of man's progress and improvement. This unfortunate condition of things is too patent to be questioned; and there is little, we believe, to hazard in the conjecture that the decadence of Modern Pulpit Influence will go on increasing until, perchance, with the growth of rational conceptions of God and His government of the Universe, the Ark of religious truth falls into the hands of an entirely new order of custodians.

NOT long since, at a meeting of the Anglican Synod of New South Wales, its President, the Bishop of Sydney, jocularly hinted, if we remember rightly, that he himself might be the first to stand before their contemplated Tribunal for the trial of ecclesiastical offenders. Of course no one anticipates any such sensational denouement; but it would be well, perhaps, for his reputation, if his lordship, either in Synod or elsewhere, would furnish an explanation of some curious statements which appear in the speech he delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Colonial and Continental Church Society, recently held in London. Familiar as we are with the large amount of heretical doctrine which a man can nowadays hold consistently with considering himself and with being considered a member of the Church of England—to say nothing of the fact that our journal, which Dr. Barker so sternly denounced on one occasion, is largely and increasingly read and appreciated within the pale of Anglican orthodoxy—we can allow the Bishop's statement about more than half the colonists of New South Wales being members of the Church of England to go for what it is worth. His other statements, respecting the religious condition of the colony in general and of certain districts in particular, are not, however, to be disposed of so easily. Goulburn, it seems, is to have a new Church, Bishop Barker having undertaken, during his stay in England, to raise money towards its erection. A case of "spiritual destitution" had therefore to be made out, and here it is: "The Bishop of Goulburn," remarked Dr. Barker, "has established in the town of Goulburn—I should rather say Mrs. Thomas has established there, for the credit is due to her—a *dépôt* for the sale of Bibles and other useful books; and that scheme has proved a complete success. In Goulburn there was previously no bookseller's shop; books were only sold by a man who kept a store—in other words, who was a grocer, a draper, an ironmonger, and many other things besides. Well, Mrs. Thomas opened a shop at the corner of two streets in the most attractive style; she herself, with her winning manner has been frequently seen in the shop, superintending the sales, and the result has been that a very large amount of bibles and of very useful literature has been dispersed through the diocese. We value this kind of work the more, because in the Australian colonies those green and yellow backed books, those cheap tales of fiction which are so injurious to the rising generation, have been almost the only books that could be purchased. In fact, the establishment of a *dépôt* like that which I have mentioned is a great comfort and boon." We must ask our readers to compare the first part of this statement with the *Yass Courier's* flat contradiction, "that for years before Mrs. Thomas opened her *dépôt*, two or three booksellers' establishments existed in Goulburn;" and again with the *Goulburn Chronicle's* equally contradictory assertion, "that Goulburn had its regular bookseller's shop, which previous to the opening of the diocesan *dépôt* devoted considerable attention to the supply of religious works, some sixteen or eighteen years before Bishop Thomas's arrival." As for the latter part of the Bishop's statement, it may be safely left to the frequenters of the leading booksellers' shops in Sydney or Melbourne to say whether cheap and demoralising tales have been almost the only books that could be purchased in the Australian colonies. It is not of course for us (unworthy that we are) to cavil at or distrust the utterances of "the wisest man in the

Archbishop of Canterbury's diocese;" yet his lordship must not be surprised if *some* "unconsecrated intellects" should find it hard to reconcile the speech we are considering, even with Romans iii. 7 thrown in as a make-weight, with a scrupulous regard for truth, to say nothing of the Scripture injunction that "a bishop must be blameless, and have a good report from those who are without." It may be, too, that captious or matter-of-fact persons, taking another view of the matter, will be found questioning the wisdom of sending one man to England to represent the colony at £1000 per annum, and another to Misrepresent it on a stipend of double that sum.

WE notice that the Dalkeith heresy case has at length terminated in the submission of the Rev. M. Ferguson to the decision of the United Presbyterian Synod. He has, it is true, qualified his *Peccavi* by maintaining that "his liberty as a minister of the Gospel, to speak according to his own light, conscience and sense of responsibility, remains unimpaired;" a position, however, which strikes us as being scarcely consistent with his pledging himself to the Presbytery to believe and teach for the future (1) "that all who shall ultimately be saved were chosen of God in Christ before the foundation of the world:" (2) "that all who are saved are accepted of God, by His grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, at or before the time of their death; and that none dying unsaved will after death, have an opportunity of obtaining salvation:" (3) "that whatever new revelations of Christ or of the truth are made after death to the saved, are made, not to free them from sin, but to increase their knowledge and blessedness:" and (4) "that, notwithstanding the inability of the will through sin, as taught in our Confession, unbelievers are fully answerable for their rejection of the offer of salvation which the Gospel makes to them." Dr. Cairns, we are told, gave thanks to God for the "harmonious and happy result" thus achieved; the Moderator also expressing his satisfaction that "the Sun of Righteousness had scattered for them an apparently dark cloud;" but to ourselves, the upshot of Mr. Ferguson's originally bold attitude towards the Presbytery is extremely disappointing. Questioning as he did, in the first instance, the right of the reverend fathers to dictate to him as to what happened to the "spirits in prison" during the thirty-eight hours which separated the death of Jesus of Nazareth from his alleged resuscitation; their badgering appears to have dragged from him one heresy after another, and to have finally triumphed by fettering Mr. Ferguson with a set of abstruse propositions in speculative theology, which, occupy and interest as they might Milton's fallen spirits when they

"reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate;
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute;
And found no end in wandering mazes lost,"

look strange enough when measured against the immediate interests and duties of our daily life, or even against the really deep and solemn problems of human life and destiny which nowadays absorb the attention of emancipated religious thinkers. The Presbytery may perhaps not be aware that these dreadfully deep questions of "election," "grace," "salvation of the elect," and "reprobation of the damned" have recently received on the American side of the Atlantic, from certain theologians of "colour" there, a remarkably straightforward and not unsuggestive solution. We quote from one of their most popular Church hymns:

"Alleluyer I Tanks and Praise !
Long enuff we've born our crosses;
Now we's de superior race,
We's gwine to heaven afore de Bosses.
Alleluyer I Praise de Lord!

We is nearer to de Lord
Dan de white folks and dey knows it;
See de glory gate unbarred—
Walk up darkies, past de guard—
Bet a dollar he don't close it!

Walk in darkies troo de gate,
Hark! de kullered angels holler,
Go'way, white folks, ye're too late,
Black's de winning kuller. Wait
Till de trumpet blows to foller."

What a transition from the blinding mists of Scotch metaphysical theology to the jubilancy of natural feeling! But can the Kirk improve upon the view taken by these "darkies" of the mysteries of the world to come? We doubt it.

OUR journal is indebted to Mr. J. G. S. Grant, of Dunedin, whose communication will be found in its Correspondence department, for a criticism, which, while respectful and even appreciative, is, at the same time, sufficiently slashing. *His* platform, it seems, is that of "philosophical theism," and from it he announces that *our* half-and-half method of procedure, which he considers too broad for Christians and too narrow for Theists, is inconsistent with sound philosophy, and therefore fated to fall through. "Jesus," says Mr. Grant, "did not write the rambling utterances attributed to him." Have we ever said that he did? Have we not, on the contrary, repeatedly maintained that the Gospels, especially the Gospel of John, attribute statements to Jesus which, so far from committing them to manuscript, he did not even *utter*? Why not publish, then, asks our philosophical friend, an "expurgated" Gospel, and give people an opportunity of studying the Jesus you really revere? For the reason, is our reply, that the human mind, when unembarrassed by false and misleading theories of biblical interpretation, is quite equal to the task of disconnecting the historic Jesus from the cloud of fable in which the New Testament writers, reflecting the ignorance and superstition of their day and people, have so unfortunately enveloped him. Mr. Grant's distrust of the mythological element in both Testaments is assuredly not greater than our own. We submit, however, that, in proposing as he does on that account to "throw the whole overboard," the offence against philosophy is not on our side but on his. Common sense, to say nothing of philosophy, would see little to admire in the destruction of a mixed heap of chaff and grain which might and should have been submitted to the winnowing process. So with the Scriptures. To treat them as unworthy of our respect and admiration, because Christians have superstitiously disallowed the numerous errors and blemishes which they exhibit in common with other ancient writers, were, we think, to perpetrate a folly *per se*, as well as a signal injustice to the Scriptures themselves. So, too, with Christianity. Are we to reject it as a wholesale delusion, because the name of its founder has, by ignorant bigots or designing priests, been associated with crimes and corruptions for which Jesus himself is in nowise responsible? Surely not. Our Dunedin correspondent refuses to hear of Jesus as "the noblest human soul that has yet worn flesh," at least until we have drawn "a clear line of demarcation between the spurious and genuine utterances attributed to him by the writers of the Gospels." Just as if all the criticism in the world were able to accomplish this clearly impossible task! Where is the student of Plato's Dialogues who will in every instance undertake to say when that eminent master of philosophy is stating his own opinions, when the opinions of Socrates, or when he is stating opinions which might possibly be entertained by some third person? With Mr. Grant we readily admit the difficulty, nay, the impossibility, of discriminating between the spurious and genuine utterances attributed to Christ by the writers of the New Testament; we must, however, emphatically disown his "throwing-the-whole-overboard" principle as one which, if generally applied, would simply "expurgate" every ancient work out of existence. "An expurgated Gospel" is no more called for than an expurgated Herodotus or Livy; and we are strongly disposed to believe that, could the common sense of the uninformed and the lens of a scholarly criticism be allowed to operate as freely on the writings of the New Testament as on the works just alluded to, the Jesus of history—the Jesus who, early consecrating himself to the service of truth and virtue, nobly stood aloof from and rebuked the iniquities of his age and people, who denounced and defied a corrupt and selfish hierarchy, who yearned and laboured, aye, and sacrificed his life, for the advent of a purer public morality and the rise of a higher national creed; the Jesus, in a word, who, without being himself faultless, made by his virtues such an impression on his contemporaries as to lead them, in their enthusiasm, to invest him with the attributes of a God—would receive from Mr. Grant, as from thousands of others occupying similar positions, the respect and admiration to which he is entitled. Who can compute the mischief for which the dogma of Biblical Inspiration is thus clearly responsible?

URGED to it, as he informs the reader, by the pressing solicitations of friends, and in the hope also that the placing of his manuscript in the hands of the printer may be "blest to scatter doubt and strengthen faith," the Rev. John Graham has seen fit to publish his lecture, delivered not long since at the request of the Sydney Young Men's Christian Association, on "The Inspiration of the Scriptures," together with a preliminary statement of what he conceives to be the question at issue between believers and disbelievers in Biblical

Inspiration. And, in the course of it, he asks: "Has our Great Father spoken distinctly and authoritatively to His children? And is the book we call the Bible, the Book of God, really and truly His inspired Word? Is it the lamp He has given us to shine in dark places till our path emerges into the perfect day. Or is it no more than a work of erring man, whose laws are but good advice, and whose doctrines are but happy guesses or opinions? If it be not supernaturally inspired, then, clearly, our world contains no book that has valid claims to supernatural inspiration; and it is then worse than a merely harmless book; it is false and deceptive; for its writers claimed to speak surely and authoritatively The Word of the LORD. If it be not inspired, then the great Father has only spoken by the dumb signs of creation; and though his children have cried in agony—'Speak Lord,'—the Lord hath not spoken; silence, terrible silence, hath sealed His lips! The Father of fathers is deaf and mute. And then His children wander in a chilling wilderness that hath not heard His articulate voice. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ this is not our dreary creed. We once hovered on the brink of this abyssmal depth, as others do now; but we were delivered; and the noon-day sun is not to us more clearly the work of God, than is the Bible His *word*, and Jesus Christ the only begotten of the Father full of grace and truth." At least some of our readers will, we think, peruse these strange utterances with astonishment, if not with pain. As for the confession with which they conclude, we can truly say we should be the last to disturb the religious tranquillity of mind which, in the case of any man, has been won at the cost of vanquished doubts and exorcised fears. It may be that Mr. Graham is, as he declares himself to be, in the fullest enjoyment of the strength and serenity of soul which just and fearless persons arc, as the reward of their mental and moral integrity, alone permitted to realise. We sincerely hope it is so. Still, from what we know of Mr. Graham, the suspicion will haunt us that, instead of having been "led up of the Spirit into the Wilderness" of Doubt, there to debate within himself for more or less than forty days the claims of Conscience versus Creed, he may have *professionally* visited the dismal region in question, armed *cap-à-pie* with the "Evidences," just to have his orthodoxy tested, and with a made-up resolution, in the event of its college-manufactured props proving shaky, or of the conflict waxing at all hot, to retreat as speedily as possible. Be this, however, as it may, it is scarcely satisfactory to learn that the pastor of Pitt Street Church, was "delivered" from the abyss of *speculative* merely to be engulfed in the slough of *practical* atheism in which, to judge from the Introduction to his lecture, he at present unmistakeably wallows. Though an avowed believer in a God, Mr. Graham, by his own confession, can regard the far-stretching and ineffably glorious Universe as a mere "chilling wilderness that hath not heard His articulate voice," whereas, on the other hand, he can turn to a set of ancient documents, written for the most part by no one knows whom, and exhibiting incontestable marks of human error and infirmity, as establishing the truth of His existence beyond question of doubt. He says, in effect, "I have studied the wonders of the Earth, and the still greater wonders of the Heavens, and am after all uncertain as to whether there be a God; but I can consult His Word, and at once be assured that He is, seeing that, as the Word narrates, He wrestled with one patriarch (Gen. xxxii.), took supper with another (Gen. xvi.), ineffectually sought to take the life of a third (Ex. iv. 24), and was on many other occasions seen in bodily shape and heard speaking with 'articulate voice.'" Mr. Graham can implicitly believe in the God who, on the authority of traditions utterly discredited by Reason and History, is said to have conversed with Moses on Horeb and the Apocalyptic Seer in Patmos, but not, it seems, in the (to him) "mute" and "terribly silent" Being of whose power, wisdom and goodness all Nature is (to souls that have any vision for divine things) an ever-present and all-glorious epiphany. Mr. Graham pronounces the creed of the Theist "dreary;" but who does not see that his own creed, as embodied in the Christianity which persistently explores the past for a God who no longer dwells and operates in the present, is essentially atheistic?

DR. WAZIR BEG has sent us another letter, printed in this issue, which, without at all depriving us of our temper, necessitates our decision that this gentleman must either mend his literary ways, or be denied access for the future to the pages of the *Free Religious Press*. Our journal is open to any correspondent, no matter how orthodox or how sceptical, who, while employing such courtesy of address as its editor has a right to expect, is prepared to discuss, in an earnest and straightforward manner, any social or religious question of the day. It is, however, but too clear that Dr. Beg can do neither. In applying, unjustly applying, such epithets as "coarse," "ribald," "scurrilous," etc., to our style of writing, and in arrogantly taxing us with ignorance of the commonest words and phrases, he clearly disqualifies himself for the arena we have thrown open to the public; and as for his mode of dealing with an argument, or of meeting an accusation, we leave our readers to say whether the contemptible evasions and silly conceits with which Dr. Beg's communications abound do not indicate the vain and insincere spirit which, we fear, is his leading characteristic. Our original charge against him was, that he had disgraced his pulpit by an offensive and pharisaical allusion to Unitarians; and all he could do in reply was, by taking cover under a mere interchange of pronouns, to insinuate his disavowal of a proceeding of which we know him, beyond question of doubt, to have been guilty. We told him that his priestly airs and affectations of superior sanctity were an insult to the noble-souled Master he professes to serve; and, instead of promptly taking heed to his ways, he has since done nothing but apishly jabber about our being—whereas we merely said

that he was not—" a Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene." We questioned the ability of this paragon of learning and piety, even when assisted by the "God's grace" he so ostentatiously relies upon, to prove the truth of a palpable absurdity: a doubt which, in his present letter, he distorts into a denial on our part of divine influence altogether. With so insincere and unprincipled a disputant it is, in truth, hard to keep on amicable terms. His sophistical quibblings and trumpety hair-splitting definitions, accord as they may with the tastes of his own flock, are decidedly out of place in the pages of our journal. We are further compelled to say that such clumsy efforts at self-defence as he seems capable of, instead of removing, do but confirm our low estimate of Dr. Beg as a public representative of the conventional Christianity which is much more the curse than the blessing of our age, and on account of which we have felt it our duty, in the interests of true religion, to rebuke him. And for that matter, indeed, we are fully persuaded that, should the Master come among us again, and set about another purification of a corrupted and corrupting temple, our reverend friend at the other end of the town would be one of the first to wince under the "scourge of small cords."

The Jesus of Historical fact and the Jesus of Ecclesiastical Fancy.

WHATEVER be the spirit with which the four Gospels be approached, it is impossible to rise from the attentive perusal of them without a strong reverence for Jesus Christ. Even the disposition to cavil and ridicule is forced to retire before the majestic simplicity of the prophet of Nazareth. Unlike Moses or "Mahomet, he owes no part of the lustre which surrounds him to his acquisition of temporal power; his is the ascendancy which mankind, in proportion to their mental advancement, are least disposed to resist—that of moral and intellectual greatness. Besides, his cruel fate engages men's affections on his behalf, and gives him an additional hold upon their allegiance. A noble-minded reformer and sage, martyred by crafty priests and brutal soldiers, is a spectacle which forces men to gaze in pity and admiration. The precepts from such a source come with an authority which no human laws could give; and Jesus is more powerful on the cross of Calvary than he would have been on the throne of Israel.

The virtue, wisdom, and sufferings of Jesus, then, will secure to him a powerful influence over men so long as they continue to be moral, intellectual, and sympathising beings. And as the tendency of human improvement is towards the progressive increase of these qualities, it may be presumed that the empire of Christianity, considered simply as the influence of the life, character, and doctrine of Christ over the human mind, will never cease.

The most fastidious scepticism is forced to admit the truth of the facts which such a view of Christianity requires. For no one who regards historical evidence will deny that such a person was put to death in Judea, and that he gave rise to a new system of religion. The four Gospels on these points are strengthened by many other testimonies, agree with each other, and contain relations conformable to the order of nature. Moreover, the excellence of the preceptive parts of the Gospels carries with it its own evidence in all ages.

But when a higher office is claimed for Christ, that of a messenger accredited from God by a supernatural birth, miraculous works, a resurrection, and an ascension, we may reasonably expect equal strength of evidence. But how stands the case? The four Gospels on these points are *not* confirmed by testimony out of the church, disagree with each other, and contain relations contrary to the order of things. The evidence on these points is reduced to the authority of these narratives themselves. In *them*, at least, the most candid mind may require strong proofs of authenticity and veracity; but again, what is the case? They are anonymous productions; their authorship is far from certain; they were written from forty to seventy years after the events which they profess to record; the writers do not explain how they came by their information; two of them appear to have copied from the first; all the four contain notable discrepancies and manifest contradictions; they contain statements at variance with histories of acknowledged authority; some of them relate wonders which even many Christians are obliged to reject as fabulous; and in general they present no character by which we can distinguish their tales of miracles from the fictions which every church has found some supporters ready to vouch for on its behalf.

In these books, and by the propagators of Christianity, the miraculous part of Christ's history is presented to us not as an indifferent fact, but as one which is to influence our whole life and conduct: the belief or non-belief of it is even to decide our condition in another world: we are called upon to count all things as loss for the sake of Christ: "He that believeth in his heart that God had raised him from the dead shall be saved;" "He that believeth not shall be damned." One would have expected that the clearness of the evidence would have been in proportion to the necessity for belief, and that a fact of which the recognition was requisite to the salvation or improvement of mankind in after ages, would have been attested in such a manner as to leave no doubt of it in

any reasonable mind. Mark, or the person who has finished his Gospel for him, would have done more to promote belief, if, instead of threatening damnation on the want of it, he had explained the apparent contradictions between his account and Matthew's;—how it was that the latter sends the eleven disciples into Galilee, whilst the others seem to represent them as remaining at Jerusalem; why Matthew omitted all notice of the ascension; where and when Jesus was seen by the five hundred brethren mentioned by Paul; and especially how he and his fellow evangelists obtained their information. But the fact is, that the accounts of Christ's resurrection are in so imperfect and slovenly a state, that the evidence afforded by them would be hardly deemed sufficient to establish an ordinary fact of any importance in a court of judicature. The accounts of the crucifixion are very circumstantial, and agree in the main so well, that we should have no difficulty in admitting this as a fact, even if it were not confirmed by Tacitus, Suetonius, and the Jews. But when the writers come to the account of the resurrection, on which, from its not being confirmed by heathen or Jewish testimonies, from its deviation from the laws of nature, and from the great importance attached to the belief of it, we should have looked, from their hands at least, for the fullest, clearest, and most accordant evidence,—here we find the story replete with confusion, contradiction, and chasms, and even to be made up apparently of fragments of different dates.

If the resurrection of Christ were necessary, as is pretended, to account for the rest of his history, and the origin of Christianity, the attempts made to strain out a consistent account of it from the materials before us, by inventing supplementary facts *ad libitum*, might deserve some attention. But there is in reality no such necessity. The order of nature, the combination of human feelings and motives at the particular junction in question, have been shown to be enough to account for the life and death of Jesus, and the proceedings of his followers. And whatever be our disposition to show deference towards Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, or the persons writing under their names, the inquirers of truth are obliged to ask, Who are these that we should believe them in contradiction to the known order of nature, and receive from them, as indubitable truth, stories which, coming from other mouths, we should reject at once as palpable fiction? Where are the proofs of their caution, judgment and veracity? How are we assured that they could neither be misled, nor attempt to mislead? They vouch for the resurrection of Christ; but who shall vouch for them, and certify that they were so far different from the rest of men as to be void of credulity, and incapable of mistake or falsehood? What witness is there to prove that they were so insensible to common human motives, as to be incapable of gratifying their love of the marvellous, and of serving their own cause, and that of their church, by either adopting or inventing "idle tales?"

The lower classes in every age and country, owing to their less acquaintance with physical science, are disposed to see special interventions in ordinary events, and receive miraculous tales readily; but about the time of Christ, even grave historians, both Greek and Roman, admitted such tales into their most finished compositions. Amongst the Jews, especially, the national temper, creed, and low degree of scientific attainments, promoted the taste for the miraculous; consequently, their accomplished historian Josephus, although obviously checked by his fear of the Roman philosophical world, and without any other apparent motive than a pure love of the marvellous, could not resist the temptation of introducing abundance of miraculous stories. The historians of the early reformed Jewish, or Christian, churches, were inferior to Josephus in education and literary attainments, wrote under stronger excitement, had in view the interest and honour of their own newly-risen sect, and apparently intended their works for the use of their brethren, who were influenced by the same feelings and opinions as them-selves. It was to be expected, then, that these histories should contain a larger proportion of the miraculous than that of Josephus. And as it would be thought very harsh to condemn Josephus as totally unworthy of credit, and to throw aside his history because he partook somewhat of a vice peculiar to his age and country, so may we also look indulgently upon the inaccuracy or credulity of the evangelic historians,—venerate their compositions as the chief remaining records of the rise of that pure and intrepid sect which has revolutionised the moral world,—admire the highly-wrought feelings and imagination which could enliven Patmos with a glimpse of the kingdom eternal in the heavens, refreshing the common-places of the world with visions unspeakable, and with angels ascending and descending amongst the sons of men,—and respect even their recognised fictions as being, not attempts at gross fraud and imposture, but the aberrations of zeal for an honourable cause, or as exhibiting that tinge of romance which times and events of interest almost unparalleled in history had disposed the minds of men to infuse into the realities of life.

To traverse the evangelic writings, exposing their weak points, and throwing down successively, with the apathy of mere criticism, fictions consecrated by the authority of ages, is a harsh and ungracious task; and it is only a belief in the expediency of reducing such tales to their due estimation in the opinion of mankind, that can induce minds accustomed to venerate them to enter willingly upon the destructive process. The cause of progressive mental improvement may at length require that such narrations should be placed amongst the things of romance rather than of history: but this being done, the imagination may still delight itself by contemplating

them in what now appears to be their true and proper light; and the more freely, from its being now unchecked by the necessity of explaining and reconciling those absurdities and inconsistencies which must belong to them when viewed as matters of fact. Many of the finer thoughts and feelings of mankind find a vent in fiction, expressed either by painting, poetry, or the poetic tale; and the perception of historical inaccuracy does not prevent our sharing the thoughts and feelings which have embodied themselves in this manner. The monotheist of the present day feels awakened in himself the conceptions of the beautiful belonging to ancient Greece, when viewing the varied and graceful forms of the council of Olympus: the Protestant, who regards monachism as a social evil, and who sees amongst the fathers of the church men of character and claims worse than doubtful, may yet appreciate the feeling which led men to tread in cloistered cells as on holy ground, and to attribute supernatural influence to the relics and images of martyrs and saints: and the critical inquirer, who sees in the mother of Jesus merely the obscure Jewish matron, may yet comprehend the mixture of devotion and chivalry which gradually raised homage into adoration, and depicted her with the placid and majestic features of the Virgin Mother of God. In like manner, whilst recognising the true character of the evangelic fables, we may still discover in them and share the feelings from which, for the most part, they sprung,—respect and attachment towards a character of unwonted power and excellence. A rude age expressed its perception of moral ascendancy by decking it with those ornaments which were then considered to be its appropriate and deserved accompaniments,—miracles, wonders and signs; the followers of the Reformer of Galilee endeavoured to express their own sentiments towards him, and to excite the same in others, by attributing to him the command over nature, and by representing him as ascending to the right hand of God. The modern observer has learned to distinguish more correctly the boundaries of the moral and physical worlds, and can appreciate superiority in the one, without ascribing to it an extraordinary control over the other. Nevertheless, he may be able to understand, feel, and translate the rude and emphatic language of former ages; and, in the delineations of Jesus healing the sick, stilling the tempest, walking on the sea, or transfigured on the mount, may contemplate a fact of no small interest or importance, viz., the deep and solemn reverence which mental and moral power, unassisted by grosser means of influence, had been able in a remote age and country to inspire, and may thus refine the false glare of the miraculous thrown around Jesus into a more serene and steady light.—C. C. Hennell.

The use and Abuse of Priesthood.

"THUS saith the Lord, the Heaven is My throne, and the Earth is My footstool: where is the house that ye build unto Me? and where is the place of My rest? For all these things hath Mine hand made, and all these things have been, saith the Lord; but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at My word." These wonderful words by the Hebrew Isaiah have been heard and repeated in the world for more than two thousand years, and not even yet have they been generally accepted and believed, as the highest truth about God. Here and there, at rare intervals in this long period, men have risen up to warn their fellow-men of the danger of neglecting them, to rid the world of its deep-crusted superstition, and false notions of the majesty and goodness of God. But they have found few followers, the ears which they addressed were dull of hearing, the eyes which they tried to open were unable to see the spiritual realities crowding around them, the hearts to which they appealed in God's name were hardened by self-righteousness, self-will, and a cold, dead formalism; they still turned, again and again, to the offerings of burnt incense and bloodshedding, thinking to please the most Holy God by sacrifices of that life which He alone could give. Men still clung to a visible temple and an elaborate temple worship, shutting up and shutting in, as they thought, the presence of the infinite God, within the narrow boundaries of time and place, and shutting out, alas! from the blessed privilege of communion all those who refused to enslave themselves to their opinion, and to worship after their manner. The few who, in all ages, have raised a protest against the common falsehood and folly of priestcraft, have had at last to bend their necks to the executioner's sword, or have fallen, like the holy martyr St. Stephen, beneath an avalanche of stones hurled at them by infuriated and priest-driven mobs.

Let us now consider what is that protest made by the Lord's prophets, which men are so slow to understand, and priests are so ready to punish. I will give it in the plain words of St. Stephen: "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." God's presence is not confined to the church, or house of prayer, which we build for his worship. God's service does not entirely consist in the offerings of prayer and praise which we offer to Him there. Proclaim these truths where you will, and the priestly instinct will rise against you; their craft is in danger; God's presence and the blessings of Heaven are made cheap and common; men can worship God without their help or sanction, and thus their hold on men's minds will be weakened.

It is the glory of Protestantism to have, in a great measure, got rid of these priestly notions. Our breaking away from the Church of Rome 300 years ago was, in reality, the first public act of the Christian Church to

liberate her children from priestly tyranny. But we must not boast; we are still very far off the liberty which we ought to have inherited from the great Reformers. Priests are but men, and men like to be priests after all; and the lust of power; the craving for tyranny over the minds and hearts of men, and to hold the keys of Heaven and Hell is natural, and if crushed in one form in one age, will burst out again in another form in another age. We could point to cases where it is quite as bad now as ever, both among the clergy of the Church of England and among the most illiterate and obscure of dissenting preachers. For when the priestly element was driven out at the Reformation, it came back again with seven spirits nearly as wicked as itself, putting the fetters of words and creeds and articles upon the necks of the people, and giving the clergy the power to say, "you cannot come to God now any more than you could before, unless you come in our way and by our help; you must now be bound by what the Bible teaches, and we are the interpreters of it, and so you must be bound still by what we think and say. God is still shut up in the Bible, and nowhere else can you see Him or hear His voice; without us and our teaching, you will get only false notions out of the Bible, and then you are lost."

So by degrees, the priest-spirit wrought fetters, and enchained the minds and souls of men tighter than ever, and all the while men fancied that because they were Protestants, they were free; that while they had the Bible for their own reading, they were safe in their liberty. Never was there a greater delusion. First one and then another arose denying that those priestly doctrines were in the Bible, denying that the Bible claimed for itself that infallibility which the priests ascribed to it. And what was the consequence? The old persecutions broke out afresh, and whether the modern Reformers were laymen or isolated clergy, or an independent and high-minded Bishop, they were hunted down. They are hunted down, I should say, now, in these very days of boasted liberty. When the bigoted priests and people can do nothing else, being restrained by the English law from tormenting their opponents, they turn to and revile them, saying "all manner of evil against them falsely."

You remember how the old silversmiths of Ephesus, who wanted to kill the Apostle Paul and his friends for preaching the Gospel of God, were afraid that the silver shrines for the Goddess Diana would fall into disuse, and so their craft was endangered by the proclamation of God's true spiritual service and His Love for men. Very much after this manner do some few of the ultra-sacerdotalists say within themselves, "our craft is in danger, the people will get to know too much; we must keep them in ignorance of what is said in these books, or they will cease to depend on our help and guidance in getting to Heaven."

To find indeed the Living God and to enter into the calmness of His Rest, we must seek Him not in the Sacraments alone, nor in the pages of the Bible alone, still less in the counsels of priests; but we must seek Him also in our own homes, in the scenes of our daily work, in the toil of labour, and in the gladness of mirth; in the pleasant gatherings of friends and neighbours, as much as in the solitude of our own hearts.

Then, and not till then, can we hope to meet the Living God in the House of prayer, when we have learnt what He is, and can recognise Him again and again in the records of His dealings in olden time; when we have listened to His constant voice in our consciences, and in the sweet echoes of nature, and have learnt to distinguish that Voice above the clamour of human words, and above the Babel of false prophets, who are ever crying in our ears, "Thus saith the Lord," though the Lord hath not sent them. "For to this man will I look," saith the Lord of Hosts, to this man will I show the bright beams of my countenance, at all time and in all place "even to him who is poor and of a contrite heart, and who trembleth at My word."

To hear many talk, one would think that God Himself had come into existence and built the world, and then suffered it to go to ruin, only to glorify themselves; they would think themselves almost ill-used, if God intended to save all mankind as well—if He intended to "give every man his penny," and to make others, who had come later into the vineyard, equal unto themselves who had "borne the burden and heat of the day." Such are far enough from contrition, far enough from seeing God.

But besides this poverty and contrition of soul, one thing more is required, if we would see God; we must "tremble at His word"—tremble with a sense of holy awe and reverence—as sons of a righteous Father, and not as slaves and cowards. We must tremble at that voice of His in our hearts, which tells the youngest and oldest of us what we ought to do, and what we ought never to do.

There is sadly too little reverence paid to this conscience of ours, this real word of God. We have been content to put in its place a very silly superstitious reverence for the words of men—for the counsels of priests—for the creeds of Churches. The true Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, comes only to our inmost souls by the divine echo of our consciences. Unless that voice gives its Divine sanction to what we hear or read, then what we hear or read is no Word of God to us.

And, what is more important than all, we must obey the conscience, if it is to grow within us and lead us into all truth. It will not bring us to God if we systematically refuse its warnings, and close our ears to the injunctions which it gives. If we will but strive to do as our consciences bid, and live in a humble sense of our own sins and shortcomings, we shall never need a higher title to the constant presence of God. Our world will be His temple, our daily life and work and rest will be all His service and all His worship.

Then the place in which we meet to unite in prayer and praise and meditation, will be to us in truth the

"House of God and the Gate of Heaven." We shall find this service our delight and our rest, because in every other service we have "set God always before us," studying only to please Him, and willing to take even the lowest place at His feet. And after death, when we climb from this earth, which is His footstool, to that Highest Heaven which is His Throne, and join that Heavenly feast for which our souls are longing, there will surely be seats of honour at His right hand, and a welcome far higher than we desired or deserved; not only "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!" but the accents of a closer fellowship, "Friend, go up higher."—*Rev. Charles Voysey.*

Conversion and Regeneration.

NOTHING is so striking in the Gospel of Christ as the principle constantly and emphatically set forth of the absolute conversion and regeneration of the heart. Christ oftentimes warns us against hollow morality. We are taught not to rest satisfied with delivering ourselves from particular vices and impurities. Nothing short of a thorough renunciation of all manner of evil, nothing short of an absolute regeneration of the heart, will please Christ. It is inconsistent with the main and fundamental principles of Christ's ethics to rest satisfied with what the world calls virtue and honesty. There is a clear line of demarcation between the true principles of the Gospel ethics and those principles of dry morality which are oftentimes prized very highly by worldly-minded men. In order to enter God's holy kingdom we must not only cast aside this vice, or that evil trait in our character, but we must thoroughly convert our hearts. There must be new life in us. The old man must be altogether put away, and our aspirations and feelings, our instincts and our thoughts, must be regenerated. We must not attempt to build virtue upon the old foundation of our animal nature, but we must annihilate the old nature, putting away all that is wrong and selfish and dishonourable in us, and enter into new regions of heavenly life. We must not try to bring down truth from God's holy mansions, and, with its aid, live in the midst of honesty and purity on earth, but we must enter into heavenly regions, and, while our bodies are on earth, our spirits must hold communion with our Heavenly Father. What is the condition, what is the true state, of regenerate life? It is set forth in the exhortation,—*"Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."* The idea of manhood, the strong characteristic which distinguishes men from children, is pride, self-sufficiency. "Want of straightforwardness also forms another characteristic of what we call manhood; but we are in this passage strongly and emphatically warned against pride, against a want of simplicity and frankness. We must pull down our pride and arrogance, and become as little children. We must become as simple, as gentle, as meek, and as pure-hearted as little infants. The infant knows nothing in this world except its father and mother; it lisps in semi-articulate language with great tenderness the name of its father and mother, and it recognises them and them alone. So must our hearts recognise our Heavenly Father as our all in all. There are, it is true, many relationships on earth dear and near to us, but our true relationship, our abiding and eternal relationship, is that in which we stand to our Heavenly Father. The child recognises its parent, not through knowledge, not through philosophy, but instinctively. So our hearts, in a state of regenerate existence, instinctively recognise the Divine Father. Philosophy does not aid us, the help of scholarship is not necessary to us; but religious instincts at once help us to perceive that He who encompasseth us, and is with us in our downsitting and uprising, who feedeth us and protecteth us, and who delivereth us from all manner of sin and iniquity, is really our Father and our Friend for time and for eternity.

There is another characteristic of little children: they are guileless. The world's temptations have no influence on them, for they know not the temptations of the flesh. The little infant looks about and sees the riches and treasures of the world, but its artless, guileless heart knows not what temptations are. Between the grass that fadeth and withereth and is trodden under feet by men and the riches and treasures of the world, there is no distinction whatsoever in the eye of the little infant. To the infant riches are nothing; and so to the regenerate soul the riches and treasures of this world are as nothing. Not only does the little child ignore riches and treasures, but they can exercise no influence whatever on its tender heart. So with regenerate and pious sons of God: it is not with them a work of struggle and difficulty to come away from the influence of temptations, to overcome them and to become righteous. No; temptations are not temptations to those who have been regenerated. In vain does the world ply the feelings and inclinations of the regenerate man with all its allurements and fascinations; they fall flat upon his mind and heart. He does not for one moment feel moved or tempted; and so with him there is no difficulty in overcoming these temptations. But those who have not been regenerated, those who desire to remain satisfied with mere honesty and morality, have not only every day, but every hour of their existence, to wage unceasing war with the passions of the heart and the lusts of the flesh. We have always to struggle with temptations, and on every occasion we have to overcome them with the aid of conscience before we can unfurl the banner of victory in our hearts; but the regenerate man does not go through these struggles. With him there is no difficulty, no warfare, but as his body freely inhales the pure air of God's

earth, so his soul freely and naturally inhales the pure air of God's kingdom. He is surrounded by God's holiness, by an atmosphere full of celestial purity, and his eyes naturally drink in God's light, and his heart naturally inhales purity. As children pass through this world without being moved or tempted, and as there cannot be any defilement in their little minds, so must the regenerate man go through the thorny paths of this world without being defiled or contaminated by the sins of this world. Though, therefore, we are grown-up men, yet we should not boast of our wisdom, of our virtue, of our sanctity. Rather let us pull down the edifices of arrogance and conceit that we have built up. Rather let us confess our unworthiness before God, and humble ourselves down to the dust under an overpowering consciousness of our sins and transgressions. Rather let us say we are as little children, groping in the dark in the midst of a wilderness in search of truth, in quest of God. Ten thousand temptations in horrid forms are every moment frightening us, and in alluring forms every moment enticing us away from the paths of purity; we have not energy or wisdom in us sufficient to overcome the influence of these temptations; and if in the spirit of humility—of childlike humility—we fall down at the feet of our Heavenly Father, He will certainly have compassion and pity on us. And with childlike trust may we recognise Him as our only Father, and Master, and Friend. May we be enabled to say that there is none on earth and there is nothing in heaven that we desire besides our God. Let our only desire be to live with our Father, as devoted and loving children wish to be always with their father. Let us not form abstract conceptions of the Deity, but let us go to Him with hearts full of filial trust as little children. Let us all feel that, whatever our doctrinal differences may be, we are children of the same Father. When we boast of our wisdom and scholarship, we are apt to enter into learned controversies and theological wranglings; but when we look upon ourselves as simply His children, of what avail is theology before God? Every man who desires and pants for admission into His holy temple must show that his heart has been converted. Let all men stand round His holy throne as little children, and when He sees that they are full of humility and childlike trust and simplicity, He shall spread His holy kingdom amongst them all, recognise them as His children, and make them into one everlasting family. All nations are pressing forward to that kingdom of heaven which is yet to come, for the Lord's kingdom is not behind, but before. If we have conscience within us and a thorough dependence on God's all-conquering grace—if we believe, as we ought to believe, that He will save the prodigal son and will receive him back if he is penitent and prayerful—then let us no longer despair, let us not faint or falter, but let us steadily march on, singing the name of our holy Father, and with hearts full of humility and meekness and gentleness, advance daily in order that we may all enter into His holy kingdom. Then there shall be no sorrow, no sighing, no controversy, no sectarianism, but all shall be received by God because of their conversion, because of their regeneration. Let us pray, then, to the Father of mercy for our regeneration, for the absolute purification and sanctification of our hearts.—*Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen.*

The Faith of the Future.

It does not seem probable, nor is it in any wise to be desired, that the "Church of the Future" should arise out of a Sect. It is not probable that the one true religion should be cast in the same mould as old errors. It is not to be wished that it should go through the same stages of fervent youth and worldly middle life, and cold and declining age as the sects and churches of the past. Great souls will doubtless arise to aid their brethren as of yore, by written and spoken words of wisdom. But though they may rally around them the hearts to whom they are the rightful leaders, they will hardly form an organised sect, or seek to do so. Rather must we hope that a wholly different process will take place, and be allowed to go forward without too vehement opposition whereby it might change to somewhat more perilous and revolutionary. Let us hope that the truths of Theism will gradually permeate the thoughts of the age, leavening them by degrees. The *Theism in Christianity* will then continue to rise (as it seems now to be doing) to more and more prominence, while all that is narrow and dogmatic in the old creed will sink into the shade. Men will think more of justice and love and less of creeds and sacraments. Preachers will take from the treasure house of the Bible, not stories of miracles and prophecies and dogmas of an Incarnation and an Atonement, but the great utterances of faith and love: the sublime spiritual lessons of holiness and self-sacrifice. Laymen will care less for their priest's "orthodoxy" or Apostolic Succession, and more for his inheritance of one of those Pentecostal tongues of fire which can "reach to the dissevering of the joints and marrow; "less for his fluency of Biblical language and orthodoxy of Biblical belief, and more for his possession of a true spark of that same great inspiration which breathed through the prophets and evangelists. We shall cease to count men religious because they hold correct doctrines and use consecrated formulas and attend services of devotion; and shall only reckon them pious in truth when the love of God has visibly purified their hearts and the love of man has become the obvious principle of their lives. And above all we shall change the common dark and gloomy ideas of God for brighter, truer, and more loving ones and as the old Calvinist doctrines of Baxter and Edwards shock us now almost as blasphemies, so the current teaching of

our present divines shall grow unendurable, and we shall insist that to the All-Righteous, All-Merciful God shall be attributed no longer deeds and modes of government we should abhor as unjust and cruel from a despot of the earth.

When thoughts like these have leavened the opinions of the age, then by degrees the old belief will fall into forgetfulness and disuse. The new shoot of vigorous faith will cause the old leaves to drop away almost imperceptibly. The sunrise of a happy Trust in God will cause all the spectres of darkness to disappear. Men will only awaken to the fact that they have ceased to hold the old creed when they have become firmly rooted in a new and holier one.

Such we hope may be the progress of human thought and the process of growth of the Religion of the Future, if it be permitted to expand naturally and beautifully. If, on the contrary, the opposition against it be so bitter, and the forces of Traditionalism ranged so determinately in opposition as to bar every step of advance, then, indeed, none may say what shape the change may take. Reformation arrested becomes Revolution. On him who would stop the wheels of the Chariot of Progress must lie the blame of the inevitable overthrow which will ensue.

For the Theology which the human consciousness will evolve when freed from the *trammels* and only aided by the suffrage of history, we believe it will be a theology avowedly seeking to harmonise and unite the claims of all the functions of our nature: of the Intellect and the Religious Sentiment, of the Head and the Heart. It can stop at nothing short of this, for there cannot be here as in a traditional creed any fiction of a duty to sacrifice the one for the other, and either warp the verdict of Reason to meet the demands of Faith, or else to divide the kingdoms of Intellect and Religion and leave our intellectual life without religion, and our religious life without intellect. There is yet much left to be done in this direction, although the work has been already commenced. Among the obvious advances of our time must be reckoned a general recognition of the sanctity of *physical* laws. Another step will bring us to the reverence for mental ones. Formerly, not only did professed ascetics of the Romish and Protestant Churches systematically set at nought the laws God has given to our bodies, paradoxically hoping by such disobedience to do Him pleasure; but throughout the whole religious teaching of Christendom might be traced the fundamental conception of Piety as a thing antagonistic to all natural interests. Such an idea as that we should strive after a life wherein each faculty should have its full and recognised place in due subordination to conscience, was the remotest in the world from anything which was taught in the churches. Natural faculties and affections were to be subdued or renounced, not developed and harmonised. The Kingdom of Grace was one thing, the Kingdom of Nature another and quite different, and the subjects of the one were the foes and aliens of the other. The ideal Saint was not a true man ascending to the inner sanctuary of religion step by step upon the altar-stairs of his lower nature—of Senses, Intellect, and Affections. He was an ascetic, lifted off the earth in visionary rapture, deeming himself higher and higher as he ceased to rest upon or even touch the natural ground of humanity.

Let us be thankful that in our time this error in its grosser forms is rapidly dying away. The physical laws of life have begun to receive the attention of religious minds, if they have not yet obtained their due reverence as the clearest expressions of our Creator's will concerning the ordering of our bodies. The domestic affections are fully recognised as innocent, if they be not yet cherished as the appointed stages whereby our souls may climb from human love up to the love Divine. The joy of the artist and the man of science in the beauty and wisdom of creation is admitted to be worthy of a devout soul, if it be not yet prized as the glorious heritage of filial sympathy in the works of the great Architect, Painter, Poet, and Mechanician of the world. But there is a region wherein the old error still reigns. There is still one part of our natures men hold it is often well pleasing to God that we should put to silence—the intellect, the reasoning and critical powers—these are in the same category now that the whole lower nature was formerly. They are things which are supposed to have no religious claims, or at best very small ones to be regarded but little. Not openly indeed is this doctrine taught any longer. "We hear often of the "Bight," sometimes even of the "Duty," of Private Judgment; but unless in some miserable controversy of the Churches whoever sees this doctrine cordially inculcated in its full bearings? What divine bids us apply our Private Judgment to the fundamentals of Religion? Who blames the too easy indolent credulity whereby this duty is for ever evaded? This, then, is a task remaining for us to accomplish—the recognition of the *Divine Right of the Intellect*. We do not want much more "Rehabilitation of the Flesh" in a pure sense—none at all in a sense it is sometimes preached. We may leave the domestic affections, and Science and Art, to complete the assertion of their claims on human nature in harmony with profoundest piety; but we need to establish the Sacredness of the Laws of Mind—the duty of giving to them not an unwilling and enforced obedience as to things we cannot wholly escape albeit we fain would do so, but the homage of willing and reverent sub-mission as to laws appointed by the God of truth for our guidance into all truth. We need to perceive that it is our part to treat this Intellect God has been pleased to give us as religiously as our consciences or spiritual affections: always as in obedience to Him faithfully and piously. Let us but do this—let us use our intellects henceforth as if such a thing as antagonism between them and true religion was

impossible,—then, indeed, will a new era for theology commence. Then will there be an end, once for all, to our perpetual strife over the "Claims and Conflicts" of "Reason and Faith," and of "The Bible and Modern Science." Then will the foundations be laid for a Religion which may be truly the Religion of Humanity—the pyramid whose base shall be wide as the whole nature of man, and whose summit shall rise higher and higher towards the heavens as the generations of the future build it up, and as the obelisks of traditional creeds fall from their narrow foundations, and are buried under the sands of time.—*F. P. Coble.*

Flotsam and Jetsam.

REMINISCENCES OF ARGUMENTATIVE CONVERSATIONS HELD AT SUNDRY TIMES BETWEEN JAMES AULDIGHT AND JOHN DUBIOUS, MOSTLY REGARDING THINGS SPIRITUAL. WRITTEN AND COLLATED BY ME THE AFORESAID JOHN DUBIOUS.

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Auldlicht defers clenching the argument until now—The end not yet—The Gospel Dispensation—The Testimony of Paul—Prayer.

JAMES.—It appears to me, John, that ye rin up an' down that chapter at random—piecin' a bit here and subtracting a bit there—when the answer to the hale affair lies i' the latter pairt o' the saxth verse, the whilk I could hae tauld ye at first, only I just wanted to see hoo far ye would gang wi' your nonsensical an' unbelievin' assertions. The saxth verse says maist expleecitly "but the end is no' yet;" and, again, the fourteenth says "An' this gospel o' the Kingdom shall be preached in a' the world for a witness unto all nations; an' then shall the end come."

JOHN.—This is Anno Domini 1871, and "the end is not yet." Now, to understand this correctly, if you will take the view I have all along maintained, you will not only comprehend it, but comprehend also that it tallies with Matt. iv. 17. Further, John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 2) preaches in the wilderness of Judea *that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. Mark (i. 14, 15) informs us "that after John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand." You therefore observe that Jesus, like John, begins his public career by preaching that this Kingdom is at hand. Now, Mr. Auldlicht, I think you will surely not refuse to believe that the Disciples, who had often heard Christ announce "the end of the world," were surely in a better position to ascertain his meaning, than either lay or clerical followers two thousand years after the event. Luke (xxx. 11) tells us very plainly his opinion about this event. Peter (2 iii. 10, 13, 17) also is very explicit on this topic. John, the reputed author of Revelation, sees it in his visions (Rev. vi. 12, 17). And, moreover, hearken to what the Apostle Paul tells the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 51, 54). If you still require more evidence corroborative of the fact that Christ predicted the End of the World and the Day of Judgment as being then just at hand, it is to be found in almost all the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, the writers of which inculcate the very same doctrine, blended with the resurrection. By attentively reading Philip, iii. 21 and 1 Thess. 4, 15, 17 you will observe that Paul classes himself with the survivors—"We which are alive and remain." Now, any reasonable man will allow that the language used here is both clear and explicit, affording room neither for cavil nor tortuous reading.

JAMES.—Ech! mon! John, ye pit mo in mind o' a stickit minister I ance kent, who was aye draw in' wrang eenferences. He preached, or rather he began to preach, on Sabbath in the auld pairish Kirk o' Kittlemeldrum frae that text in Jeremiah about the wild ass snuffing up the wind; an' what d'ye think was a' the eenference he drew?

JOHN.—How can I tell? perhaps the inference was as asinine as the text!

JAMES.—The eenference was, "that the ass would be lang o' getting fat on it." Now, John, ye are just like him; ye jump at the first conclusion that strikes ye. Noo, a' the texts ye hae quoted referrin' to the "Kingdom o'

Heaven," or the Kingdom o' God," mean neither more nor less than "The Gospel Dispensation," or "The Kirk upon airth."

JOHN.—If the Gospel Dispensation is here meant, how, in the name of all that is wonderful, do you account for Christ ordering his twelve Apostles to "go and preach that *the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand*?" and that, in the charge he delivers them, he says that "in the day of judgment it should be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha than for the city that would not receive and hear them?" To this he adds that *they should not go over all the cities of Israel before the Son of Man came* (Matt. x. 1, 23). Or, what can you make of the expressions he uses to the seventy other Apostles he sends forth, "telling them to go their ways, healing the sick, and with this injunction—"the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke x. 1, 9). Then, again, this Kingdom is further mentioned in connection with John the Baptist. It is said, "that from the days of John the Baptist until now—the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." According to Luke, the expression is, "Since that time (of John) the Kingdom of Heaven is preached, and every man presseth into it." Now, to diverge one moment, it seems pretty clear to me, that Jesus never could have uttered the words contained in Matt. xi. 12 and Luke xvi 16, and for this very simple reason, that Matthew here tells us of John being then alive and sending his disciples unto Christ. Jesus, therefore, would never have said—"From the day of John the Baptist *until now*"—when John's days had not terminated. The conclusion accordingly seems inevitable, that, in saying that *the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand*, Christ meant that he should very shortly set up a Kingdom in which he was to reign. Luke, after alluding to the strife among his disciples as to who should be accounted greatest, makes Christ say: "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke xxii. 24, 29). This looks very like a secular Kingdom. In Matt, xviii. 1, 3 it is quite apparent, that, although the disciples, nearly since the commencement of Christ's ministry, had been under what you call the Gospel Dispensation, yet when Christ spoke these words they had not entered the Kingdom of Heaven. I might also allude to many of Christ's parables.

JAMES.—Tak' your breath, mon, awee, an' let me tell ye this John, that it would be far better for ye to pray for the Holy Speerit's eenlichtment, than aye to be dealin' in negatives an' contradeections.

JOHN.—That is your opinion; and as for prayer, I say with Coleridge.—

He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

(*To be continued.*)

Audialterampartem Creek.
Urtica Urens.

How to Move the World.

ONE day a philosopher came to Athens, from a far country, to learn the ways of the wonderful Greeks, and perhaps to teach them the great lore he treasured in his heart. The wise men heard him; sought his company in the gardens; talked with him in private. He passed for a wonder with that wonder-loving people. Among those that followed him, was the son of Soplironiscus, an ill-favoured young man, a mechanic of humble rank. He was one of the few that understood the dark, Oriental doctrines of the Sage, when he spoke of God, man, freedom, goodness, of the life that never dies. The young man saw these doctrines were pregnant with actions, and would one day work a revolution in the affairs of men, disinheriting many an ancient sin now held legitimate.

So he said to himself, when he saw a rich man and famous,— "Oh! that I were rich and famous, I would move the world soon. Here are sins to be plucked up and truths to be planted. Oh that I could do it all, I would mend the world right soon." Yet he did nothing but wait for wealth and fame. One day the Sage heard him complain with himself, and said, "Young man, thou speakest as silly women. This gospel of God is writ for all. LET HIM THAT WOULD MOVE THE WORLD MOVE FIRST HIMSELF. He that would do good to men begins with what tools God gives him, and gets more as the world gets on. It asks neither wealth nor fame, to live out a noble life, at the end of thy lane in Athens. Make thy light thy life; the thought, action; others will come round. Thou askest a place to stand on hereafter and move the world. Foolish young man, take it where thou standest, and begin now. So the work shall go forward. Reform thy little self, and thou hast begun to reform the world.

Fear not thy work shall die!"

The youth took the hint; reformed himself of his coarseness, his sneers, of all meanness that was in him. His idea became his life; and that blameless and lovely. His truth passed into the public mind as the sun into the air. His acorn is the father of forests. His influence passes like morning, from continent to continent, and the rich and the poor are blessed by the light and warmed by the life of Socrates, though they know not his name.—*Theodore Parker*.

Devotion is not a Mistake.

BE assured, all visible greatness of mind grows in looking at an invisible that is greater. And since it is inconceivable that what is most sublime in humanity should spring from vision of a thing that is not, that what is most real and commanding with us should come of stretching the soul into the unreal and empty, that historic durability should be the gift of spectral fancies, we must hold these devout natures to be at one with everlasting Fact,—to feel truly that the august forms of Justice and Holiness are at home in heaven, the object there of clearer insight and more perfect veneration. There are those who please themselves with the idea that the world will outgrow its habits of worship; that the newspaper will supersede the preacher and prophet; that the apprehension of scientific laws will replace the fervor of moral inspirations; that this sphere of being will then be perfectly administered when no reference to another distracts attention. But, for my own part, I am persuaded, that life would soon become intolerable on earth, were it copied from nothing in the heavens; that its deeper affections would pine away and its lights of purest thought grow pale, if it lay shrouded in no Holy Spirit, but only in the wilderness of space. The most sagacious secular voice leaves, after all, a chord untouched in the human heart: listening too long to its didactic monotone, we begin to sigh for the rich music of hope and faith. The dry glare of noonday knowledge hurts the eye by plying it for use and denying it beauty; and we long to be screened behind a cloud or two of moisture and mystery, that shall mellow the glory and cool the air. Never can the world be less to us, than when we make it all in all.—*James Martineau*.

Mythical Christianity.

JESUS Christ belonged to the true race of prophets. He saw with open eye the mystery of the soul—drawn by its severe harmony, ravished with its beauty, he lived in it, and had his being there. Alone in all history, he estimated the greatness of man. One man was true to what is in you and me. He saw that God incarnates himself in man, and evermore goes forth anew to take possession of his world. He said, in this jubilee of sublime emotion, "I am divine. Through me, God acts; through me, speaks. Would you see God, see me; or, see thee, when thou also thinkest as I now think." But what a distortion did his doctrine and memory suffer in the same, in the next, and the following ages! There is no doctrine of the Reason which will bear to be taught by the Understanding. The understanding caught this high chant from the poet's lips, and said in the next age, "This was Jehovah come down out of heaven. I will kill you, if you say he was a man." The idioms of his language, and the figures of his rhetoric, have usurped the place of his truth; and churches are not built on his principles, but on his tropes. Christianity became a Mythos, as the poetic teaching of Greece and of Egypt, before. He spoke of miracles; for he felt that man's life was a miracle, and all that man doth, and he knew that this daily miracle shines, as the character ascends. But the word Miracle, as pronounced by Christian churches, gives a false impression; it is Monster. It is not one with the blowing clover and the falling rain.—*Emerson*.

Poetry.

Lo! Calvin, Knox and Luther cry,
"I have the truth,"—"and I,"—"and I,"—
"Puir sinners! if ye gang agley,
The deil will hae ye,
And then the Lord will stand abeigh,
And will na save ye."

But, hoolie! hoolie! Na sae fast;
When Gabriel shall blaw his blast,
And Heaven and Earth awa' have pass'd,
These lang syne saints
Shall find both deil and hell at last,
Mere pious feints.

The upright, honest-hearted man,
Wha strives to do the best he can,
Need never fear the Church's ban,
Or hell's damnation;
For God will need nae special plan
For his salvation.

The One wha feels our deepest needs,
Recks little how man counts his beads,
For righteousness is not in creeds,
Or solemn faces;
But rather lies in kindly deeds
And Christian graces.

Then never fear; wi' purpose leal,
A head to think, a heart to feel
For human woe and human weal,
Nae preachin' loun
Your sacred birthright e'er can steal
To Heaven aboon.

Tak tent o' truth, and heed this well:
The man wha sins maks his ain hell;
There's nae waur deil than himsel;
But God is strongest:
And when puir human hearts rebel,
He hauds out longest.

As when in boyhood's crude, ambitious days,
I sought to realise the wondrous charms
Of manhood's physical and mental strength;
So now, these in fruition, do I see
Still higher manhoods yet to be attained,
And long to make their glories all my own.

That which appeared my being's object sole,

The consummation of my grandest hopes,
I now regard but as a tottering step,
The weak, first stage of my eternal life:
For as a traveller, nearing mountain heights,
Sees slope on slope and cone on cone uprise,
Until the topmost brow, his wished-for goal,
Is veiled in fleecy mist, and lost to view;
So, from the stand-point of my manhood's prime,
Do I behold in spirit, sphere on sphere,
And field on field for man's development
Rise ever through the ages yet unborn,
Until his brilliant course is lost to sight,
Hid from my finite mind in God's infinity.

This life of impotence—this motley whirl
Of wasted energy and blighted hope,
Of joy ephemeral and love contemned;
And all the poor materials that make up
Our hollow consequence—is nothing worth,
Save as the embryo of a higher state.
Fain would I live that I may leave behind
No duty unperformed, nor aught neglect
Of preparation for my upward flight;
But these accomplished—all my schooling done—
No longer would I stay: for I would spurn
Earth's pettinesses; I would begone,
And, bravely struggling thro' the mists of death,
Emerge in light; though dazzled, unappalled;
All-fearless in a mighty confidence—
In faithful trust in Him who gave me life,
And intuitions true to guide me home.

That I can thus aspire is proof to me
That I shall die to live.

Zeta.

Correspondence.

Religious Free-Thought and Church-Going.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to avail myself of your columns to say a few words to my co-religionists on the above subject? I am a tolerably regular attendant at the Unitarian Church, the only place in Sydney where, as I believe, service is conducted in accordance with the views of emancipated thinkers. The evening service is always cheerful and encouraging, conveying, as it must, to the minds of strangers, a fair idea of the earnestness of those who take part in it. I, for one, always return home strengthened for the week's duties, and, I hope, a little imbued with the earnest spirit of the teacher.

I go next Sunday morning, however, and, from the smallness of the attendance, might be led to infer that

Unitarians are less numerous than they really are; and though I have come to worship, I nevertheless miss the warm glow of devotion that comes when kindred souls are all around, and find myself occupied in trying to solve the problem—how it is that the numbers who I know think with us, do not come to the most important Sunday gathering. No doubt the aspect of things chills them as it does me; but might it not be remedied by friends taking an interest in the ordinary services as they did in the late "In Memoriam" service, and in the Sunday School Service held only a few weeks ago? I know this cannot be done without a sacrifice, but I see no reason why this sacrifice should not be made. "He who would move the world must first move himself" is a saying from which Unitarians, taken as a body, may, I think, learn a valuable lesson. We admire our principles, but wait for the time when it shall be an easier and a pleasanter thing than it is now to take an active part in spreading them. Yet, let us not forget that "the best age of the Christian Church came before the fatal dower which the first wealthy Pope received," and so, in this difficult period of our history, when to avow oneself Unitarian, Theist, or Free-thinker in a general company awakens sentiments of either horror or pity, should we not show ourselves worthy "to drink of the cup and be baptised with the baptism" of him who, as the greatest free-thinker the world has seen, willingly sacrificed his life on behalf of the cause he durst not compromise.

Yours, truly,

Veritas.

Self-Contradictions of the Bible.

To the Editor.

SIR,—A somewhat impertinent letter has appeared in your last number, defying Unitarians to adduce passages from the Scriptures involving self-contradictory statements. I never was moved to swear by any one: *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*. Yet I will venture to quote three points from the Bible which are clearly self-contradictory in character.

The first is the following. The Christ, in many passages, claims divinity for himself. He affirms his equality with the Father, and yet we find him asserting : "*My Father is greater than I.*"

Secondly, we get, from reading the whole Bible, a general idea of the goodness of God; of His inability to commit sin, that is, to do evil. We are told to "*trust in Him and fear not.*" And yet, when the Christ prays he pleads: "*Lead us not into temptation;*" that is, he asks God not to deceive us, not to lead us astray.

Lastly, if we consider Jesus annulling the law of Divorce established before him, we are bound to think that either of the two was just, not both; that, therefore, one *must* have been wrong: for what is wrong at one time is the same at another. We have never been allowed to lie, to steal, to murder; and we never shall be. Even if such a society could exist, in which those things were allowed, there is an authority in man, called Conscience, which would tell him they were wrong and must not be done.

Having offered these few remarks, I further take the liberty of challenging the writer of the letter I am answering, to *prove* the divinity of the Christ, even from the Gospel as it stands; for I am prepared to prove, *by the Gospel*, that Jesus of Nazareth was not what has been made of him, namely, the son of the Everlasting Spirit.

I remain, Sir, yours respectfully,

Sydney, 21st August, 1871.

J. Matras.

Christianity and Philosophical Theism.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have received the July number of your Journal—in all eighteen numbers. The perusal of your periodical inspires me with mingled sentiments of delight, amusement and indignation. A correspondent from this city says that he "cannot go your length in exposing the shortcomings of the Bible." I must say that you do not go far enough for me. It is not my intention to criticise, within the narrow compass of a letter, any or all of your serials in detail. But permit me, in general, to say that your criticisms are too broad for Christians and too narrow for Theists. In steering your course between Philosophy and Christianity, you will find that the Roman

maxim, so safe in ordinary affairs of life—*In medio tutissimus ibis*—is not a sure guide of conduct. Here, emphatically, the middle course is neither the safest nor the most rational. I can see by your writings that you are an independent man, remarkably free from prejudices in the main, and on that account I shall always be happy to receive and read your periodical. At the same time, you will allow me to say that your present course of procedure is as much at variance with sound philosophy as your Dunedin correspondent's suggested emendations of John i. 1 and Heb. i. 8 are at issue with the Greek New Testament. You preach a perpetual crusade against Popular Christianity. Pardon me when I say that I feel a certain loathing towards that most unprofitable subject. Jesus himself did not write the rambling utterances attributed to him. He left no autographs. I am at present studying Plato's Dialogues. What would you think of me, if I always quarrelled with the Master of Athenian wisdom on the score of what Socrates said or did not say? You would, as a scholar, laugh at me? Now, Sir, with due deference, this is precisely what you are doing in relation to the Gospels. I feel disposed to say to you what F. W. Newman said to Martineau, whom you greatly admire: "Publish an expurgated Gospel," and let your readers, and me among the rest, know precisely "what is the Jesus whom you revere." For some time I followed a similar line of action with yourself; but many years ago I saw it would not do. I discovered that no reliance could be placed on Hebrew mythology. I found that what was true in the Gospels was not new, and that what was new was *not* true. I could not reconcile Jesus with History. Therefore I frankly ceased to preach, and threw the whole overboard. If ever I take to the pulpit again, it will be on the platform of Philosophical Theism. Tell me not that the Man of Nazareth was "the noblest human soul that has yet worn flesh"—till you shall have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the spurious and genuine utterances attributed to him by the writers of the Gospels. Till you shall have done this, I, for my part, feel that there is wanting a proper basis whereon to stand and contend in gladiatorial battle array.

I hope I do not use too strong language; and, if I may judge of the characteristics of your mind from your writings, I feel confident that you will not deem me impertinent or disrespectful in thus frankly unbosoming my sentiments to you. We are all seeking after Truth, and would joyfully hail the advent of More Light to guide our paths in the mysterious labyrinths of Religion as contradistinguished with Christianity of multiplex jargon. Proceed, Sir, in your quest after truth. Albeit your *modus operandi* is different from what I have been pursuing in my own humble way, in the *Saturday Review* first, next in the *Delphic Oracle*, and now in the *Stoic*. Nevertheless, I bid you godspeed, believing that so much original thought conveyed in such a bold style, cannot but ultimately forward the interests of Truth and Rational Religion, even in *orthodox* Sydney.

I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

J. G. S. Grant.

York Place, Dunedin, Otago, N.Z.,

August 2, 1871.

Infidels and Infidelity.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I regret that you have again made statements in your last issue, which are entirely groundless or erroneous. You have "*jumped to conclusions*," which have no foundation but that of your imagination, for you make "positive" assertions about me and my *motives*, which are founded not on reasons or proofs, but on your "opinions." And unhappily you express your "opinions," not freely, but *too* freely; for you express them in a way which indicates that whether consciously or unconsciously, you do not "critically" or accurately understand the force of English terms. Please do me the justice to observe:—

1. Your "opinion" about my "bluster and assumption."

(a) What does the term bluster critically mean? To bluster means "to be noisy, to bully, to swagger as a turbulent or boasting person;" and a blusterer is "a noisy tumultuous fellow, who Snakes great pretensions *from vanity*." Consequently you accuse me of being a blusterer, *i.e.*, a noisy tumultuous fellow, whose bullying has originated "from vanity."

Now, Sir, I leave it to you or your candid readers to judge whether there is any truth in this positive assertion of yours? Can you in sincerity put your finger on any sentence or word in my last, which will warrant you in applying to me a term, which implies "bullying" and "vanity?" Besides, if there were a single bullying term, would that justify you, as "a Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene," to ascribe my writing the letter to

"vanity."

(b) The term "assumption" is also employed inaccurately by you. Let me explain. One of the meanings of "assumption" is "supposition *without proof*."

Now, Sir, I assumed no proposition without proof; whether expressed or implied. For instance, the proposition assumed by me was, that "The Holy Scriptures are the Word of God," because "they do not *in reality* contradict each other. Some passages might be *seemingly* contradictory—they might have *the appearance* of contradiction; but *in reality* they were not contradictory." This proposition, I assumed, because you or your "Rob Roys" assumed that the Holy Scriptures were not the Word of God, because they contained contradictory statements. Consequently, I appeal to you and ask—when I assumed the proposition above stated—did I assume it *without proof*? Did I not give my proof—though briefly? And am I not now prepared to give you *many* proofs to establish my proposition? Ay, have I not even challenged you, that I might meet you on your *own* ground and disprove by proofs your assumption, and show it to be groundless? And I am astonished that you should write so rashly or inaccurately! I ask again—what "assumption" have I made, *i.e.*, what proposition *without proof*?

2. Your "opinion" about "my shuffling."

A shuffle is "an evasion, a trick and an artifice." So you accuse me of "duplicity, wiliness and chicanery," which all are implied by the term "shuffling." And thus, I am again, recklessly accused by you of a "mean artifice or trick," and this accusation is laid at my door, because I wanted your writers not to write anonymously.

Now, Sir, I did want your "Rob Roys" to disrobe themselves of their assumed habiliments; but in the event of their not complying with my matter-of-fact suggestion from fear or shame: did I not challenge you? Therefore, what earnest or conscientious man, unless "a Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene," will accuse me of "shuffling," *i.e.*, of deceit and chicanery for so doing? Wherein lies my "shuffling?" Is it in openly and honestly throwing down my glove to you, the honest and open leader of the Unitarians? It is not "shuffling," Sir; but I will not condescend to take notice of writers, who "show their teeth" in the dark, but whose eyes are affected with photo-phobia, that cannot bear noonday light. Besides, you represent me saying what I never said. I never doubted "the validity of the arguments" which anonymous writers advanced, but I doubted and do doubt their candour and courage, and surely this doubt was not and is not indicative of my "shuffling," *i.e.*, deceit and chicanery. My doubt was and is an honest doubt—not founded on "shuffling" or chicanery, but on the principles of the Holy Scriptures, which enjoins that Christians (particularly "Christians of the pattern of the Nazarene") ought not to be ashamed or afraid of their religion. *Vide* Rom. j. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 12. "I suffer," says the Apostle Paul, "nevertheless, I am not ashamed."

I, therefore, humbly ask again, *why* do your "Rob Roys" write anonymously? Is it not that they are either afraid or ashamed? If they have any other reason for their Rob Royism, would you, as their champion, kindly inform me thereof, but do not, please, unnecessarily and falsely accuse me of "shuffling?" If you give me any other reason or reasons, why "Rob Roys," or "Unitarians" are permitted by you to emit their "war-whoop" in the forests of *gloom*, I will retract what I have said regarding their cowardice. No doubt you are aware what little importance is attached to, and what penalty is inflicted on—by "Law"—the productions of anonymous cowards; and as "a Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene," you ought to show similar detestations of anonymous dastardliness.

3. Your "opinion" about "God's Grace," on which you do not rely, but on which I rely. Pray, attend to the following and observe what both Inspired and uninspired writers have said on the subject:—

(1) The Apostle Paul—"Work out your own Salvation with fear and trembling, for it is *God that worketh* in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Another says :—"Open *Thou* mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law."

(2) And it is some satisfaction to know that while you—living in the midst of "Christian light and privileges," and rejoicing in the name of "the Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene," do not rely on "God's Grace," even many of the ancient Grecian and Roman Philosophers believed in and relied on it. Seneca says:—"It is God that comes to men, yea, more, He enters into them; for no mind becomes truly good but by his assistance." Plato:—"Virtue is not to be taught but by the assistance of God."

(3) Even "the earlier Unitarians" belived in the doctrine of "God's Grace." But, of course, it is beneath the knowledge and strength of "the Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene" in Sydney to rely on "God's Grace." He can do without it: he is a mighty host in himself: by his *own* knowledge and strength, he can put to flight the army of Christian aliens!

4. Conclusion. The above observations have been made, not on *personal*, but on public grounds; for if controversy is to be conducted freely and decently, it would be well to attend to the following:—

(1) In future communications do not employ terms inaccurately nor apply epithets to your adversaries rashly and recklessly. You might use them freely, but not too freely. (*Vide* Art. 3, Unitarian Principles.)

(2) Do not make your "opinions" or "positive assertions" as reasons or grounds for condemning Christian adversaries. Do not make "assumptions," *i.e.*, propositions *without proof*. Do not make your adversaries say what they never said.

(3) Do not rashly and recklessly judge of "*the secret motives*" of your Christian adversaries; for, if necessary, it could be shown from *the writings* of "Infidels," that they misrepresent Christian adversaries and Christian doctrines.

(4) Do not "prune" any portions of the letters of your adversaries: pray, do not "clip" even a sentence.

(5) No respectable Journalist, especially a "Christian of the pattern of the Nazarene," ought to allow anonymous writers to write in his Journal with all the barbarity or vulgarity of Vandals. *Vide. A. F. R. Press*, p. 186, &c..

I am, Sir, your obedient, humble Servant,

Sydney, August 15, 1871.

Wazir Beg

Anonymous Writers.

To the Editor.

SIR,—A word, if you please, with Dr. Wazir Beg. I would refer that learned pundit to the "Letters of Junius" for a reply to his senseless protest against anonymous writing, contained in last No. of "More Light;" and would hint, in charity, that a study of the luckless part played by one Sir William Draper, might tend to the health of the Doctor's mind. Anticipating the sneer that no man now lives who can wield the pen of Junius, I will at once concede the point; but would observe that, although it may have required a Junius to snuff out a Sir William Draper, it by no means follows that none can be found both able and willing to perform the same benevolent office for Dr. Wazir Beg.

Zeta.

Editorial Notices.

The cost of Printing and Publishing the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A. F. R. P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication,) to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street, Sydney.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office to be made payable to the Editor, who will be happy to receive Subscriptions for the New Volume, and to supply back numbers.

Well-bound volumes of the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, price 7s. 6d. each, can be obtained at the Publisher's, or from the Editor.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, Sep. 18, 1871.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on the prospects of his soul."—*Martineau*

Vol. II., No. 21. October 16, 1871.

Notes.

SCANDALISED at the "half a dozen loads of Straussian rubbish" which, in their late controversy, his opponent was allowed to shoot athwart the columns of the *Herald*, and laudably bent withal on clearing the path as speedily as possible "for the sake of the feeble," the Rev. John Graham has delivered two lectures, garnished with musical accompaniments, on the Talmud and the Gospel, with the object, as it seems, of showing that the latter, as the Word of God, is not only incomparably superior to the former, as the production of "uninspired" and therefore erring writers, but, moreover, without the faintest blur on its escutcheon. Such statements as the following sufficiently indicate the lecturer's position: "The Gospels," he informs us, "stand pre-eminently in contrast with the Talmud in that their great subject, Jesus Christ, claims a relation to and a oneness with God, such as prophet or rabbi never claimed before. He professed to come forth from God, and to speak only the words of God. He admitted divine worship to be paid to him, while, as having come in the flesh, he acknowledged himself to be subordinate to God. . . . His birth, his baptism, his miracles, his prophecy, his transfiguration, his crucifixion, his resurrection and ascension, all appear to harmonise with the unique mysterious being who was emphatically the Son of Man and the Son of God. . . . Jesus alone was absolutely stainless: in him we see perfect piety without fanaticism, assurance without presumption, courage without rashness, caution without fear, zeal without intolerance, humility without weakness, firmness without severity, and absolute devotion to the interests of man while grandly robed in the claims of God. He breathed only the celestial breath of love—wide as the atmosphere, clear as the light, impartial as the dew. His love was the moral miracle of all time, the standard of all virtue, the reflection of the invisible God. It was the simplicity, the symmetry, the perfection of moral goodness—a glorious rainbow standing out as the arch of promise against the sins of the world. . . . The teaching of Jesus contrasts with the Talmud in that it is worthy of God. . . . the Talmud, as contrasted with the Gospel, being largely made up of puerilities and the petty details of a multiplicity of ritualistic and ceremonial observances. . . . The God of the Talmud was glorious compared to the gods of Greece and Rome, but far inferior to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."—and so on. Having thus allowed Mr. Graham to speak for himself (being anxious not to misrepresent him), we feel assured that our readers will readily detect the essential weakness of the theological system he so vigorously champions. He means, if he can, to establish the reputation of the New Testament by drawing comparisons between it and "uninspired," albeit, highly meritorious, writings of the same class, and, again, by advancing claims on the former's behalf which History, Science, the well-ascertained Laws of Nature, and the constitution of the human mind alike pointedly discountenance. Surely intelligent persons do not require to be preached into an acceptance of the New Testament as a collection of religious and ethical writings which, resting on its own merits, has nothing whatever to fear from confrontation with the Talmud, the Koran, or the Vedas; still less into a recognition of the Founder of Christianity as foremost among the great and noble souls the impress of whose virtues will emblazon the page of history to the end of time. To affirm, however, as Mr. Graham does, that Jesus, being himself God, was, therefore, "absolutely stainless," and that the Scriptures, being the "Word of God," are, therefore, as absolutely free from the blemish of a single contradiction, is, in our opinion, to incur the double responsibility of affirming what both Reason and Scripture pronounce untrue, and of nourishing in the minds of thousands a more or less expressed repugnance towards Christ and Christianity. Mr. Graham can be very eloquent on the "puerilities" with which the Talmud—wholly differing in this respect, as he says, from the Gospel—is so largely disfigured. Yet we constantly read in the New Testament of persons who, in suffering from certain disorders of the nervous type, were believed to be possessed of devils which the College of Physicians has long since exorcised; and again of physical and mental ailments before which the highest surgical skill of modern times stands baffled, being instantly removed by a word or a touch. We have the story of a hungry multitude of people having been fed and satisfied with a quantity of food hardly sufficient for a family, but which, nevertheless, was larger at the end of the repast than at the beginning—the story of a quantity of water having, at a wedding-feast, been miraculously turned into wine under the very eyes of the guests—the story of a tree which, for not yielding figs at a season of the year when figs were not due, was withered by a curse—the story of a poor unbefriended paralytic who for more than half a life-time had anxiously waited, and waited in vain, on the banks of a pool, which at a particular season of the year was "troubled by an angel from heaven," on the chance of being cured of his disorder by an early descent into the water? etc. Mr. Graham, in a word, as a staunch defender of the Gospel, will, we think, do well to say as little about the "puerilities" of the Talmud as he conveniently can. Firm, again, as may be his private belief in the astounding phenomena which are said to have attended the birth, baptism, transfiguration, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, he will do wisely, in these inquiring days, not to submit them to the decision of "a dictator before whom," as Bishop Strossmeyer remarked in the course of his brilliant speech in the Vatican Council, "we must prostrate ourselves and be silent, even his Holiness Pius IX. This dictator is History." And so it is. Surveying the alleged events which the mass of Christians reverently cherish as authenticating the divine origin of their faith, History sternly asks: Are these things so? A question, we hesitate not to say, which, frequently, can only be answered in the negative.

THE Rev. Charles Voysey, as we see from a late issue of the *Unitarian Herald*, stands accused by that journal of having played a mean and dishonest part from the time he commenced to preach as a minister of the Church of England, and—good heavens, what next?—of "deliberately trying, under the careful cover of merely attacking verbal inspiration and the doctrine of Christ's godhead, to undermine the reverence of men for the Bible, and their discipleship to Christ." In the same issue, the Rev. A. Gordon—one of the two ministers of the Unitarian Church, Hope Street, Liverpool, where Mr. Voysey had been invited to preach—deplores "the scandal of this man's presence among us," as one upon whom he can "look with neither respect nor patience," and who had been "expelled from his post, not without well-merited ignominy, as one faithless to a solemn bond." Mr. Gordon further regrets that Mr. Voysey has not been formally denounced or, at any rate, disowned by the leaders of English Unitarianism, while the *Herald* is convinced that Unitarians generally would not care to have him in the list of their recognised ministers. A matter, perhaps, of very little importance, seeing that Mr. Voysey has publicly announced his intention not to identify himself with any sect, and that many English Unitarian pulpits still remain inaccessible to men holding what are termed "advanced views" on theological subjects. It does seem to us, however, that our Contemporary's article is as unworthy of the Cause the *Herald*, in a small way, represents, as it is unjust towards the man who, by his fearless and persevering assaults on the strongholds of orthodoxy, has done and is doing so much for the emancipation of the human mind from the thrall of false and god-dishonouring dogmas. Shocked at Mr. Voysey's confession, that, *before* taking orders, he had lost all faith in the creed of his youth, what are we to think of a man, asks the *Herald*, who, when people were crediting him with the frank utterance of a believer's progressive doubts, was, all the time, cautiously letting off his heresy by instalments? Thus put, the case, it must be confessed, looks bad. In a teacher of religion, few things, we freely admit, can be more contemptible than the reticent or temporising attitude, no matter under what plea, towards doctrines in which he no longer believes. Mr. Voysey's admission, therefore, that for some years he delivered only a portion of his message, "because the time was hardly ripe for more open attack," unquestionably indicates a line of conduct on his part for which no valid apology can possibly be offered. But, waxing bolder and more conscientious, he has, at any rate, at length delivered his message with a fulness and an emphasis which, while fully atoning for the false religious posture which his connection with a legalised faith forced him temporarily to assume, would, if more generally manifested, assuredly work wonders for the Unitarianism which Mr. Voysey, when preaching in Hope Street Church, ventured somewhat freely—indeed we are not at all sure that the *Herald's* attack was not provoked by what was said on that occasion—to criticise. His remarks, which appear to us full of truth, we reproduce for the consideration of our readers: "Nothing," said he, "can be worse than the assumption that while there may be progress and improvement in every other department of human thought and energy, there can be none whatever in the sphere of religion, and in our convictions about God and his dealings with men. This assumption is in every church and sect throughout Christendom, and the Unitarian body is not altogether free from it, although that Church stands out in marked and honourable contrast to the rest of Christendom as containing many members who repudiate the prevailing conservatism. So long as it is understood that the New Testament is a book of final appeal for Unitarian doctrine, there is neither desire nor effort to give up one of its errors and delusions. The pre-existence of Jesus in another world, and the superhuman nature of his mission upon earth, his magical powers, his resurrection from death, and his ascension into heaven, were until lately as much part and parcel of Unitarian belief as of the rest of Christendom. It was not even contemplated to outstep the boundaries which that venerable book imposed on the human mind in its search after a higher knowledge of God and of human destiny. Hence, as a natural result of this stagnation and petrification, several nominal Unitarians seceded from the advanced position occupied by their forefathers, and fell back upon the Trinitarian churches. They had been brought up to lean upon external authority, to derive all their doctrines from the words recorded in a book, and, as they did not even think it needful or beneficial to correct or to add to their previous knowledge, they simply and naturally went back instead of going forward, and embraced all the old superstitions and idolatries which the founders of Unitarianism had made such awful sacrifices to renounce. If I may be permitted to speak to Unitarians about Unitarianism, I will say that some of their most splendid advantages have in some places been lost or imperilled by reason of this tacit satisfaction with the knowledge or conviction already gained. Unitarians have perfect freedom from written creeds and obligations. Why is not this rare privilege more fruitful than it is, in cultivating a spirit of inquiry? It seems to me that it is because that liberty from written tests and creeds has been supplanted by fetters forged from unwritten tests and unformulated creeds. Ministers have not availed themselves of all the independence professedly allowed them, or else congregations have put a ban upon their freer utterances which, when translated into plain English, means—'While you preach to us, you must pay more regard to our well-known convictions and prejudices than to the convictions of your own mind.' Such a restriction on a preacher may have its uses, but wherever it is exercised it has a tendency to keep down thought, to stifle inquiry, and to generate slothful and sleepy orthodoxy. I believe that the truly philosophical view of all religious systems is that they are in a great measure good as far as they go, and they only cease to be

good when they are final. Each one is but a stepping-stone to a higher stage of spiritual development. For my part, speaking as a clergyman of the Church of England, I unhesitatingly yield the palm to the Unitarian Church among all the denominational sections of Christendom. I believe its creed to be the highest and purest estimate of the divine character and dealings, and the most consistent with the best teachings of Jesus Christ among all the creeds which bear His name. But, instead of resting here I would call on that body above all others not to stand still upon the small eminence already attained, but to press onward with renewed vigour, and to judge of religious truth by still purer standards than those which have hitherto been used. If Unitarians are to be the vanguard of Christian churches, they should be the first to pioneer the great army behind them into wider regions of spiritual truth and into richer fields of divine knowledge. This is what many of them are actually doing. They are advancing—they are ceasing to believe that divine revelation is limited to a book; or that the life of Jesus himself exhausts the moral perfection of which man is capable. They are beginning to recognise the fact that both the Old and New Testament are the work of man—of man compound as he is of the earthly and the heavenly—and that no record exists in which blemishes are not manifest. Unitarians are beginning to take a higher ground than that of external authority, and are drifting more into the spirit of Theodore Parker and others who take the human soul as the basis of religious truth and as the fountain of God's revelation. By all the varied influences brought to bear upon them they are learning more and more of the universality of God's love, and are meeting with the actual evidences of those facts which they used formerly only to believe in and to hope for. It is in their power, more than in that of any other religious body in Christendom, to win the world of science into the atmosphere of true religion, if only they will use their opportunity, and throw off the shackles which still clog their progress." In view of the "harshness and crudity" of these utterances, the *Herald* likens Mr. "Voysey to a blind man who, with his eyes just opened, sees "men as trees, walking." With the fact however, before us, that all human institutions are singularly liable to degeneracies which only an eye "just opened" is capable of detecting, we are inclined, from a somewhat intimate acquaintance with Unitarianism, to believe that the author of *The Sling and the Stone* has, on the whole, spoken truly. There can be little doubt that it has distrusted its own thought—that it has unworthily temporised with orthodox views of Christianity and the Bible—that it has lost splendid opportunities by standing still when it might have gone forward—that its congregations do demand of preachers a greater respect for certain "unformulated" creeds than for their own convictions, thus frequently steeping the preacher's soul for years or a life-time in an insincerity of the ghastliest order—and that, by its assumption of doctrinal perfection and finality, it had prepared for itself a sepulchre which the more modern forms of Unitarianism have happily closed. Unitarianism, we feel assured, must either be advised by Mr. Voysey and "Go forward," or collapse in favour of that higher and more consistent religious faith of which he himself is a so distinguished a pioneer.

Discrepancies of Biblical Doctrine.

THAT champion of orthodoxy, the Rev. John Graham, while admitting in his late controversy with Rabbi Davis that he does not believe in verbal inspiration, has asserted, as a position which he is prepared stoutly to maintain, that there is no *real* discrepancy between any two portions of the Bible. It seems to us, however, that the term "discrepancy" may not inaptly be applied to the case of a Biblical doctrine, and that a very prominent and startling doctrine, which, being put forward in a most distinct and unqualified manner by one of the "inspired" writers, is either omitted or slurred over by the rest. For example, the seventeenth Article of the Church of England states that "Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour." This Article also speaks of the process by which this gracious decree is carried out; of the immense comfort the chosen ones must feel in knowing themselves to be the objects of such grace; and the recklessness and desperation of curious and carnal persons who, lacking the spirit of Christ, have continually before their eyes the sentence to which God has predestined them. Further, this doctrine is laid down with at least equal fulness and distinctness in the Larger Catechism of the Church of Scotland, where it is stated "that God in Christ has chosen some men to eternal life and the means thereof; and also has passed by and foreordained the rest to dishonour and wrath." What dogma could be more startling in character than this? "We attach a prodigious interest to the birth of an imperial prince, and are not slow to pay adequate, and frequently much more than adequate, respect to the holders of titles and ancestral honours; but what are our puny dignities, our paltry letters patent of nobility, compared to the overpowering glory of being enrolled among the aristocracy of Heaven itself—destined to reign for ever in bliss with angels and archangels, whilst the miserable mob of sinners that make up the mass of mankind shall be howling in agony in the darkness of an eternal pit? Small wonder is it that the Puritan soldiers of Cromwell, with this blissful assurance of being

numbered among the elect, should have borne down with invincible onset the utmost efforts of the gentry and cavaliers who owned for their king such a commonplace monarch as the first Charles.

Now, for this fearful dogma what foundation is there to be found in the Scriptures? In the words of Jesus taken by themselves little or none; for although he sometimes speaks of his elect, it must be observed that the term "elect" or "chosen" may refer, and indeed generally does refer to things or persons chosen *after* observation and approval, whereas the dogmatic meaning of the term applies to persons chosen by God's decree antecedent even to their birth. Thus in Matthew xxv. 34 are the words: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." But this expression does not necessarily mean "prepared for *you personally*," but rather "prepared for you *generally* as being righteous." Time and space will not allow us to discuss separately all the texts bearing upon the words "elect" and "election," but we are of opinion that any one carefully examining such passages will come to the conclusion that the doctrine of Predestination, apart from statements by the writer who may be considered the founder of it, is unsupported by Scripture. A modern author has pointed out how very large a portion of our modern dogmatic Christianity is due to the writings of the Apostle Paul, and it does not seem to us a rash assertion to say, that if the Epistle to the Romans had never come down to posterity, our Calvinistic friends would have had no scriptural foundation-stone of their theological system. In the eighth chapter of this Epistle we have all the several steps of the process of Predestination laid down with the precision of an architectural plan; foreknowledge, predestination, calling, justification and glorification. Further, the principle is exemplified in the case of Esau and Jacob, of whom, before they were born, it was said, "the elder shall serve the younger;" and of Pharaoh, who was expressly raised up that God's power might be shown in that monarch's punishment. But presently, Paul, as if conscious that the promulgation of this doctrine would probably provoke objections, proceeds to argue: "Hath not the potter power over the clay to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour of the same lump?" Undoubtedly he has, and in the case of senseless clay, *right* as well as power; the superb porcelain that adorns a palace being as unconscious of its position and dignity as the commonest piece of earthenware is of its degradation. But in the case of rational beings we object to the Apostle's teaching on the score of justice. Let us test the principle by one or two simple examples. Suppose some modern philosopher, having made sparrows of clay, as the infant Jesus in the Apocryphal Gospels is reported to have done, should somehow contrive to galvanise them into life; and, hanging up in his aviary all the most attractive fruits which his foreknowledge of sparrow-nature might suggest, should keep alive only those whose phlegmatic temperament was proof against temptation, and punish the rest by scorching them before a slow fire. Would not anyone cognisant of such proceedings think it his duty to call in the police? Suppose, again, that some newly-married couple should resolve to confine their care and kindness to such of their children as might be born with flaxen locks and blonde complexion, and to leave those with darker hair and skin to shift for themselves, with the gutter for a play-ground and the pig for companion! Would not an asylum or a prison be the proper destination of such parents, and the cold impartiality of the law a better guardian of the children than such unnatural caprice?

But to return to the doctrine itself, how is it that we do not find it as plainly stated in the words of Jesus or of John? Is there no discrepancy between Paul and the equally inspired James, who warns us against saying that we are tempted of God, for that God doth not tempt any man (not even Pharaoh)? We have in the New Testament, besides the Gospels, the writings of the five inspired authors, Paul, James, Peter, John and Jude; and but for the decision of certain Councils we might have had also the epistles of Barnabas and Clement. How strange, then, does it seem, at least to the carnal mind, that one of the cardinal points of modern theology should rest so largely, not to say entirely, on the authority of one of these writers, and he not a disciple of Jesus. Is there no real discrepancy, we ask, between this portentous conception of divine fore-ordination and the plain practical teaching of the Sermon on the Mount—of the Parable of the Prodigal Son—of the advice given to the rich young man—and especially of the exhortation (John vii. 17) in which Jesus so pointedly postpones doctrine to practice: "If anyone will do his (the divine) will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." To any impartial reader the discrepancy must be plain enough; but theological systems are like inlaid work; and the aim of those who devise them is not to get at the plain meaning of the words of the authors whom they profess to admire, but rather so to shape them, by paring off a little here and a little there, that they may fit into their appointed places in the theological pattern.

It may suit clergymen, when hard pressed by these objections, to repeat the warnings of Peter (2 iii. 16) to those unlearned and unstable persons who wrest the hard things in Paul's epistles unto their own destruction. Still, to say nothing of the doubt which (as the rev. Rabbi has remarked) rests upon the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter, we may question whether the sceptics are in any respect more unlearned and unstable than their opponents, and further whether it is not just possible that the Apostle might be wrong about the destruction of sceptics, as he and his fellow Apostles were undoubtedly wrong about the duration of the world. We think it impossible for anyone to read the Gospels and Epistles with an unbiassed mind, without perceiving

that even the Founder of Christianity as well as the Apostles anticipated a speedy end to the world. What else can Paul mean when he says, "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep?" What a forced expression it would be for the Apostle to classify himself with persons living at least eighteen centuries afterwards. Gibbon has mentioned the universal prevalence of this opinion among the earlier Christians, a fact which also throws light upon and accounts for two other characteristics of the Christian disciples, the community of goods and the practice of celibacy, which Paul does not hesitate to sanction by the weight of his private judgment; a practice however which certainly could not be made generally applicable, if the world, or at least the Christian world, was to last for many centuries. Now Peter, in this same Epistle, mentions the advent of scoffers who should ask, "Where is the promise of his coming?" If, therefore, the Apostles looked forward to a speedy end of the world, and their scoffing opponents derided the notion, is it not likely that the latter, whom the irresistible logic of events has proved to have had the best of the argument, may have taken the sounder view of some other questions than under dispute.

Finally, we cannot help remarking the total change which time has wrought in the relative position of saints and sceptics. "Scoffers walking after their own lusts," says the Apostle; and as to be pure, chaste, temperate and sober in the first century in such a city as Corinth, the name of which had been a by-word for gross sensuality, involved a self-denial and a steadfastness which we can now scarcely understand, so, probably, the scoffers were men who lived according to the lines of our great modern poet, whom the hypocrisy and selfishness of the George IV. era made worse than he really was by nature,—

*"Let us have wine and women, mirth and laughter,
Sermons and soda-water the day after."*

But all is changed now. We have no saints walking our streets in plenitude of power, ready to transform into stalwart men and useful citizens the cripples and the blind men who haunt our thoroughfares; nor, on the other hand, are our modern sceptics in any way inferior in decorum of life and in the punctual discharge of the regular duties of their callings to the saints themselves. We encounter saints and scoffers in the highways or in public meetings, but can by no external sign discern the one from the other. The ancient scoffer, in the time of Paul, at least such a one as would find a pleasure in deriding and vexing the early Christians, would probably be "a lewd fellow of the baser sort;" but a scoffer nowadays may be a philosopher (as Huxley or Lubbock), a judge (as Chief-Justice Hanson of South Australia), or even a colonial bishop (as Colenso). The chief peculiarity of such men is that when they have gone through the usual routine of their vocation they do not care to give their leisure so much to amusement, even to the princely amusement of shooting tame pigeons out of a trap, as to the composition of works of what is called a "dangerous" tendency on matters on religion. Nay, what doubtless seems most astonishing to evangelical folk, they do all this under the delusion that they are thereby advancing the cause of religion, and are helping to clear Christianity from the excrescences with which centuries of mediaeval ignorance and barbarism have encrusted its original simplicity. Our modern scoffers will even carry their self-esteem to such a height as to claim to be in reality better Christians than the saints who denounce them; not hesitating to affirm that if Jesus of Nazareth could walk this earth again he would be found among the first and foremost workers at the destruction of the dogmatic encroachments which impede the development of a rational and universal religion.

Scorpio.

The Duties of the Age.

WHAT matters it at the end of this short, sad life, to be cited as an example of external happiness? What really matters is, to have thought much, to have loved much, to have cast a firm glance on everything, to be able to say in our last hour, "I have lived much." I prefer a *yogui*, I prefer an Indian *mouni*, I prefer Simon Stylites, eaten by worms upon his pillar, to these pale existences on whom no ray of ideal light has ever shone, whose days from their first to their last moment have been quietly turned over like the leaves of a ledger. If philosophy, if science, if art, if literature, were only an agreeable pastime, a pleasure for the idle, an ornament of luxury, an amusement for amateurs, in a word, "the least vain of vanities," there would be days when the scholar would have to say with the poet: "*Honte à qui peut chanter, pendant que Rome brûle.*" But, if the labour of thought be the most serious thing that exists, if the destinies of humanity, and the perfection of the individual be linked to it, this labour has, like the things of religion, a value for every day and for every instant. To give to study and intellectual culture only leisure moments, is to insult the human mind, is to suppose that there is something more important than the discovery of truth. Now, if it were so, if philosophy were only an interest of secondary order, ought the man who has devoted his life to Perfection, who wishes to be able to say in his last moments: "I have accomplished my aim:"—ought he to spend an hour on philosophy when he knows that loftier duties call for him? What matters it, after all, whether the day after to-morrow be sure or uncertain? Of

what importance is it whether the future does or does not belong to us? Is truth less beautiful, is God less great? Though the world should perish we must still philosophise; and I trust that if ever our planet be the victim of a cataclysm, in that terrible moment there will be found men, who in the midst of ruin and chaos, will retain disinterested and scientific thought, and who, forgetting their approaching death, will discuss the phenomenon, and draw from it conclusions on the general system of the universe.

The whole secret of the intellectual condition of the times in which we live lies in this fatal truth: Intellectual labour has been degraded to the rank of a pleasure, and now that a day of serious struggles has come, pleasures are found insignificant and insipid. The fault lies then not in the events, which have contributed rather to excite thought; it lies wholly in the general decay induced by this love of ease, this shameful worship of pleasure, of which the Communistic follies are only the last consequence.

Science, art and philosophy are of value only so far as they are religious things; that is to say, only so far as they furnish to man the spiritual bread which religion formerly gave him, and which it can give him no longer. "One thing alone is needful." We must admit this precept of the great Master of morals as the whole principle of a noble life, as the expressive rule, although dangerous in its brevity, of the duties of human life.

The first steps of him who wishes to give himself to Wisdom (as the ancients said) is to divide his life into two parts,—the one commonplace, and containing nothing sacred, consisting of wants and pleasures of an inferior order; the other, which may be called ideal, celestial, divine, disinterested, absorbed in the worship of the pure forms of truth, beauty, and moral goodness, or (to take the widest expression and the one most consecrated by the reverence of the past) of God Himself, touched, perceived, and felt under His thousand forms by knowledge of all that is true and love of all that is beautiful. The saint is he who consecrates his life to this great ideal, and declares all else useless.

Yes, there is in the pure worship of the human faculties and the divine objects to which they relate, a religion as truly sweet, as truly rich in delights, as the most venerable faiths.

I have experienced in my childhood and in my early youth the sweetest joys of the believer; and, I say it from the depth of my heart, these joys were as nothing compared with those which I have felt in the pure contemplation of Beauty and the passionate research for Truth.

I desire for all my brothers who remain in orthodoxy a peace comparable to that which I have felt since my struggle ended, and the abated tempest left me in the midst of this great peaceful ocean, this sea without billows and without shore, where there is no star but reason, no compass but the heart.

Christian asceticism was right in declaring that religious things alone have ideal value, and that all else is vanity. But in proclaiming this great simplification of life, it represented in a maimer so contracted this one thing needful, that its principle became in time an intolerable chain for the human mind. Not only did the fathers of the spiritual life totally neglect the true and beautiful (philosophy, science, and poetry were in their eyes only vanities), but in attaching themselves exclusively to moral good, they conceived it under its meanest form.

Goodness was to them the execution of the will of a superior being, a kind of subjection humiliating to human dignity. Now the pursuit of moral good is not an obedience to external laws any more than the search after the beautiful in a work of art is the observance of certain rules.

Thus human nature is mutilated in its highest part. Among intellectual things, which are all equally holy, a distinction into sacred and profane was made. The profane, thanks to the instincts of nature which were stronger than the principles of an artificial asceticism, was not entirely banished; they tolerated it, though as a vanity. But, had they been consistent they had banished it without pity, it was a weakness which perfection renounced. Fatal distinction! which has poisoned the life of so many free and beautiful souls, born to taste the ideal in all its infinitude, whose lives passed away in sadness under this gloomy limitation. What struggles has it cost me! The first philosophical victory of my youth was to proclaim from the depth of my conscience: "All that is intellectual is sacred."

The inferiority of modern society arises from the fact that intellectual culture is not understood as a religious thing, that poetry, science, and literature are looked upon as arts of luxury, to be enjoyed only by privileged classes. Greek art was produced for the nation, the art of the seventeenth century was produced for the king, and so in a measure, for the nation; the art of our days is seldom produced but on the order of an individual.

Hence comes it that a novel-writer can make a brilliant fortune, and gain what is called a position in the world, whilst a grave scholar, though his works be as fine as those of Bopp, or M. Eugène Burnouf, can in no wise live on the proceeds of his writings.

Poetry, philosophy, and literature were not in the great days of antiquity exclusive professions, as is the case in our modern society. Men could be philosophers or poets, as they could be honest men,—in every condition of life. No material interests, no official institutions were needed to excite zeal for research, or poetical creation. Spontaneous curiosity, the instinct of the beautiful, was sufficient. Ammonius Saccas, the

founder of one of the most abstract schools of ancient philosophy, was a street porter. Imagine a porter in our days creating an order of speculation analogous to the philosophy of Schelling or Hegel! When I think of that noble people of Athens, where all felt and lived on the life of the nation; of that people who applauded Sophocles, and criticised Isocrates, of that city where the women cried, "That is Demosthenes," where a costermonger recognised the foreign diction of Theophrastus, where all had been educated at the same gymnasium and in the same poetry, where all knew and understood Homer; I cannot help feeling some anger against modern society with its sharp division into cultivated and uncultivated men. There all had a place in the light of intelligence, all had part in the same memories, all felt a glory in the same trophies, all had contemplated the same Minerva, the same Zeus.

Intellectual labour has its full value only when it springs spontaneously from that want of human nature which is expressed in the phrase, "Man shall not live by bread alone." The great scientific and religious sentiment will reappear only when we return to a conception of life as true, as little artificial, as that of the traveller alone in the forests of America, or of the Brahmin finding that he has lived as was his duty, and preparing himself for the Great Departure—to die upon the heights of the Himalayas.

Who has not experienced these moments of inward solitude, in which the soul, pressing ever deeper in its search for its true self, pierces veil after veil, and comes at last to the silent region where all conventionality is at an end, and it stands in presence of itself without fiction or artifice between. Rare and fleeting are these moments, commonly we live in presence of a third personality which hinders the soul from this awful meeting with itself. Freedom of life can be won only by tearing away this veil, and flying directly into the deepest recesses of our nature, there to listen to the unselfish instincts that bid us to know, to worship, and to love.

Would to God that all living and pure souls were persuaded that the question of the future of humanity is entirely a question of science, and that philosophy, that is to say, rational investigation, is alone competent to solve it.

The really thorough revolution, that which will give form to the future, will not be a political revolution, but a religious and moral one. Politics have furnished all that they could furnish; henceforth they are a barren and exhausted field, a struggle of passions and intrigues, uninteresting to humanity, interesting only to those who mingle in them.

There are periods when all becomes political; as, for instance, at the juncture of the middle and modern ages. In the time of Philippe le Bel, of Louis XI., learned men and thinkers were of little importance, and had real value only so far as they aided politics. Politics then led the world; and men of genius, who aspired to do more than to charm their contemporaries, were obliged to become statesmen, in order to exercise their legitimate share of influence upon the times.

It was no blameable ambition which led into this whirlpool the most intelligent men of the first half of our century; they served their times in the best way. But the state of things which they represented draws to an end, and influence passes more and more to the men of thought. There are ages when politics hold the first place in the movement of humanity; there are others when they dwindle into a little bustle of intrigue, and the world's interest concentrates upon men of letters. For instance, in the eighteenth century, who held in their hands the great affairs of humanity? It was Voltaire, it was Rousseau, it was Montesquieu; it was a great school of thinkers who took possession of their age, moulded it, and created the future.

And did these thinkers seek to occupy themselves with state affairs as the first generation of the nineteenth century did? No; they remained writers, philosophers, moralists, and it was as such that they influenced the world. So, I imagine, those who shall restore great originality to our age, will not be politicians, but thinkers. They will flourish outside the official world, not caring even to oppose it, leaving it to die in its narrow circle.

In the dry pastures of the Isles of Brittany, each sheep of the flock is tied to a stake, and can eat the scanty grass only in the narrow limits which his cord allows him. Such seems to me to be the present condition of politics: they have exhausted the resources which they possessed for solving the problem of humanity. Morals, philosophy, true religion, have now passed beyond their range, and they wander in a fatal round of weakness.

Let us take as another example the three first centuries of the Christian era. What were the important events of that time? "Where was the future being moulded? What were the names destined for the reverence of future generations? Did Tiberius and Sejanus, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius really occupy the centre of humanity, as people would doubtless then believe? The true centre of the world was in the most despised corner of the East. The great men destined for veneration were believing enthusiasts, entire strangers to the secrets of political life. Five centuries later, none of the illustrious men of this century were named except Peter, Paul, John and Matthew, poor men who assuredly had made little figure in it. Here, then, is an immense development silently prepared during three centuries, outside the political world, growing side by side with official society, persecuted by official society, but which when its day comes conquers that society, or rather remains living and strong when the political world has perished from exhaustion.

If St. Ambrose had remained governor of Liguria, even though he had been promoted, and had become,

like his father, prefect of Gaul, he would now be forgotten. He did better in becoming a bishop.

Do you say then that there is no means of serving humanity except by throwing oneself into the combat? I say on the contrary, that he who throws his whole soul into this humiliating labour proves that he is not called to great duties.

What are politics in our day? An agitation without principles and without laws, a combat of rival ambitions, of mines and counter-mines, a vast theatre of cabals, of purely personal struggles. What is necessary for success, for being "practical" as we say now? Lively originality? ardent and vigorous thought? impetuous conviction? These are invincible obstacles to success. You must not think, or must not utter your thought; you must shut yourself up in a system of conventionalism and official falsity. And do you believe that hence can arise what we need—a source of life, a new patriotism, a belief capable of giving fresh inspiration to humanity? As soon could we hope that scepticism will engender faith, and a new religion spring out of the office walls of a minister or the lobbies of a senate. What humanity needs is Morals and a Faith. It is from the depths of human nature that this faith must come, and not from the dry and beaten tracks of the official world.

M. de Chateaubriand, has, I believe, maintained somewhere, that the entry of men of letters into political activity, marks the weakening of the political spirit of a nation. It would be more true to say that it marks the weakening of the philosophical spirit, and proves that we no longer understand the value and dignity of intellect; that power has passed from thought and knowledge to intrigue and meddling. It is thus in our own times.

But the ever-rising tide of social questions will compel the political world to confess its weakness. Then shall we understand that the great revolution will come, not from men of action, but from men of thought and feeling; and all elevated minds, abandoning the earth to disquiet men, and regarding forms of government and the names and actions of governors as things indifferent, will take refuge in the heights of human nature, and, burning with enthusiasm for the true and beautiful, will create that new Force, which will overthrow the frail shelter of politics, and will become in its turn the law of humanity. It is no exaggeration, then, to say that philosophy enfolds the future of humanity, and that it alone can teach man his destiny, and the mode of fulfilling it. In politics, said Herder, man is the means; in morals he is the end.

The revolution of the future will be the triumph of morals over politics. Scientifically to organise humanity—such is the last aim of modern science; such is its audacious but legitimate purpose. What is there astonishing in the thought that all the progress, so far made, is perhaps only the first page of the preface of an infinite volume?

All who still adore are united by the object which they adore. The atheist is the frivolous man; the impious, the pagan, are the selfish, those who know nothing of the things of God; withered souls who affect cleverness and laugh at those who believe; souls base and worldly, destined to wither in their egotism and to die of nothingness.

How, oh! disciples of Christ, can you make alliance with men like these? Were it not better to take your stand with us by poor humanity as she lies gloomy and silent by the wayside, and direct her eyes towards the heaven which she has ceased to contemplate? As for us, there our lot is cast; and though superstition and frivolity, henceforth inseparable and allied together, may silence for a time the human conscience, it shall be said in the nineteenth century, the century of cowardice, there were still some men who, notwithstanding vulgar contempt, loved to be called men of another world; men who believed in truth, and pursued it enthusiastically, amidst an age frivolous because it was without faith, and superstitious because it was frivolous.—*Renan*.

Miracles Impossible and Incredible.

THE Scriptures teach that the universe and all it contains, were called into existence in six days, by God's direct command. This Biblical cosmogony (Gen i. 1—ii. 4) is grand and sublime, but it is faulty and unscientific; it disregards those attributes of matter which, by their own inherent power, of necessity produce the changes and combinations that constitute the cosmos; therefore, it arbitrarily compresses within the limits of a few days what was effected by the gradual operation of myriads of millenniums, and it transforms into acts of personal agency what we are wont to regard as the result of clearly defined and unchangeable laws.

The same personal interference continues in Biblical *history*. For special ends, the eternal course of nature is altered, and *miracles* are performed. Yet the idea of miracles is absolutely opposed to our notions of the universe, as derived from a patient cultivation of the natural and historical sciences. It gains ground whenever men, unable to understand their position as a subordinate though organic part of mankind, consider themselves or their community as the chief end of creation and general government. For it rests virtually on the assumption that nature pays special regard to the deeds and destinies of individuals or single nations, and bestows aid and sympathy, or displays resistance and enmity, in accordance with the behests of a ruling power; whereas her

whole economy is one and indivisible, embracing the universe, and working in majestic impartiality for all worlds alike. Therefore Spinoza justly used *miracles* and *ignorance* as convertible terms, and he added the weighty words fraught with significant meaning, "I believe the principal difference between religion and superstition to be this, that the former is founded upon wisdom and the latter upon ignorance; and I am convinced that herein lies the reason why the Christians are distinguished from other men not by an honourable life, nor by love, nor the other fruits of the Holy Ghost, but merely by an opinion; because, like all the rest, they fortify themselves only by miracles, that is by ignorance, which is the fountain of all wickedness, and thus convert faith, however true, into superstition"

Ancient nations felt strongly the influence of the divine power in nature; but as they had explored nature most imperfectly, all her remarkable or unusual phenomena appeared to them as direct manifestations of the deity, or as miracles, which inspired them both with terrifying awe and sublime veneration; and these feelings worked the more powerfully, the more vividly their youthful minds were affected by all impressions, and the more consistently they were accustomed to develop and to supply every new and great idea. The assumption to which we have alluded gave rise, among the Romans, to the fictions of *prodigia* or *portenta*, by which the gods were believed to announce impending calamities or important events—the sky appearing in a blaze of fire, or flaming torches illumining the air; spears or hands burning but not consumed; men of fire assailing and fighting with each other; flesh or worms, earth, stones, or blood raining from heaven; the water of rivers changed into blood; women giving birth to monstrosities; animals speaking, mules bringing forth young, and wonderful animals, as snakes with the manes of horses, starting up; trees springing from the soil full grown, and cut stems suddenly rising to an extraordinary height; rocks moving spontaneously; birds, in anguish without apparent cause, seeking refuge; marvellous or alarming sights and sounds produced by delusion of the senses; images of gods speaking, or shedding tears.

The Biblical miracles are founded on similar conceptions. By the command of God, heavenly bodies are said to have been arrested in their course (Josh. x. 12-14; Is. xxxviii. 8); yet we know that such a contingency would be inevitably followed by a complete derangement of the sidereal systems, and by the incalculable ruin of thousands of worlds. Occasionally even the Bible shows a gleam of the conviction of nature's immutable stability: "He has established the heavens for ever and ever: He gave a law, and they trespass it not" (Ps. cxlviii. 6); "He said to the sea, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed" (Job xxxviii. 11); "I have placed the sand for the boundary of the sea by an eternal law, that it cannot pass it; and though its waves rage, they cannot prevail" (Jer. v. 22). But such incidental admissions do not materially influence the spirit and tenor of the narratives. According to Biblical accounts, the Divine will constantly changed those intrinsic properties of things which constitute their very character and essence. But if we read that the water of the Nile was converted into blood (Ex. iv. 9; vii. 17-20), and that ordinary water was at the marriage of Cana, changed into wine (John ii. 1-11); that the waves of the Red Sea were divided and stood upright like a wall (Ex. xiv. 21, 22), and the floods of the Jordan, touched by Elijah's mantle, opened a dry path (2 Kings ii. 13, 14); that an axe, which had sunk to the bottom of the river, rose by Elijah's will and swam on the surface (2 Kings vi. 1-7), and that Christ walked on the water of the Lake Genesareth (Mark vi. 48, 49); that the men of Sodom and Bar-Jesus (Elymas) were suddenly struck blind (Gen. xix. 11; Acts xiii. 6-11), and blind men recovered as suddenly (Matt. ix. 28-30; xx. 32-34); that a staff became serpent and a serpent a staff, a healthy hand was by a word made leprous, and a leprous hand healthy (Ex. iv. 2-7); that the earth opened its womb to engulf alive rebellious offenders (Num. xvi. 30-33), and the dead were revived or raised alive from the grave (John vi. 1-44; Matt. ix. 18, 24, 25); that Moses was forty days on Mount Sinai without requiring any food whatever (Ex. xxxiv. 21), and that a limited supply of flour and wine was practically unlimited, and sufficed for the household of the widow of Zarephath a considerable time (1 Kings xvii. 14-16); that every vessel which could possibly be procured, filled itself spontaneously with oil by Elisha's command (2 Kings iv. 3-6); that 4,000 men, besides women and children, were satisfied by seven loaves and a few little fishes, and left over seven baskets of broken pieces (Matt. xv. 23-28); that a fig-tree, covered with leaves and capable of bearing fruit, instantaneously withered away (Matt. xxi. 19); that the ass of Balaam spoke (Num. xxii. 21, 30), a raven provided Elijah regularly with bread and meat (1 Kings xvii. 4-6), and a whale preserved Jonah in its womb three days and three nights, and then threw him on the dry land unhurt (Jonah ii. 1-11) : if we read all this, we might be led to the perplexing conclusion that there is nothing stable and fixed in nature, were we not taught by science to regard undeviating uniformity as nature's first principle. All reality is destroyed, and the things, devoid of a well-defined character, lose their intrinsic value and absolute existence. "The miracle changes the serious code of nature into a merry book of fairy-tales; but for this reason, miracle itself deserves to be ranked no higher than a fairy-tale." Disdaining, like fancy, to which it is largely indebted, the fetters of necessity, it capriciously confounds the qualities of matter, combines what is naturally incompatible, and disjoins what is inseparable. Every miracle "paralyses reason;" for it checks the specific work of reason, which consists in searching for laws and causes, and, by depriving it of the safe support of experience, renders it

valueless even for pointing out the path of practical duty. The miracle attempts to sway nature, but not, like reason, by penetrating into its organism, but by misusing it for arbitrary ends. Unrestrained by any limit, and unshackled by any condition, it appears in power boundless and inexhaustible. Exercising a complete rule over matter, and reminding man of his own inborn yearning for the infinite, it is by unreflecting generations easily mistaken as divine. Hence the East is the home of miracles; because the East is more apt to confound fancy and reflection: these two faculties have indeed abstraction as a common element; but fancy defies or disregards reality, while reflection judiciously preserves and spiritualises it.

It is not only useless but objectionable to reduce the miracles by ingenious and strained interpretations, to the least possible number, or to explain their force away, by representing them as ordinary occurrences told in a marvellous or imaginative form. Thus it has been asserted that the Bible contains nothing that is opposed to the rules of nature, and that, for instance, the prolonged day in Joshua's time may be accounted for by the supposition that a large quantity of ice happened to be in the upper region of the air, and caused an unusually strong refraction of the solar rays; and this led to the vague and untenable opinion that all Biblical statements found to be in opposition to the laws of nature are "either poetical metaphors, or are related according to the opinions and prejudices of the writers, or have been inserted in the Scriptures by sacrilegious hands"—which principles manifestly deprive the narratives of Scripture of all definite meaning and value. Equally questionable is the device of separating the "end and essence" of the revelations from the accessory notions associated with them, and of insisting upon the truth of the former, while relinquishing that of the latter, a device which would open the floodgates to every variety of arbitrary distinction. Yet these views have been adopted by earlier and later writers, and among them by Reimarus, the famous "fragmentist" of Wolfenbützel, who by attempting "natural explanations" of events which the authors of the Bible obviously meant to describe as supernatural, was misled to the most curious fancies, as for instance, that the thunder which accompanied the revelation on Mount Sinai was possibly produced by the sudden explosion of "a sort of gunpowder," while Moses communicated with Joshua, who was in the camp, by means of a speaking-trumpet. Who does not see that such principle, or rather absence of principle, renders all religious knowledge uncertain and fluctuating, and renounces beforehand all absolute truth?

It is equally unavailing to confine miracles to certain periods; Catholicism, in this respect more in accordance with the spirit of the Bible than Protestantism, which attempts an unsuccessful compromise between belief and reason, extends their operation beyond the limits of tradition, and supposes their constant and living manifestation. For the Biblical narratives do not simply contain miracles, but are throughout framed in a miraculous spirit. They are entirely compiled on the assumption of a perpetual and immediate intervention of God in the natural course of events. That extraordinary "offering of jealousy," (Num. x. 11-31), which is evidently an ordeal involving the regular and miraculous interference of God, is alone sufficient to disclose the wide chasm which separates the Biblical from the scientific notions beyond all possibility of agreement. Wonders are freely employed to remove difficulties, even where these might have been overcome by natural agencies. Whether Noah and his family are alone rescued amidst the universal destruction of living creatures, or Lot is by special messengers of God saved from the calamities which overthrew his entire district; whether Pharaoh is, by unparalleled afflictions, forced to release the Hebrews, or the persons and the property of the latter remain untouched when the land is visited by appalling misfortunes; whether God personally guides and protects the patriarchs, or afflicts the women of Abimelech's household with barrenness because that king took Sarah into his house (Gen. xx. 17, 18); whether he gives to the myriads of wandering Israelites food and water in abundance for forty years, or makes the hostile Syrian army hear a noise of vast numbers of horses and chariots, to delude them into the belief of large hosts approaching, in consequence of which they fly panic-stricken, leaving their whole camp behind them (2 Kings vii. 6, 7)—these and the numerous traits of a similar kind defy all laws both of reason and experience, and substitute phantasmagoric playfulness for sober historiography to such a degree that even the attempt at harmonising them with scientific results bespeaks the slothfulness of a mind equally unable to form an independent estimate of the antiquated past, and to keep pace with the growth of modern inquiry. By the direction of God," observes Spinoza, "I understand the fixed and immutable order of nature or the concatenation of natural things. The general laws of nature, by which everything happens and is determined, are nothing but the eternal decrees of God, which ever involve eternal truth and necessity. Therefore, whether we say that everything happens according to the laws of nature, or that everything is ordained by the will and direction of God, we say the same thing." These views, whether they be avowed or not, rule our lives and our thoughts. They must form the starting point of all future theories of philosophy and theology. Sometimes indeed the Bible records natural facts in connection with miracles; for instance, Moses threw a certain wood, which God had shown him, into the bitter waters of Marah, which then became drinkable (Ex. xv. 25), and similarly Elisha rendered salubrious for ever a deleterious spring of water by casting into it a quantity of salt (2 Kings ii. 20-22); Elisha leaned repeatedly over the dead boy, till the latter grew warm and returned to life (2 Kings iv. 34, 35); the Syrian general Naaman was healed from leprosy after

bathing seven times in the Jordan (2 Kings v. 1-14); and the ten plagues of Egypt are all based on natural phenomena of almost regular occurrence in that country: but these facts, though affording *to us* valuable hints and explanations, were by the Biblical narrators not meant to remove the miraculous character of the events; they prove, on the contrary, that even where a natural explanation offered itself, and was suggested by tradition, it was rejected by miracle-loving generations, and set aside in favour of the assumption of extraordinary agencies. Yet, what natural basis can be discovered for the legends that Miriam became suddenly "leprous like snow" because she had spoken slightly of Moses (Num. xii. 10); that a corpse which touched, the bones of Elisha, became alive and rose from the grave (2 Kings xiii. 21), or that diseases were cured, physical defects removed, and evil spirits expelled by touching the hand or garment of Christ (Mat. viii. 13-15), or "a handkerchief or apron" of the apostle Paul? (Acts six. 12); that a large number of fiery horses and chariots appeared to deliver Elisha from his pursuers? (2 Kings vi. 17); that fire came out of a rock by striking it with a staff, and consumed the meat and the cakes placed thereon by Gideon as an offering? (Jud. vi. 20, 21); that the sea raged because it bore the guilty Jonah, and became tranquil as soon as the latter was removed from the ship? (Jonah i. 12-15).

And yet the Bible itself lowers considerably the force and effect of miracles by attributing the power of performing them not only to Hebrews worshipping foreign gods, and to heathens controlled by the might of Jehovah, as in the instance of Balaam, but to idolaters who work in opposition to Jehovah Himself, as the magicians of Egypt (Ex. vii. 11, 22). The New Testament goes even farther; it supposes that miracles are performed by "false Christs and false prophets" (Mat. xxiv. 24) to such an extent "that if it were possible they might deceive the very elect; the enemy of the Church represented under the form of a beast rising out of the earth "did great wonders, made fire come down from heaven, and thereby deceived many men" (Rev. xix. 23); and "the spirits of the devils," which betray the kings of the earth and of the whole world, work miracles (Rev. vi. 14). Wonders, therefore, neither testify to the greatness of God, nor to the purity or truth of doctrines. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to distinguish between a true and a false miracle; all criteria that have been fixed, are either misty or fallacious.

The inference to be drawn from these facts is as decisive as it is significant. Can a gift that an idol is able to bestow, have any value or reality? Can those powers be supernatural which a Hebrew prophet shares with a priest of Baal?

Miracles are both impossible and incredible—impossible because against the established laws of the universe, and incredible because those set forth by tradition, are palpable inventions of unhistoric ages.

The notion of "rational wonders" which has been propounded is preposterous; for all wonders are irrational; they realise their character the more completely, the more irrational they are; for reason penetrates into the depth and essence of things, while miracles play lightly on their surface. The *love of the miraculous*, innate in human nature, and strongest in imaginative or enthusiastic minds, and in the early stages of development, is the parent of miracles; they germinate not in the quality of things but in the propensity of men. "Believe you that I am able to do this?" Jesus asked the blind men who came to him to be cured, and "they said to him, Yea, Lor" (Matt. ix. 28); a leper appealed to him saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," and Jesus said, "I will," and the leprosy was immediately removed (Matt. viii. 2, 3). Miracles are desired and demanded when they are believed in; their origin lies neither in the sphere of metaphysics nor of theology; they can be explained only as psychological phenomena. Mohammed was pressed on all sides to perform miracles in vindication of his alleged mission; the incessant requests of both friends and foes, justified by the precedents of the Old and New Testament, almost brought him to despair; and in vain he insisted, that the greatest miracles are the creation, the animal and vegetable kingdom, heaven and the seas.

History rests on proofs and the internal evidence of facts; the Biblical narrative introduces elements lying beyond the test of ordinary examination, and often directly opposed to experience, reason and possibility. "While, therefore, the one possesses objective truth, the other may be accepted or discarded according to the individual principles of the reader.

The Scriptures habitually represent drought and famine, pestilence and earthquake, floods and every other disaster caused by the elements, as the results of idolatry and wickedness; they make the cessation of these inflictions dependent on the people's repentance and reformation, and hence they speak, for instance, of the "ignominy of famine" (Ez. xxxvi. 30): but the scourges of nature result from physical laws which, though they should never be thoroughly understood, certainly repudiate the notion of a direct influence of the moral upon the physical world. And with respect to the living creation, the conception of the Bible is so childlike, that it assumes the possibility of moral degeneracy in animals, usually supposes a simultaneous corruption of men and beasts, and includes the one and the other in the same exercises of penitence, fasting and humiliation (Jonah iii. 7, 8); nay, it imagines that even the earth, the abode of man, and the material from which his body was framed, may share the general depravity; and hence it couples the destruction of man, as in the deluge, with the destruction of the beasts, and at least the temporary devastation of the earth, if not, as in the punishment of

Sodom and Gomorrah, its utter annihilation—all which notions are to us like strange and fanciful echoes of a remote past.

The veil which once covered and hid nature, has in a great measure been withdrawn. The awe which man felt at her grandeur, has thereby not been diminished; on the contrary, it has gained in force and reality. But inquirers have arrived at the conviction that they must renounce the hope of fathoming a power that rules her working; that she does not enable us to understand the distinction between "a primary cause" and "secondary causes," since, throughout her dominion, she reveals causes that we must consider as primary, and beyond which we cannot pass if we desire to penetrate into the genesis of things; and that, therefore, man's dignity and his happiness depend on the earnestness with which he explores nature's laws and obeys her suggestions and behests.—Dr. *Kalisch*.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

REMINISCENCES OF ARGUMENTATIVE CONVERSATIONS HELD AT SUNDRY TIMES BETWEEN JAMES AULDLIGHT AND JOHN DUBIOUS, MOSTLY REGARDING THINGS SPIRITUAL. WRITTEN AND COLLATED BY ME THE AFORESAID JOHN DUBIOUS.

CHAPTER IV.

Private Interpretation—Edinburgh Encyclopedia unanswerable—Stupendous Panic in the Tenth Century over the Universal Annihilation Doctrine.

JOHN.—As the subject of prayer is, however, diverging from our present argument, we will, if you please, Mr. Auldlicht, defer it for a future occasion.

JAMES.—As ye like, John; but I maun tell ye this, an' weel wad it be for ye, as I tauld ye afore, if ye wad follow my example in prayin' for grace frae day to day. Does na' my fallen and corrupt natur', always prone to sin, require me to pray for forgiveness thro' the atonin' bluid o' our Saviour?

JOHN.—Pause there, friend James: you have started two fresh themes Our corrupt and fallen nature, and a vicarious atonement, which, with prayer, will make three points for future discussion. In the meantime you will please return to the point at issue.

JAMES.—Before we gang ony farther wi' this argument, John, I wad hae ye maist deestinctly to understand this,—that altho' I listen to ye, it only gangs in at the ane lug an' oot at the ither, for I hae the authority o' Peter in sayin', "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 i. 20). Moreover, does na' Peter also assign the reason o' that assertion, or rather, as I think, gangs intil a further an' fuller explanation o' what he had said, "For the prophecy cam' na' in auld time by the will o' man (that is, ye'll observe, John, it was na' o' human invention,—it did na' express the conjectures o' men), but holy men o' God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Noo, by what authority can ye interpret for yersel' contrair' to the received opinions o' holy men wha hae flourished durin' the last auchteen hundred years? Men of God wha were content wi' the passages o' Scriptur' as they fand them, an' forbye that, did na' want to forge new links i' the chain o' ony prophecy, nor yet——

JOHN.—One moment, please, Mr. Auldlicht, before you get lost in the mists of ages. Allowing the fact (whatever my private opinion may be) that the Bible was written by men inspired of God to write it, is there any just reason why it should not be of private interpretation? Does the circumstance that God gave them the thoughts—that he even suggested to them the words in which they should clothe them—render the production so unintelligible, or so equivocal in its meaning, that a private individual cannot be trusted to read it? This would be tantamount to saying that God cannot make himself understood as men can!

JAMES.—Ye'll observe this, hooever, that Peter restricts us only in the matter o' prophecy.

JOHN.—In other words, you mean this,—*the prophecies are especially inspired vaticinations, therefore too*

obscure and ambiguous to be of private interpretation! Inspired, therefore unintelligible! It is a wonder you do not affirm that this identical verse itself (2 Peter i. 20) is not to be subjected to private interpretation!

JAMES.—Noo, John, I just want ye to listen to the followin' extract frae the article "Christianity," in the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*. "Whatever is dictated to us by God himself, or by men who are divinely inspired, must be believed with full assurance. Reason demands us to believe whatever divine Revelation dictates, for God is perfectly wise, and cannot be deceived. He is faithful and good, and will not deceive his creatures. When Reason has found out the certain marks or credentials of divine authority, which belong to any proposition, there remains no further inquiry to be made. God can dictate nothing but what is worthy of himself, and agreeable to his own nature and divine perfections." I'm thinkin', freend John, ye'll find that vera kittle to be ans'ered.

JOHN.—It may seem unanswerable to you, but did the early Christians "*find out the certain marks or credentials of divine authority,*" which belonged to the proposition, that the last day was at hand? They evidently considered there was no further inquiry to be made when they preached the immediate Destruction of the World in Judea and other eastern countries in the first centuries of Christianity, when men by thousands became converts to it from fear. The Christians also of the tenth century *evidently considered there was no further inquiry to be made* regarding the doctrine which created such a panic in their day. Mr. Waddington, a writer who cannot for a moment be supposed adverse to the interests of Christianity, in his *History of the Church*, speaking of an occurrence which took place only 911 years ago, or nearly a thousand years after Christ, says that "a very wild and extraordinary delusion arose and spread itself, and at length so far prevailed as not only to subdue the reason, but to actuate the conduct of vast multitudes. About the year 960, one Bernhard, a hermit of Thesingia, boldly promulgated (*on the faith of a particular revelation from God*) the certain assurance that at the end of the thousandth year mentioned in the Book of Revelation (xx. 2, 3), the fetters of Satan should be broken, and after the reign of Antichrist should be terminated, the world should be consumed with a sudden conflagration. The clergy, without delay, adopted the doctrine; the pulpits loudly resounded with it; it was diffused in every direction with astonishing rapidity, and embraced with an ardour proportioned to the obscurity of the subject and the *greediness of human credulity*. The belief pervaded every tank, not as a cold and indifferent assent, but as a motive for the most important undertakings. Many, among whom were bishops, nobles and princes, abandoned their friends and their families, and hastened to the shores of Palestine, with the pious persuasion that Mount Sion would be the throne of Christ when he should descend to judge the world; and these, in order to æoure a more partial sentence from the God of Mercy and Charity, usually nade over their property, before they departed, to some adjacent Church or Nonastery. Others, whose pecuniary means were thought, perhaps, insufficient to bribe the justice of heaven, devoted their personal service to the same establishments, and resigned their very liberty to those holy mediators, whose pleadings, they doubted not, would find favour at the eternal judgment-eat. Others permitted their lands to lie waste and their houses to decay, or terrified by some unusual phenomenon in the heavens, betook themselves in lasty flight to the shelter of rocks and caverns, as if the temple of Nature was destined to preservation, amidst the wreck of man and his works." This listorian goes on to state that "the year of terror arrived and passed away without any extraordinary convulsion, that the people returned to their lomes, repaired their buildings, and resumed their former occupations; and he only lasting effect of this stupendous panic was the augmentation of the temporal prosperity of the Church."

(*To be continued.*)

Audialterampartem Creek.

Urtica Urens.

Intellectual Freedom.

LIBERTY may be said to consist in the assertion of individuality. So strongly toes the natural instinct prompt to such assertion, that the wonder ought to be—not how any ever dared to be free, but how any ever dared to infringe upon freedom. So complete, however, is the subjection to which the minds of some have been reduced, so entirely has an artificial fear cast out their natural love and reliance, that we find the very idea of bringing reason to War upon matters which they are accustomed to regard as having been once or all determined by authority, evoking manifestations of a terror that to us must appear simply ludicrous.

Here is an instance of what I mean, sufficiently typical, it seems to me, to be quoted in illustration. I was riding with a companion in the Australian mush when an aged crone, miserable product of a life of crime and drink, and epic of the old penal system of the colony, with many a pious ejaculation besought alms of us. Being passed unheeded, she suddenly changed her blessings into the most horrible curses. Upon this my companion, whose nationality and religion I shall not specify, hastily turned back and thrust money into her hand. I

remonstrated against the immorality of charity so bestowed; but he assured me that there is a special validity attached to an old woman's curse, which makes it most dangerous to be incurred. Looking at him, with wonder, to see if he was in earnest, I found him not only perfectly serious but pale with fright, and really angry at an incredulity which he professed himself utterly unable to comprehend. So I said by way of exculpation, "I see how it is. You believe in the devil: I prefer believing in God." He seemed for a while to be thinking over this, for after some time he remarked, "Ah! but we are told, you know, that the devil is very strong."

Riding on, we came to a spot where a party of aboriginies were holding a "corrobory," or native dance, of a kind far more vigorous than elegant. Whether it was out of pure liveliness of heart, or in pursuance of a time honoured custom, or as an act of devotion that they danced thus, I was ignorant. My companion, however, declared it to be the latter, and straightway proceeded to denounce the Government of the colony for suffering devil-worship (for such he believed it) to be practised within its limits. And his indignation towards the poor dancing savages was not mitigated one whit, even when I offered on their behalf the obvious apology that, perhaps they, too, had been "told that the devil is very strong."

There must have been something "very strong" in the motives originally brought to bear upon men to induce them to abandon their liberty of thought and action, and to submit to rules which are arbitrary, and unverifiable by any acts in their own consciousness; and all upon the strength of what they were "told." I say *originally*, because, when submission became a habit, its maintenance was comparatively easy. We have here a problem of which we must attempt a solution before we can at all comprehend the significance of the intellectual activity of our own time.—*Maitland*.

Superstition and Love of Truth.

RELIGION is the attitude of reverence, in which noble-minded people instinctively place themselves towards the Unknown Power which made man and his dwelling place. It is the natural accompaniment of their lives, the sanctification of their actions and their acquirements. It is what gives to man, in the midst of the rest of creation, his special elevation and dignity.

Accompanying our race as it has done from the cradle of civilisation, it has grown with our growth, it has expanded with the expansion of knowledge, subject only to the condition that when errors have been incorporated in religious systems, they have been exceptionally tenacious of their ground. Rituals and creeds, created by the piety of constructive and devotional ages, have become so precious when once accepted, that it has been held sacrilege to touch them. They have been guarded by superstition and sealed against alteration by anathema. The eternal nature of the Object of our reverence has been attributed to the form under which it has been adored, and unable notwithstanding to escape the charges which the development of knowledge imposes upon it, religion has advanced not by easy and natural transitions, but by successive revolutions, violent leaps, spasmodic convulsions. Opinions formed, or facts believed, in the immaturity of experience, become incredible when seen to be out of harmony with larger and more exact information. Piety, the twin brother of Science, tends at such times to be the guardian of error. Love of truth is forced into unnatural hostility with the virtue which is only second to it, and then come those trying periods of human history, when devotion and intelligence appear to be opposed, and the metal of which men and nations are composed is submitted to a crucial test. Those who adhere at all costs to truth, who cling to her though she lead them into the wilderness, find beyond it a promised land where all that they sacrifice is restored to them. Those who through superstition, or timidity, or political convenience, or pious feeling, close their eyes to fact, who cling to forms which have become shadows, and invent reasons for believing what is essentially no longer credible, escape a momentary trial only that it may return upon them again in a harder and harsher shape. They surrender themselves to conscientious emotions, and they forfeit those very emotions for which they are sacrificing their intellectual honesty as the object of their reverence becomes more palpably an idol. While the Church of Rome is losing the countries which it persuaded to refuse the Reformation, it exults in the converts which it is recovering from the nations which became Protestant. It fails to see that its success is its deepest condemnation. Protestantism alone has kept alive the sentiment of piety which, when allied with weakness of intellect, is the natural prey of superstition.—*J. A. Froude*.

Compensation.

THIS law of laws which the pulpit, the senate, and the college deny, is hourly preached in all markets and all languages, by flights of proverbs, whose teaching is as true and as omnipresent as that of birds and flies.

All things are double, one against another.—Tit for tat; an eye for an eye; a tooth for a tooth; blood for

blood; measure for measure; love for love.—Give and it shall be given you.—He that watereth shall be watered himself.—What will you have? quoth God; pay for it and take it.—Nothing venture, nothing have.—Thou shalt be paid exactly for what thou hast done, no more, no less.—Who doth not work shall not eat.—Harm watch, harm catch.—Curses always recoil on the head of him who imprecates them.—If you put a chain around the neck of a slave, the other end fastens itself round your own.—Bad counsel confounds the adviser.—The devil is an ass.

There is no den in the wild world to hide a rogue. There is no such thing as concealment. Commit a crime, and the earth is made of glass. Commit a crime, and it seems as if a coat of snow fell on the ground, such as reveals in the woods the track of every partridge and fox and squirrel and mole. You cannot recall the spoken word, you cannot wipe out the foot-track, you cannot draw up the ladder, so as to leave no inlet or clew. Always some damning circumstance transpires. The laws and substance of nature, water, snow, wind, gravitation, become penalties to the thief.

Neither can it be said, on the other hand, that the gain of rectitude must be bought by any loss. There is no penalty to virtue; no penalty to wisdom; they are proper additions of being. In a virtuous action, I properly *am*; in a virtuous act, I add to the world; I plant into deserts, conquered from chaos and nothing, and see the darkness receding on the limits of the horizon. There can be no excess to love; none to knowledge; none to beauty, when these attributes are considered in the purest sense. The soul refuses all limits. It affirms in man always an Optimism, never a Pessimism.—*Emerson*.

The Foundations of Religious Faith.

WILL is the ruling power in Man; the functions of intellect are its ministers. His worth or his worthlessness as a moral agent, must be estimated from the habitual attitude of his will. Will, however, is not wholly lawless and unconfined. It acts within prescribed limits and on fixed conditions. There are convictions of which man's mind cannot divest itself, and which his will more or less assumes in all its resolutions; though it may sometimes act in defiance of them, and by continued inattention, make them faint and dim. It is through such convictions, that the Spirit of God has immediate access to the human soul. There is, first, the sense of an agency external to man's will, and mightier than it—in which the belief in a Sovereign Mind—a God—has its source. In its essence, this sense is perhaps inextinguishable :—but as, on the one hand, it may be obscured and weakened to apparent annihilation; so, on the other, through the exercise of reason on the order and harmony of visible phenomena, and the habitual verification in them of the deeper faith which springs from the interior consciousness of mind itself,—it is capable of development into the clearest and most undoubting conviction.—There is, secondly, the sense of the broad distinction between right and wrong—as the subjects of a free choice, to be finally appropriated by the will. Whatever actions and affections dependent on will, distinguish themselves to present apprehension, as fit or unfit to be done and cherished under the circumstances given—excite in our minds a feeling of approval or disapproval which they cannot lay aside, though in particular cases, where self-interest is strongly at work, they may attempt to stifle or disguise it.—There is, thirdly, a sense of subjection to law—of responsibility for voluntary acts to a Higher Power—an apprehension of final retribution, corresponding to the moral order of the universe—which cleaves to the mind through all the sophistries of scepticism and all the shifts and difficulties of a troubled and adverse life—and in which, down to man's lowest estimate of despairing and hardened unbelief, they who have skill to probe the human conscience, may yet find undestroyed the seed of a belief in immortality. These principles of faith—these tendencies (if we may not give them a more positive name) towards a recognition of the great spiritual realities of our being—are imbedded firm and deep in the bottom of every human soul—put there by the hand of God himself—landmarks bounding in the dim region of our moral agency, which may at times be covered over and transgressed, but can never be torn up and carried away.—*J. J. Tayler*.

Superficial Religion.

It is to me one of the most pitiful of sights to see men and women whipped into religion by misfortune, as idle boys of old time were whipped into their lessons, and as lazy men are scourged by poverty to manly industry and work. These persons endure for a time, but when money comes back, when new friends fill the aching void which old ones had left, the new religion is withered and dried up, because there was no deepness of earth. So Jonah's gourd sprang up in a single night, to shelter the prophet's head, but the morning sunbeam looked on it, and it melted down and was gone. Such persons set up religion in the day of their distress, as a man holds an umbrella over his head in a summer shower, but the storm passes by, and religion is cast aside as

the umbrella, to lie with rubbish in a corner till the next storm comes, when it will be taken up again to shelter their heads, but poor and old, and dingy and rent, worthless as a shelter, and contemptible as an ornament. There are some homely lines which well describe the consciousness of such men:

"The Lord and the doctor we alike adore
Just on the brink of danger, not before;
When the danger is past, both alike are requited,—
The Lord is forgotten, and the doctor is slighted."

But with other persons, with great depth of soul, the occasion only is transient; the religion it awakens lasts for ever, and bears fruit continually. Now and then you see this in a nation, which persecution or war scourges into religion. It was so with the Hebrews, so with the founders of New-England. Have you never seen men and women whom some disaster drove to a great act of prayer, and by-and-by the disaster was forgot, but the sweetness of religion remained and warmed their soul? So have I seen a storm in latter spring; and all was black, save where the lightning tore the cloud with thundering rent. The winds blew and the rains fell, as though heaven had opened its windows. What a devastation there was! Not a spider's web that was out of doors escaped the storm, which tore up even the strong-branched oak. But ere long the lightning had gone by, the thunder was spent and silent, the rain was over, the western wind came up with its sweet breath, the clouds were chased away, and the retreating storm threw a scarf of rainbows over her fair shoulders and resplendent neck, and looked back and smiled, and so withdrew and passed out of sight. But for weeks long the fields held up their hands full of ambrosial flowers, and all the summer through the grass was greener, the brooks were fuller, and the trees cast a more umbrageous shade, because that storm passed by,—though all the rest of earth had long forgot the storm, its rainbows, and its rain.—*Theodore Parker*.

NOT they who court the public applause get their names joined in stable wedlock with fame; but they who scorn that applause, and ask only for their own soul's approbation, and the praise of God. Their names it is that live for ever.—*Ibid*.

Poetry.

To the Preachers of all the Creeds.

Cease your drowsy disputations,
Ye who'd preach the Word divine,
Pouring out your turbid waters,
When we thirst for living wine.
Speak the truth, as if you meant it,
And would turn the Wrong to Right,
Not as if you half denied it,
And mistook the Dark for Light.

Like a slow and oozy river,
Neither clear, nor broad, nor deep,
Flows your weary stream of Doctrine,
With a drone that lulls to sleep!—
Words like yours bring no conviction,
Prick no conscience, touch no heart,
And from Sin's destructive courses,
Warn no sinner to depart.

Leave your dry, unfruitful dogmas,
Faith unreasoning, credence blind,
All the little narrow circles
Where you wander, self-confined;
Plashing in the mire and puddle
Of your small, sectarian pond,
Heedless of the mighty Ocean,
And the boundless Heaven beyond!

Is there nothing more to preach of
Than the letter of the Law?
Nothing left to feed the people
But the barren husk and straw?
Nothing for the unbelievers
In a creed their souls disclaim,
But eternity of torment
And the unconsuming flame?

Nobler themes than these invite you,
If you'd throb as throbs the Time,
And would speak to hearts responsive
Words more human, more sublime!
"God is Love—and Love eternal;"—
"All things change—but nothing dies;"
Find *this* Gospel and expound it
In the Bible of the skies!

O'er the starry vault of midnight,
See the countless worlds outspread,
Homes, perchance, of nobler creatures
Than our planet ever bred;—
Larger than the Earth—and fairer,
And then limit if you can,
God's great love to one poor corner—
And one little creature, Man!

God—our God—whose works surround us,
Preaches in the summer wind,
In the tempest of the ocean,
In the silence of the mind,
In the sparkle of the planets,
In the splendour of the sun,
In the voice of all creation—
"God is Love—and God is one!"

Preaches ever and for ever,
That for him who made us all
There is neither Past nor Future,
Time, nor Space, nor Great, nor Small,
But one vast, eternal Present,
Filled with love for all that are,
From the dwellers in a dew-drop
To the peoples of a star.

"Love and infinite Progression!"
These the secrets of the sky,
Open to the humblest spirit
That but asks and wonders why;—
Shut alone from hostile churches,
Struggling each to rule, or be;
Who distress both Faith and Reason,—
Blind because they will not see.

Give, oh, give us true Religion,
Ye who'd preach the Word divine,
We reject your tepid water,
We're athirst for living wine.
Rouse the heart—awake the conscience,
Look beneath you—look above;—
Evil is but Disobedience!
God is Justice—God is Love!

—*Gamaliel Brown.*

Correspondence.

Rey. C. Voysey and Unitarianism.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have no doubt that many of your readers have read with the same pleasure as myself some of Mr. Voysey's published sermons, and those who have not had this opportunity must have rejoiced that he has had the courage to publish his opinions on the popular theology in a way at once so bold, so manly, and so self-sacrificing as to bring him to trial at the bar of the Church of England for assailing her time honoured but untenable doctrines. Perhaps, too, we have all felt that the result of his trial was a satisfactory one; for if the Establishment were broad enough to keep *him* in her bosom, why should not all religious free-thinkers be nestling there instead of incurring odium for conscientiously keeping aloof from what they hold to be false? It was satisfactory, however, to see that, although Air. Voysey publicly stated his determination not to identify himself with the Unitarian body—what other body, by the way, could he identify himself with?—that he had been preaching in some of their pulpits; and I, for one, as a Unitarian, am prepared, from the bottom of my heart to wish him god-speed in his work. It is with surprise and regret therefore, that I notice an article in the *Unitarian Herald* of July 7, on the Rev. Mr. Voysey, which, after accusing him through two columns and a half of meanness and dishonesty in having entered the Church merely to dole out heretical opinions which he had held for years *seriatim*—goes on to criticise his doctrines, accusing him, among other things, of deliberately trying to undermine the reverence of men for the Bible and their discipleship to Christ. The *Herald* is impatient

with Mr. Voysey for having enunciated his unbelief in graduated portions; yet advises him, with strange inconsistency, to maintain more of reserve in the expression of his opinions for the future. It concludes by disowning him as worthy of Unitarian fellowship.

In the following number of the *Herald*, however, Mr. W. H. Herford has a protesting letter which, if I could, I should be glad to condense for the consideration of your readers; showing, as it does, how Unitarians can compromise their position in condemning one who, like Mr. Voysey, has been and is being persecuted for opinion's sake. We have, at any rate, in the *Herald's* article an unmistakeable indication of the narrow spirit, which, under the guise of liberality would take upon itself to assign limits to religious free thought, and has, I fear, much to do with the apparently small hold which Unitarianism exercises on the public mind. Happily times are changing, and the younger representatives of the faith of Priestley, Channing and Parker are evincing a determination to join with all of every creed and nation who, whatever their opinions, strive to fulfil the two great commandments of Love to God and Love to Man. Yet is it to be feared that there are still many Unitarian Churches where, should the teacher supplement his statement of the doctrine of the Unity of God with an expression of his logically-resulting belief in the simple humanity of Christ, he would be greeted, not perhaps with a storm of indignation, but, in all probability, with cold looks and deserted pews.

To be loyally true to conscience under such circumstances requires, if I mistake not, a type of character in respect of which many and many a Unitarian Minister has something to learn from the outspoken author of "The Sling and the Stone."
Veritas.

The Tactics of Orthodoxy.

To the Editor.

SIR,—One of the commonest performances to be seen in any equestrian circus is that of a rider upon two horses who poises himself alternately with one foot on either horse, and occasionally stands with a foot on each, springing over bars and flying through hoops, to the great delight of the youngsters. This kind of exhibition always reminds me of the vagaries of orthodox theologians, but with this difference, that in the circus the fact of there being two horses is patent, whereas your artful theologian, while hopping from the stand-point of practical religion to that of dogmatic theology and back again with marvellous agility, as the pressure of an opponent's arguments may compel him, persistently maintains that the two are but one system all the while.

It may be, for example, that some thoughtful student of history, sickened with the revolting details of Arian and Trinitarian persecutions, of the doings of the Inquisition, of St. Batholomew, etc., exclaims in a burst of indignation—"This religious cant (meaning, of course, dogma) has been, I believe, the greatest curse ever inflicted upon mankind!" "What, Sir?" replies Theologian, "do you dare to attack the religion of the pure and holy Jesus? has not Christianity modified the horrors of war and of slavery; discountenanced if not destroyed some forms of loathsome vice formerly prevalent; raised the status of woman throughout Christendom?" and so on.

If, on the other hand, a Hindoo philosopher, like Keshub Chunder Sen, finds the Sermon on the Mount and the general tenor of the precepts of Jesus commending themselves so strongly to his reason and conscience that he feels himself to be in heart and mind a Christian—*hey presto!* your theologian, vaulting on the back of dogmatic theology, cries out: "Stop, Sir, before establishing your right to the title of Christian, you must confess yourself prepared to accept every word included between the covers of this Book as divinely inspired and literally true! Are you persuaded that he who was baptised by John in Jordan, the dove that hovered over his head, and the being who spoke from heaven, were really all one? Do you believe in a personal devil, an everlasting hell, the atonement, justification by faith?" and the rest of it. What, when addressed in this fashion, can a philosopher do but smile and turn away?

The Rev. John Graham has been lecturing on the Talmud and the Gospels. I have the *Herald's* report before me, from which I find that he told his hearers that "the substance of all religion and morality is love, to which Jesus in his teaching gave a universality that it had never before. That in the days of Jesus the following precept prevailed—Love thy neighbour and hate thy enemy." Then it is clear that the Jews must have utterly forgotten their own law (Leviticus xix. 18): "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And, again (v. 33): "If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, you shall not vex him—Thou shalt love him as thyself." So, too, in Ex. xxiii. 4: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." Do not these passages show that forgiveness of enemies and good-will to strangers were not quite new things to the Jews?

But accepting most cheerfully the lecturer's assertion that the glory of the teaching of Jesus was to combine

love to God and love to our neighbour, I am puzzled to know why all this abuse should be lavished upon free-thinkers and infidels? Is there a single Unitarian, Jew, Turk, Socinian, Free-thinker, Infidel, or Secularist, who will not gladly accept this teaching, and confess that the only cause for regret in the matter is, that these precepts are so rarely put in practice? I have never met with any Creed, or Confession of Faith used by Congregationalists. I cannot tell therefore what may be the lecturer's theological platform: though my familiarity with the doctrines of Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism enables me to affirm that the divines of these two churches bestride at the same time a horse (to return to my metaphor) of another colour; a very dark horse indeed. These men teach that the world is a wreck, and that the nature of man is so hopelessly and helplessly depraved, that he cannot even wish for better things without divine grace enabling him so to do. "Man, as man, and not as Jew or Gentile, is the object of God's love." Very good; but how is this compatible with the preparation of an everlasting cauldron of unquenchable fire into which millions of miserable sinners are foreknown and (as some say) foreordained to fall. Once upon a time, in one of the pleasantest parts of England, a group of young children were met on the road by a man who abruptly asked them: "Do you know where you are going?" "Oh, yes," was the prompt reply; "we are all on the way to X." "You are going to Hell," was the tremendous rejoinder with which, accompanied by a distribution of tracts of a dismal character, he left the terrified youngsters to scamper on their way. And small blame to him if he held the orthodox tenets; for, surely, it was better to scare only one poor child into heaven than to suffer all to drop unheeded into everlasting torture. And as for the gloom cast upon young minds, better were gloom for seventy years than an infinity of woe. Does Mr. Graham, believe in an everlasting hell? Let him, if he can, reconcile that belief with the statement that God is love. If he does not, and if he has no mysterious creed in the back-ground, then assuredly he need not cross swords in controversy with the Rev. Rabbi Davis. He may be assured that no modern Jew would object to the teaching of Jesus, considered as *human* teaching—to be tested and criticised as that of any other moralist.

Some one will say—here is nothing new; we have heard something like this often before. Certainly, you have; but in religion, as in politics, one must keep "pegging away," as President Lincoln said. No great reform has been carried during these forty years without reiterated argument, vehement knocking at the door of the House of Commons, and still more vehement knocking at the door of "another place." What said the unjust Judge? "Though I fear not God, nor regard man, yet, because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me." To pass off creeds and articles under cover of the personal character of Jesus, is the "stronghold of superstition:" it is, therefore, the business of all friends of free and practical religion to dissolve this unnatural and factitious alliance, to point out how much of "sweetness and light" there is in the one, how much of bitterness and gloom in the others; looking forward to a time, however distant, when the one shall be really the rule of life among civilised men, while the others shall have become, like Druidical remains and mediæval monuments, mere objects of interest and research to the student of the Past. Scrutator.

Editorial Notices.

The cost of Printing and Publishing the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A. F. R. P. steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication, J to be sent to the Editor's residence, 245 Macquarie Street, Sydney.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office to be made payable to the Editor, who will be happy to receive Subscriptions for the New Volume, and to supply back numbers.

Well-bound volumes of the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, price 7s. 6d. each, can be obtained at the Publisher's, or from the Editor.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, Oct. 16, 1871.

The Australian Free Religious Press

Edited by James Pillars, B.A.

"No inquirer can fix a direct and clear-sighted gaze towards Truth, who is casting side glances all the while on

Notes.

THE recent annual demonstration of the Congregational Union of New South Wales, a flattering six-column notice of which appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, afforded the Rev. G. G. Howden an opportunity of incorporating with his presidential address an announcement of his undiminished confidence in the well-known "Evidences" for the truth of the Bible and of Christianity, which, as he believes, will secure these precious verities from the successful attacks of unbelievers to the end of time. He, it is true, confesses himself both distressed and alarmed at the boldness with which men nowadays, "speak of the Gospels as developed from beautiful myths, of the absurdity of a belief in miracles, of the doctrine of a Special Providence as wholly untenable," etc.; at the audacity too, with which religious sceptics are wont to set aside the celebrated theses of Paley, and the still more famous arguments of Butler, as old-fashioned and illogical. Yet how comforting to reflect that whole libraries of books have been written in defence of the Divine Revelation, not one of which has been replied to; and that although the "enemies of the Bible are for ever shouting as if the victory were theirs, . . . the grand old fortress still stands in its own majestic grandeur with a strength that resists the foes of hell, with a beauty that awakens the praise of heaven. . . . They gather about it," do these troublesome but impotent enemies of God's Word, "in their rage and fury; one swears at the architecture as not in accordance with modern taste; another imagines he has discovered a weak part, not seeing the strength that part derives from its connection with the whole; another sends forth his shafts at the wall, from which they fall harmlessly to the ground; while others theorise about overcoming it, and rejoice in their theories as if they were reduced to practice. And so, elated with conceit, they sing their song of victory, when not a stone has been disturbed on the walls of the fortress, and the thousands who enjoy their protection enjoy that protection still." So firm and unshaken, indeed, is Mr. Howden's faith in the "Evidences" which, as he believes, attest the truth of the popular estimate of Christianity and the Bible, that he can well afford to lay aside his weapons, and leave unbelievers to do their worst. Be it so, then. Still, with a view to making the list of Evidences as complete and effective as possible, we would suggest to him the advisableness of associating therewith some account of the tendency of Christianity to perpetuate itself in spite of the damaging apologies advanced on its behalf by the majority of its accredited defenders. The divinity of Christianity—the divinity of its underlying and imperishable essence—is, we believe, more than established by the dignified persistency with which it pursues its career of conquest, while its professed friends are unconsciously doing their utmost to bring the whole thing into contempt. Mr. Howden, as his address—with its prevailing distrust of, and tirade against, the intellectual tendencies of our age, its whining allusions to some Devil's ditch or other as awaiting the earnest truth-seeker at every turn, and, above all, its insolent *procul este profani*, as applicable to all heterodox religionists—clearly proves, has yet, with thousands of others, to learn this important lesson. "It is to be remarked," he observes, "that the enemies of the Bible use as their weapons the judgments of carnal and worldly minds, and are unable to discern the spiritual and the heavenly." Perhaps in his next public utterance, he will be good enough to give us some idea as to the exact amount of spirituality that would be required to elevate an *unbelieving* Martineau to the rank of a *believing* Mr. Howden.

Inter alia, at the seventh "sederunt" of the late General Assembly of the "Fathers and Brethren" of the Presbytery of New South Wales, was discussed, with becoming gravity, the question of "Othe best means of removing hindrances to early dedication to God." The main feature of the Presbytery's machinery for accomplishing this important object is, it seems, its 67 Sunday-schools, comprising 3795 scholars and a staff of 427 teachers. From the Committee's Report, however, we learn that only 49 per cent, of the latter are in "full communion with the Church;" nor could the Rev. J. Bonthorne, in commenting on this "painful fact," understand how any could offer their services as teachers who had not "openly acknowledged their Redeemer;" just as if the teacher's chance of influencing for good the youthful heart and mind were to be measured, not by his moral and intellectual fitness for the task, but by his ostentatious observance of the forms, and his libness in repeating the shibboleths, of an exploded orthodoxy. The Rev. P. N. Mackray considered that the Presbytery should "show practically, that only the regenerate are the proper subjects for Baptism," and counselled, accordingly, that the ordinance should be denied to children whose parents were non-communicants; though why these unsprinkled babes should be onsigned hereafter to the fiery fate decreed to them by the Westminster Confession, simply because their parents were not saints of the strict Presbyterian pattern, the reverend gentleman did not deem it necessary to say. Dr. Fullerton also thought that parents soliciting baptism for their children should be required to give evidence of their own regenerate condition. He eared, however, that anything like compulsory action on the part of the Church in the matter would often be sturdily resisted, and, in

all probability, result. in numerous secessions from the Presbyterian fold. So, too, thought he Rev. A. Thomson, who—fairly letting the cat out of the bag—contended that the Kirk ought not to be outdone by any Church in the matter of beating up scholars for its Sunday Schools. This we may readily admit; but is it not astonishing, and pitiable as astonishing, that a conclave of reverend others should, in their united effort to take thought for the religious culture of the rising generation, entirely lose sight of that religious influence of the Home Circle, from which the holiest results—"the eager outlook into life, deep in its early flush of glory; the opening awe, the thrilling touch of things invisible; the dawning perception of the divineness of truth, and nearness of the living God"—may, under true parental guidance, be expected to spring? To ourselves—and we say it dispassionately—the Sunday-school system, considered as a means for unfolding the religious instincts of childhood, is something more than a failure. It has no doubt shown itself fully equal to the manufacture of multitudes of little saints and sectaries of the several ecclesiastical patterns; but the Churches that organise and carry on Sunday Schools expressly for this purpose have yet to learn that the mind of a child, in being crammed with scraps of catechism, scripture and dogma, is cruelly robbed of its power to rise to the regions of a holy and elevating faith.

THOUGH rigidly orthodox on other religious questions, Lord Shaftesbury, we are glad to see, has resolved to stand aloof from the extravagancies of Sabbatarianism. Unlike Dr. Cairns and the rest of the good people in Melbourne who, if they could, would remorselessly deprive the working man's one day out of seven of all its attractions, he regards Sunday as an occasion for "physical and mental recreation," for "social intercourse and innocent enjoyments," and wishes for no more agreeable spectacle on Sunday afternoon than that of the working man and his family disporting themselves under the open canopy of heaven. Dr. Cairns, again, at the late Sabbatarian demonstration in Melbourne, could name no better reason for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest than the creation of the world in six days, and the Divine Artificer's cessation from labour on the seventh day. Lord Shaftesbury, however, wisely eschewing all such intolerable nonsense, remarks: "Those who are engaged in works of toil, whether it be of the brain or of the hand, call out for repose, and if it be said that rest is necessary for the human mind and the human body, I ask you if ever there was a period in the history of the world, in the history of this nation, when it was more necessary than at the present moment? Is it not an observation of every one that we are living with immense rapidity? Is it not an observation of every one that we are crowding into a year the events of a century? Is it not an observation of every one that the mad competition of trade keeps every one upon tenter hooks, keeps every one in the furnace, keeps every one in such a state of excitement that the nervous system is shaken? Everybody knows that in the days in which we live the moral system, the intellectual system, is more greatly disturbed than ever, owing to the wild competition in every department of trade and art in which men's minds are busily engaged." Seldom, if ever, have we seen the argument for the religious and political observance of the Christian Sunday, apart from all speculations as to its divine origin and authority, more irrefutably stated.

The Bible, the Whole Bible, and Nothing but the Bible.

AGAIN has the editor of the *Protestant Standard* been induced to do battle for the Bible, and to charge with all his chivalry its pestilent rejectors; in which class, without the slightest hesitation or apology, he ventures to place our esteemed friend the editor of the *Australian Free Religious Press*.

We have been long enough acquainted with the Standard to know that its editor is favored with a very fair share of assurance; but till we had read his recent article on the Bible and its Rejectors, we were not aware, that occasionally he could be as impertinent as he is arrogant. For the first time in our lives, we learn that before we can decide as to the force of an opponent's arguments, it is necessary to know whether or not he has paid his printer. And should he happen to be a preacher who discourses on Sunday evenings, it is equally desirable, it appears, that, either before he announces the text, or shortly after, he should make it manifest to the congregation that the bill for the gas has been duly liquidated. As it is scarcely credible that any one within range of the amenities of civilised society could possibly be so grossly impertinent, we submit the paragraph to which we refer *verbatim et literatim*:—"We suppose such a man as Pillars must find readers enough of his 'More Light' lucubrations to pay his printer, and hearers enough of his Sunday evening harangues to pay for his gas, and keep him in countenance, or else he would give up his trade." Of course, much will not be expected in the way of reasoning, from one, who, with such admirable taste, discharges the functions of a genuine Paul Pry; but on this point, all that we have to advance is, "Blessed are they that expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed."

It is admitted on all hands that the Bible is pregnant with difficulties that defy solution, and with

contradictions that are at once decided and palpable. From this cause it often becomes the fertile source of serious differences that too frequently degenerate into discreditable quarrels. But why should it be so? The instructor seriously intent on correcting what he may honestly deem erroneous, will, if he be wise, adopt a conciliatory tone, the very opposite of that which characterises the bearing of our pugnacious Contemporary. He has no doubt whatever of the correctness of his own opinion, and is equally certain that we are wrong; but surely difference of opinion does not justify the exhibition of an arrogant spirit.

But he is not merely arrogant; his blind zeal forbids him the exercise of even the vulgar virtue of common fairness. He has thought proper to place Hume and Mr. Pillars in the same category, as respects their estimate of the Bible; showing that other he is wholly unacquainted with the writings that he condemns, or that his power of reckless assertion can only be the result of unflagging practice. But so it is. Only venture to deal with any one of the many questionable passages of Scripture, and forthwith are we assailed with a senseless accusation of Atheism, or some other *ism* equally combustible. We are told, *ex cathedra*, that, at our peril, we must believe the whole of the Bible—all or none. We concede that if the Bible be altogether the result of divine inspiration, it would not be too much to claim implicit belief for every part of it. But this is the very point at issue; and we are not only prepared to take the negative side of the question, but to show as well, that if the rejection of certain portions of the Scriptures be criminal, the editor of the Standard is either *partieeps criminis*, or entitled to a billet at Tarban Creek, or some other institution open to the reception of harmless lunatics.

But above measure should we be gratified could we but induce our Contemporary to deal with one of the indisputable contradictions of Scripture. Let him try his hand at the *utrum horum* if he dare. Let him but inform us which branch of the alternative he accepts and which he rejects, and at once we claim him as one of us. Let him do just what he likes with it, so that he moves in it at all, and our purpose is answered: our position will be fully vindicated.

But we are too well acquainted with the *modus operandi* of our censor to expect that he will ever venture to come to close quarters. He may pretend to answer us, and tell us what we are or what we are not, all of which is foreign to the point; or he may indulge in a little innocent egotism, illustrative of his many commanding excellencies, which is just-as pertinent to the matter in hand; but as to grappling with the subject, it is out of the question: he knows a trick worth two of that. But to proceed to our task.

We need not give chapter and verso for the scriptural declarations of God's invisibility. This is set forth in various passages, and will not, we presume, be controverted. We do not know if it will be any satisfaction to the editor of the Standard to be informed that we as firmly believe in God's invisibility as he does; yet such is the fact. But supposing this point settled and mutually agreed upon, what becomes of the unutterable nonsense of boxing up Moses in the cleft of a rock, lest he should see the face of an invisible God. Now, which account is the true one? Is God visible, or invisible, or is he both? Our contemporary has a fair chance of stultifying himself will he but avail himself of it? We are told, however, and with a gravity that fairly capsizes our own, that Moses *did* see the back parts of the Deity, and we can only regret that the Lawgiver was not an artist. A photograph of an invisible God, although it only represented the back part of the Deity, would have been a curiosity for the ingenious of the first order. The quasi inspired penman tells us that no man can see God's face and live. But we cannot help thinking that the clever fellow that could see the face of an invisible God is entitled to a premium rather than be subject to punishment. But who fails to see that the whole fabrication instead of being an emanation from the Deity is an unmistakable exemplification of the thin *pabulum*—the pap—prepared by designing or grossly superstitious men for the baby-hood of humanity? That God Almighty should come all the way from Heaven for the express purpose of exhibiting his back parts to Moses—his back parts, like all the rest of him, being invisible—is a morsel that we prefer handing over for the delectation of the credulous, whose faith, we trust, may meet with adequate reward.

The fact that, in the opinion of the best biblical scholars, the original of *me back parts* should be translated *me afterwards*, diminish as it may the grossness of the old Hebrew conception of the Deity, as set forth in this passage, in nowise lessens the general force of our contributor's argument. Othodox Christians affirm that the Bible, being the Word of God, is wholly free, necessarily so, from self-contradictions. Yet, we are expected to overlook the glaring self-contradiction, among many others, that God, "whom no man had seen nor can see" (1 Tim. vi. 16), and "whom no man hath seen at any time" (John i. 18), visibly and tangibly revealed himself to men on various occasions.—ED.

But proceed we to another specimen of these biblical absurdities. Inspiration, so called, declares that no man can see God's face and live. But Jacob declared that he had seen God face to face—that is, God's face—*yet his life was preserved*. Contradiction again. In one case, the sight of God's invisible face would be fatal to the beholder; but the other side of the picture shows that Jacob was blessed with a pair of eyes that could grasp the Invisible, whilst he himself was preserved. Is there anything in Dr. Smith's Mythological Dictionary more absurd than the account of Jacob's wrestling with the Almighty all night long, till the mortal was touched in the hollow of the thigh (wherever that may be); when, it appears, he confessed himself vanquished, and gave in like

a man. Jacob, it is evident, was under the impression that his antagonist was the Deity himself; but it must be admitted that opinion is not uniform on this point. Hosea styles the celestial wrestler an Angel at first, but afterwards Jehovah. The celebrated commentator Brown is of opinion that he was none other than the Son of God. In the first place, then, we read of the Son of God wrestling with Jacob; centuries after we find him in the lap of the Virgin Mary, as a babe; and lastly, according to Torquati, a Catholic priest, holding forth at Rome a short time since, Pope Pius the IX is none other than Jesus Christ in the flesh again. When, in the name of common sense, shall we ever get to the end of this long chapter of absurdity.

Reverting, however, to the contradiction which the Bible offers to itself in respect of God's risibility, we now invite the *Standard* to make his election, and tell us which is the true account. We know very well that he will demur, for it is evident that the rejection of either the visible or the invisible will entitle him to row in our boat, a position that, we are aware, he eschews with horror.

But in spite of its blemishes, we hold the Scriptures to be the faithful record of the labours of good men, devoted to the improvement of their species by circulating a sound morality. Some months ago, we ventured to criticise a portion of Scripture in the *Free Press*, when we were at once charged with asserting what we never dreamt of. "We never said," to repeat our remark, "that the Bible was nothing but old wives' fables; and if we ever refer to the improbable and ridiculous therein contained, it is only with the view of showing that the Bible is not entitled to be considered a work of plenary inspiration."

Pax.

Cruelty in Belief and Cruelty in Practice.

"THERE are many marvellous things," said the Athenian poet, "and none more marvellous than man;" and in nothing is the marvel of man's nature more potently displayed than in his capability of development into the extremes of high and low, downwards below the level of the beast, upwards to something a little lower than the angels. Could we but see disclosed before us the secrets of the different houses in the quietest streets of our quietest towns, what a revelation would be made! Here we should see order and decency, harmony and love; while a few yards off we should behold strife and selfishness, sensuality and filth. And yet there may have been a time when these men and women, now so different, were all apparently innocent, unsophisticated children, playing in happy homes; and no one can say how far a change of circumstances, in respect of early training and associations, might have kept the wretched grovelling sot a decorous citizen, and, *vice versa*, have plunged the now respectable husband and father into the gulf of misery and degradation. What man of culture in this our century, whose nature has been elevated by a large infusion of that "sweetness and light" on which Mr. Matthew Arnold so eloquently enlarges, can fail to look back with wonder and disgust upon the amusements which were in vogue two or three centuries ago. Imagine decent Christian men—noblemen, gentlemen and clowns alike—watching with keenest interest the struggles of two game cocks, armed with artificial spurs to make their attacks more sanguinary and destructive; and this so-called sport being regarded, not as the disgusting peculiarity of some eccentric human monster, but as a national institution! Fancy, moreover, decent men, fathers of families, taking a horrid pleasure in the savage encounters of dogs and bears, or dogs and bulls. We seem, when reading of such things, to be contemplating the actions of heathen savages, of men a long way removed from ourselves in thought and feeling. Yet Macaulay (if we recollect aright) states with bitter irony that bear-baiting, even when abolished by the Puritans, was so abolished, not because it gave *pain* to the bear, but because it gave *pleasure* to the spectators.

If men in past times were brutal in their amusements, we may reasonably expect to find that they were brutal in their punishment of crime. Small demand was there then for Refuges and Reformatories. We extract from an old number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* the following account of the execution of one of a set of ruffians (called *assommeurs*), who, in 1742, spread terror throughout Paris: "Would you know how France was trained to tolerate the horrible sights of the Place de la Revolution? The culprit, named Desinoulins, aged 17, had been condemned to be broken on the wheel alive. Accordingly on Tuesday, December 18, he was brought at midday to the Place de la Grève, and the executioner, after having broken with an iron bar his arms, his fore-arms, his thighs, his legs and his chest, fastened him upon a small carriage wheel, with the broken limbs brought round behind his back and with his face toward the sky." He was, says Barbier (the author from whom the Reviewer derives his information), "so stalwart a youth and so resolute withal, that he remained twenty-two hours alive. And the aforesaid Desmoulins took several draughts of water and suffered much. Finally, seeing that he would not die and that the process was tedious, the officer in charge sent and asked permission of the authorities to have him strangled, which was done this morning, Wednesday the 19th, at 10 o'clock, otherwise perhaps he would be there still. His comrades and others of the same stamp will take notice that we are not disposed to jest with them." Shades of Bentham and Romilly! this thing was done in open day in a public

square of the most tragical of European cities, and honest citizens, we suppose, witnessed it, and went home to eat and drink, and slept placidly through the night whilst this poor wretch was groaning in his agony! We spare to recount the horrible details of the fate of Damieus, who, for attempting to assassinate that "most religious and gracious king" Louis XV. was torn in pieces by horses, a mode of punishment which even Livy, the Roman historian, writing before the advent of Christianity, characterises as monstrous and inhuman, and alien to the nature of the Romans. Nor will we do more than allude to the revolting particulars of the English punishment of high treason, the hanging, cutting down *alive*, disembowelling, quartering, etc.—details which defiled the pages of the Statute Book long after the penalties had dropped out of use; besides which we may mention the minor punishments of cutting off the right hand and searing the mutilated stump with a red-hot iron, the slitting of noses and cropping of ears, the pillory and other barbarous inventions of refined cruelty.

Now, it would be a mere waste of time to revive the recollections of these sickening brutalities, were it not that these practices tend to cast a light upon what would otherwise seem most portentous and unnatural—viz., the prevalence in those days of very gloomy views of man's nature and destiny. We are not about to quote from any creed or formula of religious belief. We prefer to take, as an example, the notion of the state of the world and of its future prospects which is tacitly assumed in, and which forms in fact the basis of, John Bunyan's world-famous allegory. Be it understood that we do not mean to disparage the story itself, viewed merely as a story; all that we have to do with on the present occasion is the truthfulness of the allegorical representation of the world in which we live. Christian, be it observed, leaves his wife and children and starts on a pilgrimage. Now, in a case of shipwreck, there are few of us who would not think better of the man who, realising the extent of the peril, should resolutely persist in remaining to share the fate of his wife and family, than of one who seeks his own individual safety by running away. This point, however, we will not press. But it ought to be noticed that, whereas our pilgrim leaves a whole city of Destruction behind him, all whom he encounters in his Progress may easily be counted on the fingers. One companion only, Faithful, joins him in the early part of his career, and when he has suffered death in Vanity Fair, only one other friend, Hopeful, accompanies Christian to the Celestial Gate. Nay, counting even Christian's wife and children and all their friends, Messrs. Valiant, Honest, Feeble-mind, etc., whose adventures form the second part of the allegory, we have but a very small band of successful candidates for the Celestial City, whilst the multitudinous denizens of the City of Destruction, of Vanity Fair, and of other places lying off the road, are abandoned to the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. In other words, good old John Bunyan plainly implies that the righteous are a very small minority, but that the majority of mankind deserve to be damned and are damned accordingly. Now, we doubt whether amongst civilised men the most fertile imagination ever invented anything so horrible before or since. Of the two great nations whose influence has told so largely upon European intellect and morals, we may safely say that they conceived nothing of the kind. They had indeed their Elysium for the good and their Tartarus for the bad; but they did not consign an overwhelming majority of mankind to the latter; and their classical Tartarus, with its Sisyphus heaving with much toil and sweat a large rock up a hill down which it continually rebounds, and its daughters of Danaus vainly attempting to fill a sieve with water, was but a meagre and spiritless conception compared to the abyss of flame in which that eminent father of the early Church, the pious Tertullian, exultantly expected to see writhing the princes, philosophers and poets of the ancient world. We do not pretend to say how far these cruel notions of man's destiny gave a sanction to cruel practice, or vice versa. Such a point is as hard to determine as the oft-mooted question whether representative men, such as Voltaire, may be considered as forming the age in which they live, or as being themselves the out-come of that age. But it may safely be predicted that there is a kind of mutual relation between cruelty in belief and cruelty in practice; and that men who honestly and thoroughly accept a great degree of vindictive anger as an attribute of the Deity whom they profess to worship, will not hesitate to use much hardness and harshness in their dealings with one another. And why should they not? What is such a small matter as poverty, or stripes, or imprisonment, or the pillory, or even an *auto-da-fe*, compared with the infinite destiny of a man for weal or woe. And thus dogmatism, pushed to its logical conclusion, makes persecution a duty.

We, however, in this year 1871, have changed all this. We have abolished cock-fighting and bear-baiting, and fire ashamed of prize-fighting; we have reserved the punishment of the lash, in a very slight form comparatively, for a few of the lowest criminals; many able and well-meaning people have entered upon a crusade against the gallows; and even the guillotine, despite the dreadful associations attached, to its indiscriminate use in Revolutionary France, was originally invented in order to shorten the pangs of condemned culprits. Further, we are gradually coming to look upon war, not as a grand historical game of chess to be played for the amusement and vain-glory of a few ambitious princes and politicians, but in its bearings upon the fortunes of the peoples who invariably pay the heaviest part of the cost. We are learning to appreciate the value of men as men, not in proportion to rank; to bring education down to the lowest, and to prevent as far as possible the continual growth of a dangerous class of professional criminals; and finally, our great novelist, lately deceased, has earned a wide-spread and well-merited popularity chiefly by bringing all the light of his

genius to bear upon the fortunes and misfortunes, the sorrows and joys, of grooms, coachmen, fishermen, pedlers, etc.—a set of people heretofore reckoned beneath the dignity of literature, yet, strange to say, no one dare venture to tamper with the Athanasian Creed.

Jesus taught men to say, "Our Father;" and, in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, has left behind a most touching picture of the feelings of a father towards an erring son.

Orthodox theology, finding the Parable of the Prodigal Son too benign for its taste, will probably quote as a set-off that of Dives and Lazarus in the very next chapter of the same Gospel. It is, however, not our business, as rational Theists, to find the means of reconciling apparent discrepancies between different parts of the Scriptures. The tenour of the former Parable seems to us as genial and benignant as that, of the latter seems gloomy and despondent. Put we no more undertake to harmonise the two, than we can pretend to explain how the same being who blessed little children, wept over Jerusalem, and prayed for his murderers, could have withered a fig-tree with his curse, because it did not bear fruit out of season.

And yet, in their Confessions of Faith, men go on persistently imputing to the Infinite Father of all a never-ending thirst for vengeance, which assuredly could never be found rankling in the heart of any humane father towards the most abandoned and depraved of sons. To inferences drawn, however, from the conduct of a human father towards his offspring, a very ingenious reply has been made, for which orthodox theologians are indebted (if we mistake not) to the late Dr. Mansel, Dean of St. Pauls.

It amounts to this—that man, as a finite being, cannot be a judge of an infinite being, and, as a consequence, although the finite goodness of a human father may not be consistent with a particular line of conduct (*e.g.* the everlasting punishment of a rebellious son), yet infinite goodness may be consistent therewith. To this the best rejoinder has been made by John Stuart Mill: "We cannot conceive infinite space; but does anyone ever suppose that it does not possess all the properties by which space is characterized. Does anyone imagine that in ranging through it we might arrive at some region, where, though no body intervened, motion was impossible, or where the sum of two sides of a triangle was less than the third side. If in ascribing goodness to God, I do not mean the goodness of which I have some knowledge, but an incomprehensible attribute of some incomprehensible substance, which for aught I know may be a totally different quality from that which I love and venerate [and even must, if Mr. Mansel is to be believed, be in some important particulars opposed to this], what do I mean by calling it goodness, and what reason have I for venerating it?" We may add that Dr. Mansel proves, if anything, too much, by his ingenious theory; for if we may not reason by analogy from the finite father to the infinite, what meaning is there in the words "Our Father," and what comfort are men to derive from that cherished appellation?

Of a truth we live in strange times. We have one set of accredited public instructors telling us one set of things on Sundays in spoken words, and another set of public instructors telling us quite a different set of things in printed words at other times. We are supposed to believe the statements of the one under heaviest penalties, and we really believe what the others inform us, under no compulsion whatever. What patent absurdity is here! How absurd is it for intelligent men to read with interest, to weigh and to criticise the speculations of Huxley, Darwin, or Lubbock, upon the origin of the forms of animal life now existing on this globe of ours, if the key to the mystery lies in the sonorous deliverance of any parson who has been enlarging as usual upon the fall of man, discoursing about Adam and Eve and the serpent, as if these were as well-known historical personages as Napoleon and Bismarck. Moreover this kind of organised hypocrisy which people practice on Sundays is not, as some may fancy, a mere harmless conventionality. Religion should be practical. But being thus bound up with much that men no longer believe it cannot become practical. This is the nineteenth century of Christianity. Yet within twenty years we have had five wars in Europe and a great war in America. Of all vices cruelty, one would suppose, must be especially alien to Christianity. Did not Jesus say, "Love your enemies, bless those that curse you?" Yet recent events have shown us that, in one of the most civilised countries in Christendom, men, even in the hour of triumph, have not learnt to carry out in practice such a modified form of Christ's teaching as is comprised in the following: "Do not shoot prisoners in cold blood; do not kill your enemies first and tell lies against them afterwards to justify your barbarity; give them the benefit of a fair trial; and in the torrent of your rage, remember that they are men, not wild beasts or venomous reptiles."

Hector.

The Miraculous.

THE etymology of the word Miracle teaches us that it is something wondrous, and for the moment inexplicable. It may be all this, however, and still be neither preternatural nor supernatural. The miracles recorded in Scripture are wondrous enough, and, for the most part, are something more than merely supernatural. They are decidedly antinatural, and, therefore, as our God is the God of Nature,—as Nature is

God's art,—we hesitate to accept the teaching that represents the Deity as *vis-a-vis* to himself. It is true that
God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;

but this does not justify the presumption that he will move in direct antagonism to his own laws. God and Nature must necessarily harmonise; their antagonism is impossible.

With the unfairness characteristic of the *Standard*, he contends that because the Deity is represented as unable to operate in direct opposition to Nature, there is, therefore, an unwarrantable limit placed to his potency,—in a word, that it implies a denial of God's omnipotence. The objection is perfectly childish, and as rational as if, because it was alleged that a good man could not, under given circumstances, perpetrate what a perfectly bad man would not hesitate to do, it was contended that the good man was unwarrantably reduced to the dimensions of a genuine imbecile.

A. well-known Roman poet would not tolerate the Deity on the *tapis* unless there was something to be effected worthy of a god:

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus Inciderit.

Let us bear this in mind whilst adverting to a miracle of the first class, involving nothing less than Sun and Moon, and Earth and Stars, and all Creation. A handful of Jews were busily engaged in braining some ragged Gentiles, and to aid and assist in this very important affair the Deity was invoked, and forthwith operated in a way that indicated the undoubted presence of the Omnipotent. The shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz, was arrested it is true; but that was merely a trifle in the great account. The great clock of Nature was stopped. The law of gravitation was suspended for the nonce; and Sun and Moon, and Earth and Stars would have gone to ruin had not Deity been present to superintend this magnificent operation in favor of two or three thousand obscure Israelites.

When God created man, he supplied him with the requisite amount of intelligence, either in the form of instinct or reason, to deal with the laws of Nature; but had they not been permanent and invariable, they would have been a constant source of difficulty, instead of assistance, to him. We have referred to the law of gravitation : we should be glad to know whenever there was any genuinely authentic account of its variation. Astronomers have made it the basis of calculation up to the time and beyond the time of Christ, and so far, at any rate, has it proved to be invariable in its operation, and free of the shadow of a change. More ancient than the Sun,—than all suns,—gravitation retains Sun, Moon and Stars in their ordained courses, and with a grasp second only to that of Omnipotence. But all-powerful though it be, in the service of God's creatures, it is as delicate in its pressure as it is potent. It attunes the zephyr to its softest sigh—incarnadines the cheek of beauty with its loveliest hues, and guarantees to man his salubrity and a thousand unnumbered and innumerable blessings beside. And whenever was this admirable mechanism out of order or going wrong? Maugre the sacred record, we have no doubt whatever that the behaviour of the sun-dial of Ahaz is erroneously reported. The shadow on that sun-dial, depend upon it, was *semper eadem* in its record of the progress of the sun in its diurnal march westward. But let us suppose that gravitation pressed unequally for a single week in Australia, and in consequence, that it required double the quantity of wool to raise the lb. weight than was before wanted to produce the same effect. What endless confusion would be the result of such a catastrophe; for were things to resume their old course in a week's time, where is the guarantee that the same irregularity would not again afflict the commercial world?

But for a moment let us revert to the great biblical miracle of all, which, without any apology for saying so, is, in our estimation, no miracle at all. The advent of Jesus Christ was natural enough, if man would have allowed it to remain so. But forgetting the *nee deus intersit* of Horace, Deity was brought upon the stage for no other earthly purpose, that we can discover, except to show what was very well known before, namely, that men, in their readiness to swallow the absurdest fictions, are, for the most part, fools. Dreaming a dream, Joseph the carpenter is represented by the Gospels as being half-witted enough to believe that his wife, the Virgin Mary, was with child by the Angel Gabriel; and this same story we ourselves are called upon to believe at the peril of our salvation. Well, at the peril of our salvation, we will most decidedly reject the whole affair as a miserable fabrication. God would not comport himself as he is represented to have done if he could; nay, we maintain (and are fully aware of what we are saying) that he could not—his power being limited by moral considerations—if he would.

We are not, however, so far hostile to miracles as to deny their possibility. Indeed, we are in a position to tender evidence in verification of an apparent impossibility that occurred when we were at school; and we trust that its narration may prove sufficiently interesting to repay the trouble of perusal. One of the many large boarding schools in the county of Bedford was, many years ago, under the superintendence of the Rev. George Keely, a Baptist minister of high repute amongst his co-religionists. One evening the school was in the dining room discussing a light supper, when the Domine appeared in the principal doorway. "Gentlemen !" he exclaimed, at the top of his voice. The hum of conversation instantly subsided, and Mr. Keely went on.

"Gentlemen ! I have the pleasure to announce that the Apostle Paul, from the other world, will occupy my pulpit on "Wednesday evening next, at the usual hour." He bowed, turned on his heel, and disappeared." Why ! what can he mean ?" was the universal query, which Joe Jaques disposed of very summarily by declaring, very unreservedly, that it was a lie. This was cutting the knot certainly; but Joe's solution was universally declined. No! no! Mr. Keely would not lie. Still, as no other explanation was attempted, it was agreed to wait till Wednesday night, when it was hoped the mystery would be cleared up. Wednesday night came, and so did the Reverend Mr. Paul, a Baptist minister from the United States of North America. The Rev. Mr. Paul was employed on a mission from the Baptist Churches in America to the Baptist Churches in England. He was therefore properly styled an apostle. We were in the Old world, he came from the New. We were in one world, he came from the other. Therefore, the Apostle Paul from the other world preached to us on the Wednesday evening that it was announced he would do so, and thereby perpetrated as genuine a miracle as the very best of them.

Libra.

Hindrances to Progress in Theology.

THE principal cause for the slow progress of religious thought is undoubtedly fear—blind, unreasoning, superstitious fear—which extends its influence over all persons not yet redeemed from its curse. Fear has been the prime and most effective motive power in nearly all, if not all, the religions of the world up to the present time. In some of them its agency was overwhelming. God, or the gods, were represented in an awful aspect full of vindictiveness, revenge, and cruelty. Men trembled at the thought of them. Their religion became a mere effort to appease the divine displeasure, or to purchase the divine favour. Oriental speculations had considerably modified these conceptions when Christianity arose and became (at all events as presented by its founders) the gentlest form of faith the world then had known. The teaching of both Christ and Paul, so far as it is ascertainable, presented the character of God in a benign relation to the world, and encouraged trust and love rather than fear. One dark and gloomy doctrine was still retained, which although neutralised in the loving spirits and teaching of these noble men, became developed into fearful forms under the influence of the fiery and dark minds which succeeded them. I refer, of course, to the doctrine of eternal punishment. That doctrine I am compelled to own both Paul and Christ distinctly taught. I should be glad to think that the philanthropic apostle, and above all that the gentle, loving Jesus had given no countenance to such an immoral doctrine. But all honest criticism forbids me from doing so. The methods of criticism adopted by those who hold the contrary conclusion seem to me altogether subversive of rational interpretation, and would leave every document at the mercy of the interpreter.

Now, the doctrine they sanctioned, and which the whole of the New Testament teaches or recognises, has ever since been made more or less an efficient instrument of terror. In the hands of the best men of the church it has been used merely for the purpose of restraining vice or stimulating faith. But the darker spirits have used it with Satanic power to mould men to their will. Especially has this been the case in times of doubt, heresy and schism. Then with all the vehemence of eloquence, and with all the invention of art, its awful, sulphurous terrors have been drawn forth before the affrighted imaginations of men, in the expectation that the fear of the horrible torments of an endless life might preserve them within the orthodox fold of Christ. In the present day such representations are much modified, and the fear arising out of them is consequently less active. The genteel, tolerably-educated minister of your city churches would not venture to deal out flames and fiery darkness as his fathers did. It is only in some out of the way parish, situated at what seems the world's end, in some little conventicle where the preacher is innocent of a day's schooling, that you now hear of eternal damnation in all the fulness of its horrors. Yet the influence of it has a strong hold of men's, and especially of women's feelings.

Fear has always restrained inquiry. The anathemas of the church long held back the mind of Europe from inquiry into the Protestant dogmas. "What if the Church's dogmas should prove to be true? The eternal perdition would be incurred by the doubting of her creed." The same fear virtually operates now." One's first concern is the salvation of the soul. What if one exposed it to jeopardy by pursuing these inquiries about the incarnation, the atonement, the inspiration and authority of the Bible? Leave such questions alone, and tread not on such dangerous ground."

Such dangerous ground!—that is of course, assuming, before the inquiry, that these orthodox dogmas are true. But what if they be untrue? Which will be the dangerous ground then? And how can you tell whether they be true or untrue until you have thoroughly investigated the matter? Should they prove to be untrue, and untrue I thoroughly believe them to be, they must be working intellectual and moral mischief in your souls. For every lie entails intellectual and moral mischief. But it is of no use to tell a large portion of the orthodox this. The fear

of losing the soul has so taken possession of the feelings that it shuts out all reason, all common sense, and leaves them the miserable victims of their superstitious delusions. They turn a deaf ear to all argument, evidence, and proof of every kind, and see nothing but the hazard of eternal woe in the questionings of reason. They have no confidence in the divine fatherhood that the gospel of John tells them about;—no confidence that the God of truth will guide aright the mind seeking to know the truth, much less have they any confidence in the rational faculties with which man is endowed, and in the certainty that all honest inquiry must bring a blessing of some kind with it. But that grim devil the ignorance of barbarous times conjured into existence, and those dreaded torments over which he presides, frighten them out of their seven senses into the irrational act of clinging tenaciously, as if for their life, to the unexamined dogmas of orthodoxy. One grieves to see the gentle nature of women so abused, but grows indignant when men, pretending to a higher intellect and a stronger understanding, show the same foolish weakness. And yet all around us the dark superstition is keeping both men and women, parsons and people, from all thoroughgoing rational inquiry. It is as powerful in this respect amongst large masses as ever; and no doubt it will require another generation before the multitude arise above it.

In the next place, I think an ignominious love of ease, comfort, or peace of mind, keeps a large number from inquiry. There are very few who love truth for its own sake. It is courted rather for the fortune it brings, the blessings of a physical and spiritual kind. Most seek some ulterior end, and above all ease, comfort, peace of mind and great enjoyment. Now if you do not harass your brains by entertaining doubts and milking inquiries, orthodoxy will furnish you with these desired blessings. On cheap terms it will assure you of the salvation of your soul and God's present and eternal favour, and in addition will bring you the approbation, sympathy, and regard of the respectable people around you. But if you once set off upon the dangerous road of free inquiry, instantly all these blessings disappear, and there is no saying to where you will be led. Knowing this, the majority of quiet well-to-do people are very careful to shun inquiry.

And the mischief feared lies in two directions : first, in the dogmatical. When verities which have been venerated for ages are once called into question and doubt, their mind loses all its anchorage ground, and seems to itself like a ship out at sea in the midst of a storm. Whither it will be driven no one can tell. And there are again two things which distress it; the one is the uncertainty and suspension of faith into which it is brought. Most minds rebel at this. It requires thorough mental training and discipline to be able to suspend one's judgment without pain during the examination of evidence. We become impatient of it, and want to settle down on the one side or the other. The mind wants rest; but as long as inquiry lasts there can be no rest—no reposing on assured truths—no drawing of comfort from sweetly consolatory doctrines! It is all hard work, and moving on from point to point. And so rather than embark upon such troubled waters, shoals of men superstitiously keep the harbour of the old faiths. There at least, so long as they do not doubt, they find quiet and comfort.

And then the other thing which keeps them from inquiry is that they find many are led when once they loosen their moorings, lengths which seem to them perfectly horrifying. Some who once were good, sound, orthodox believers have become what these people call perfect infidels; and mistrust of themselves, apparently, or mistrust of the truth, leads them to fear such if they once set out might become their own fate. Some could go as far as Robertson, of Brighton, but it would be dreadful to get to the length of Martineau ! Some could go as far as Carlyle, but it would be ruin to think like Stuart Mill! Some could accept of the theism of Newman, but the positivism of Comte would be perdition ! So each and all have their several bugbears of infidelity which terrify them from thought. It does not seem to occur to such people that it is just possible that those who have gone the lengths they fear to go, may have reached the truth. They only think of the consequences to which they presume it will lead. "Oh," say they, "we could find no comfort, no ease, in such horrible doctrines, however true they might appear. All peace would be thrust from our souls for ever."

Well, and suppose it were so; did you come into this world for ease and comfort, or to find the truth and live by it? Is blessedness to be had in a false peace, or in the living facts of the universe? Ease ! Comfort! For shame! Go get you into a cradle and call out some crazy beldame from the work-house to rock you your worthless life long. That is all such drowsy souls are fit for. And yet, although all reason must condemn them, although they themselves must for very shame be forced to own that in the pure and perfect truth man's supreme bliss can alone be found, and that in this day of the disruption of parties and the dissolution of churches each one must search out the truth for himself, this bugbear of extreme Infidelity keeps thousands, and will continue to keep thousands, from all manly and honest inquiry. One grieves over their weakness, but the remedy seems far away.

The other disturbance to one's comfort and peace lies in the social direction. Men like to be at ease when their professional or business engagements are over. It is comfortable to get home, sit down by the fireside, chat with one's wife and children, read the newspapers, or doze over a glass of wine. Besides, there are acquaintances, perchance friends, amongst whom one likes to spend a pleasant evening now and then over a game at cards, or in conversation upon the social and political gossip of the day. But now, earnest religious

inquiry is very apt to break in upon all this, to make one's home a scene of constant contention and tears, and to make one's acquaintances very shy and distant. If the wife have not the intellect to enter into the questions with the husband, or the husband with the wife, to what bickerings, sometimes angry discussion and wordy contentions, it leads. And then who can resist those tears and those earnest appeals, "If not for your own sake, for the sake of the souls of our darling children give up such wicked doubts!" And then the good people, too, aid the home influence. "Who will associate with an infidel? Who will have anything to do with him who denies the verities of the faith?" My dear fellow, such notions are not respectable, and I can assure you if it became known that you hold opinions so dangerous it will materially affect your business. You have a young family rising up, and cannot afford to indulge in such speculations. Besides, I confess all your friends concur with my own feeling in the matter, that is, however much we respect you, we should not like it to be known we associate with the companion of infidels. You are all right, you know, but you will be thrown amongst all sorts of vagabonds, and people will suspect that you have fallen into the vices to which Infidelity always leads. Give it up, my dear fellow, give it up, if you do not wish every respectable acquaintance to give you up."

Who could withstand such arguments as that? So the poor fellow does give it up, dismisses his doubts, henceforth walks demurely with his wife and sweet babies every Sunday regularly to church, and by and by gets held up by his minister as the very type of "That large and respectable class of intelligent men who amidst the doubts and scepticism of a licentious age hold fast by the old faiths !"

Another reason just alluded to operates with some. I referred to the low character imputed to those who depart from the old beliefs. It is the common conclusion of weak minds that he who doubts the accepted dogmas is a bad man. And even what the world calls respectable men and women, great professors of religion, think it no shame to either create or propagate all sorts of lying slanders against the infidels. Now and then this is done unconsciously of the wrong, the ignorant people not knowing that slander is a form of immorality, and that to speak evil of one another without sufficient evidence is a crime. But generally the evil is known, but committed under the palliating thought that it does God service. Now the effect of this is twofold: 1st, Ignorant people who do not know the wickedness of which religious people can be guilty, believe the slanderers, and shrink very naturally from connecting themselves with such seemingly disreputable parties. And 2ndly, They are very apt to conclude that bad men cannot have found the truth. Of course the character of a person cannot affect the truth or untruth, the validity or invalidity, of his arguments and propositions. And a rational person would judge of the doctrines by these alone. But in matters of religion, as we have seen, the majority are not rational. And so these slanderers succeed in their efforts to deter the weak-minded from inquiry, and in God's name effectually do the devil's work.

Other reason's might be added to these to account for the large number shunning all inquiry upon the questions of religion; but these must at present suffice. And they are sufficient to encourage our faith and hope in the gradual progress of the truth. That which lies at the root of them all, the want of a sound judgment, a disciplined mind habituated to exercise its reason upon all things, must gradually give way before the more enlightened system of education all classes are feeling their way towards. And in time it will affect women as well as men. Those tender affections which now bind them to superstition will not always be so perverted. When woman receives the education her nature requires, the intellect will assert its proper supremacy. Already there are some noble pioneers, the vanguard of the advancing race. When the whole host has come forward, then divine, bliss-giving, beauteous truth shall be our sovereign mistress, and all men will dare to follow whithersoever she may lead.—*Cranbrook*.

The Infidelity of Orthodoxy.

INFINITELY shocking to conscience and reason is the infidelity of orthodoxy concerning God's justice, mercy and truth, which all our orthodoxies are perpetually teaching. Nothing can be clearer than the doctrine both of Scripture and of the Church of England about the sufficiency and universal application of what is called the vicarious sacrifice or atonement for the sins of man, which was completed by the death of Christ upon the cross. The Baptist pointed him out at the beginning—"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."—(John i. 29.) There is no exception made here in exclusion of any sin in any portion of the world. You cannot honestly read part of the sin or part of the world. He came "that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man."—(Heb. ii. 9.) And in accordance with this the Church affirms in her second Article that: Christ "truly suffered, was sacrificed, dead and buried, to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but for all actual sins of men." In the 15th Article, again, the Church declares that Christ "Came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by the sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world." More definitely, again, in the 31st Article, she lays it down, that "the offering of Christ one made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original

and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone." The emphatic word, and, in truth, the clearest word in all this, is *satisfaction*. If it is not a scriptural word it is, at least, quite easy to understand. Somebody is satisfied. "Who can this be but the Almighty Father, who sent His only Son to die and to make by his one oblation of himself a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world? God is satisfied : about what? Surely about the demands of his law, of his justice, and of the glory of his moral government, against mankind for their sins. He is satisfied with the suffering endured and with the penalty paid, by the Lamb without spot who, by the sacrifice of himself, came to take away the sin of the whole world. It was satisfaction paid to reconcile an angry God to mankind," satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." Can there be any trick of ambiguity or priestcraft lurking in terms so plain as these? Is it too much to infer from these strong words, that every human being, however little he knows of the theory of this atonement, has a right to call God his reconciled Father, and a right to believe that if he forsakes his former sin and labours earnestly and honestly in what light he has to do or to suffer obediently the will of that Father, he will be accepted as that Father's forgiven child? You look at the preacher and the priest for a reply. That *depends*, quoth the oily preacher—that *depends*, says the wily priest—that *depends*, says the thundering Scotch doctor. I put the case first about this satisfaction for original sin thus: Thousands of infants under three days old, have died today; who can doubt that their Maker is perfectly satisfied with His Son's sacrifice for their birth-sin, or that their souls are saved? They are all damned, says the priest, damned to eternal fire for Adam's sin, unless they have had Christian baptism. I think it quite possible, says the preacher, that they are either all or part of them saved by the uncovenanted mercies of God. I am certain that they are all in hell, says the Scotchman, that are not baptised, because they have none of them been professors of the Christian religion. No man, woman, or child, who is not a professor of the Christian religion, can be saved *by any means whatsoever*, no matter how purely and faithfully he or she may walk by the precepts of any other religion, or may serve God and man by the light of nature. And the Scotchman proves his position by showing me this fiendish atrocity in the clearest words of human speech in that black manual of infidelity, the Westminster Confession, and by the unanswerable remark that a babe unbaptised is no professor of the Christian religion. Not by any means whatsoever! No room here for the sheltering cloak of invincible ignorance, which the Romanist may employ, nor for the uncovenanted mercies of God, as the milder Pharisees phrase it. Here is a deadlock of contradiction and infidelity. The full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction has been made by the Son to the Father, who sent him down on purpose to make it, and who is satisfied that it has been made both for the original and actual sins of all the world—and yet neither the Father nor the Son can save from eternal hell a single one of those innocent babes, or of those virtuous and sincere Jews, Turks, Buddhists, Parsees, &c. They must all be damned, just as if Christ had never died; and Chunder Sen, with his church of pure monotheists, must burn for ever along with them ! And why is this? Because that priest and that Scotch doctor will have it so. Those Gods, the Father and the Son, ought both to have known better than either to arrange or to place on record that transaction of sufficient satisfaction for all mankind, just between their two selves, without the explicit authority and agency of the Church and the Kirk. The bills are worth nothing unless made payable to the Kirk's or Church's order; and the satisfaction is all waste-paper and waste blood, till the Kirk or Church has signed, sealed, and delivered it.

Let me now ask the reader who fully believes the teaching of our Church about this complete satisfaction to the Father by the one oblation of the Son for the sins of the whole world, how he thinks it becoming and reasonable to conceive of the intercourse between the Father and the Son on this great subject, both being adored as omniscient and unchangeable, true and faithful. I am pretty sure that, if he were a stranger to the popular notions about the intercession of Christ, the last conception he could possibly frame would be that of the Son pathetically and perpetually reminding the Father, by the exhibition of his wounds, about the satisfaction once for all completed; nor would he think it a becoming thing for any member of a congregation who believed in the universal application to human needs of that satisfaction, to offer passionate and irreverent appeals to the memory or the pitying mercy of either the Father or the Son, not as one of a Church, but with continued repetition of the—me—me. There is a deep infidelity in such a picturing of the bleeding advocate, and much spiritual pride in such a tone of the importunate self-asserting worshipper. The hymns of Wesley owe much of their poetic vigour to this pride and infidelity. For example, in Hymn 127, we read : "See where before the throne he stands, And pours the all-prevailing prayer! Points to his side, and lifts his hands, And shows that I am graven there! He ever lives for me to pray; He prays that I with him may reign : Amen to what my Lord doth say ! Jesus, thou canst not pray in vain." And in Hymn 168: "Jesus speaks and pleads his blood! He disarms the wrath of God! Now my Father's bowels move; Justice lingers into love. Kindled his relentings are; Me he now delights to spare; Cries, ' How can I give thee up ? ' Let the lifted thunder drop. There for me the Saviour stands: Shows his wounds and spreads his hands ! God is love! I know, I feel; Jesus weeps and loves me still!" And again in Hymn 202 : "He ever lives above, For me to intercede, His all-redeeming love, His precious blood to plead : His blood atoned for all our race, And sprinkles now the throne of grace. Five

bleeding wounds he bears, Received on Calvary: They pour effectual prayers, They strongly speak for me: ' Forgive him, O forgive,' they cry, 'Nor let that ransom'd sinner die!' The Father hears him pray, His dear anointed one; He cannot turn away The presence of his Son: His Spirit answers to the blood, And tells me I am born of God." Again in Hymn 627:" Entered the holy place above, Covered with meritorious scars, The token of his dying love, Our great High-priest: in glory bears; He pleads his passion on the tree, He shows himself to God for me."

The dramatic charm of these pictures is due to a dark infidel shadow thrown over the conception of the Father; who, after all the completeness of the satisfaction for all the sins original and actual of all mankind, is still prone to forget it, to kindle into fury and to resume his purpose of vengeance. The soul of the worshipper, trained by hymns like these, pays dearly for the consolation "that I am graven there," on the hands whose pleadings "disarms the wrath of God," by harbouring such dishonouring infidelity with respect to the Father's faithfulness and love. What: should we think of an earthly creditor who, having demanded and obtained from a self-sacrificing surety the most complete satisfaction of all his claims on a poor debtor, should still require to be pacified and prevented from smiting and tormenting that debtor by the continual entreaties of the generous friend who had both discharged the debt and received and handed to the debtor a perfect acquittal? It is a painful duty, but I may not shrink from the pain, to expose these conceptions of the popular orthodoxy of Ditheism in all their incongruous infidelity and canting pharisaism.

How are we to reconcile these two pictures of the communion between the Father and the Son? In one we see them accomplishing a solemn legal act, by which once for all the Father is reconciled to us men, by the most complete atonement and satisfaction, settled and accepted for ever for all the sins original and actual of all mankind; and this fact is stated to us both in Holy Scripture and in our church formularies without a hint of any sort about a reserve of anger or unkindness on the part of the Father towards any portion of mankind, by reason of which he yet requires to be propitiated, or reminded, or entreated for pity or mercy. In the other, the penitent sinner reads all his hope in a spectacle thus described: "Five bleeding wounds he bears, Received on Calvary: They pour effectual prayers, They strongly speak for me: ' Forgive him, O forgive,' they cry, ' Nor let that ransom'd sinner die.' He ever lives above for me to intercede, His all redeeming love, His precious blood to plead." "Jesus speaks, and pleads his blood, He disarms the wrath of God; Kindled his relents are, Me he now delights to spare; Cries, ' How can I give thee up?' Lets the lifted thunder drop." How can you hang up these two pictures, so that if one be God's revealed truth to man, the other shall not be its infidel and blasphemous contradiction?

There is no escape from this infidelity of puritan orthodoxy in the excuse of poetical license. We know well that everything stated in these hymns is every Sunday taught to the people in hundreds of pulpits in plain prose, as very facts now in heaven, and taught with exaggeration by many of our sensational soul-smitters and soul-savers. And in the preface to Wesley's hymns we read: "In these hymns there is nothing turgid or bombastic on the one hand, or low and creeping on the other. Here are no cant expressions, no words without meaning. Those who impute this to us know not what they say: We talk common sense both in prose and verse, and use no word but in a fixed and determinate sense." So that his book is in effect a little body of experimental and practical divinity.

But what are these priests about in their gaudy millinery? They are offering the sacrifice of the altar, their puppet-show parody on the grand atonement and satisfaction of Calvary once for all made and accepted for all more than 1800 years ago. This mass is forsooth a true propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, one and the same with the sacrifice of the cross! This *must* be offered everywhere and continually, and impudently thrust into the faces of the Father and the Son, that the former may not perfidiously forget their compact and that the old wrath may not kindle again on the burning throne! Can unbelief and insult go farther against the faithfulness of God, and against the declaration of the churches about the one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world? Here is the perpetual outrage and flagrant infidelity of priestly orthodoxy! And still "my people will live it so !" They are taught to believe in a Devil-God—no wonder that they crowd to a Devil-worship !—*T. P. Kirkman, M.A. F.R.S.*

A Lesson for the Day.

RELIGION should be "a thousand-voiced psalm," from the heart of man to man's God, who is the original of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty, and is revealed in all that is good, true, and beautiful. But Religion is amongst us, in general, but a compliance with 'custom; a prudential calculation; a matter of expediency; where by men hope, through giving up a few dollars in the shape of peev-tax, and a little time in the form of church-going, to gain the treasures of heaven and eternal life. Thus Religion has become Profit; not reverence of the Highest, but vulgar hope and vulgar fear; a working for wages, to be estimated by the rules of lots and gain. Men love Religion as

the mercenary worldling his well-endowed wife; not for herself, but for what she brings. They think Religion is useful to the old, the sick, and the poor, to charm them with a comfortable delusion through the cloudy land of this earthly life; they wish themselves to keep some running account therewith, against the day when they also shall be old, and sick, and poor. Christianity has two modes of action, direct on the heart and life of a man, and indirect through conventions, institutions, and other machinery; and in our time the last is almost its sole influence. Hence men reckon Christianity as valuable to keep men in order; it would have been good policy for a shrewd man to have invented it, on speculation, like other contrivances, for the utility of the thing. In their eyes the church, especially the church for the poor, is necessary as the court-house or the jail; the minister is a well-educated Sabbath-day constable; and both are part of the great property establishment of the times. They value Religion, not because it is true and divine, but because it serves a purpose. They deem it need-full as the poll-tax, or the militia system, a national bank, or a sub-treasury. They value it among other commodities : they might give it a place in their inventories of stock; and hope of Heaven, or faith in Christ, might be summed up in the same column with money at one per cent.

The problem of men is not first the Kingdom of God, that is, a perfect life on the earth, lived for its own sake; but first all other things, and then, if the Kingdom of God come of itself, or is thrown into the bargain, like pack-thread and paper with a parcel of goods, why very well; they are glad of it. It keeps "all other things" from soiling. Does religion take hold of the heart of us? Here and there, among rich men and poor men, especially among women, you shall find a few really religious: whose life is a prayer, and Christianity their daily breath. They would have been religious had they been cradled among cannibals, and before the Flood. They are divine men; of whom the spirit of God seems to take early hold, and Reason and Religion to weave up, by celestial instinct, the warp and woof of their daily life. Judge not the ago by its religious geniuses. The mass of men care little for Christianity; were it not so, the sins of the forum and the market-place, committed in a single month, would make the laud rock to its centre. Men think of Religion at Church on the Sabbath; they make sacrifices, often great sacrifices, to support public worship, and attend it most sedulously, these men and women. But here the matter ends. Religion does not come into their soul; does not show itself in their housekeeping and trading. It does not shine out of the windows of morning and evening, and speak to them at every turn. How many young men in the thousand say thus to themselves, Of this will I make sure, a Christian character and divine life, all other things be as God sends? How many ever set their hearts on any moral and religious object, on achieving a perfect character, for example, with a fraction of the interest they take in the next election? Nay, woman also must share the same condemnation. Though into her rich heart God more generously sows the divine germs of Religion; though this is her strength, her loveliness, her primal excellence; yet she also has sold her birthright for tinsel ornaments, and the admiration of deceitful lips. Men think of Religion when they are sick, old, in trouble, or are about to die, forgetting that it is a crown of life at all times; man's choicest privilege; his highest possession; the chain that sweetly links him to Heaven. If good for anything, it is good to live by. It is a small thing to die religiously; a devil could do that; but to live divine is a man's work.

Since Religion is thus regarded or disregarded by men, we find that talent and genius, getting insight of this, float off to the market, the workshop, the senate, the farmer's field, or the courthouse, and bring home with honour, the fleece of gold. Meanwhile, anointed dulness, arrayed in canonicals, his lesson duly conned, presses, semi-somnous, the consecrated cushions of the pulpit, and pours forth weekly his impotent drone, to the blest with bland praises, so long as he disturbs not respectable iniquity slumbering in his pew, nor touches an actual sin of the times, nor treads an inch beyond the beaten path of the Church. Well is it for the safety of the actual Church, that genius and talent forsake its rotten walls, to build up elsewhere the Church of the first-born, and pray largely and like men—Thy kingdom come. There is a concealed scepticism among us, all the more deadly because concealed. It is not a denial of God,—though this it is whispered to our ear is not rare,—for men have opened their eyes too broadly not to notice the fact of God, everywhere apparent, without and within; still less is it disbelief of the Scriptures; there has always been too much belief in their letter, though far too little living "of their truths. But there is a doubt of man's moral and religious nature; a doubt if righteousness be so super-excellent. We distrust Goodness and Religion, as the blind doubt if the sun be so fine as men tell of; or as the deaf might jeer at the ecstatic raptures of a musician. Who among men trusts Conscience as he trusts his eye or ear? With them the highest in man is self-interest. When they come to outside goodness, therefore, they are driven by fear of hell, as by a scorpion whip; or bribed by the distant pleasures of heaven. Accordingly, if they embrace Christianity, they make Jesus, who is the archetype of a divine life, not a man like his brothers, who had human appetites and passions; was tempted in the flesh; was cold, and hungry, and faint, and tired, and sleepy, and dull—each in its season—and who needed to work out his own salvation, as we also must do; but they make him an unnatural character; passionless; amphibious not man and not God; whose holiness was poured on him from some celestial urn, and so was in no sense his own work; and who, therefore, can be no example for us, goaded as we are by appetite, and bearing the ark of our destiny in our own hands, It is not the

essential element of Christianity, *love to man and love to God*, men commonly gather from the New Testament; but some perplexing dogma, or some oriental dream. How few religious men can you find, whom Christianity takes by the hand, and leads through the Saharabs and Siberias of the world; men whose lives are noble; who can speak of Christianity as of their trading, and marrying, out of their own experience, because they have lived it! There is enough cant of Religion, creeds written on sanctimonious faces, as signs of that emptiness of heart, "which passeth show," but how little real Religion, that comes home to men's heart and life, let experience decide.

The Christianity of the Church is a very poor thing; it is not bread, and it is not drink. The Christianity of Society is still worst; it is bitter in the mouth and poison in the blood. Still men are hungering and thirsting, though not always knowingly, after the true bread of life. Why shall we perish with hunger? In our Father's house is enough and to spare. The Christianity of Christ is high and noble as ever. The religion of Reason, of the Soul, the Word of God, is still strong and flame-like, as when first it dwelt in Jesus, the chiefest incarnation of God, and now the pattern-man. Age has not dimmed the lustre of this light that lighteneth all, though they cover their eyes in obstinate perversity, and turn away their faces from this great sight. Man has lost none of his God-likeness. He is still the child of God, and the Father is near to us as to him who dwelt in his bosom. Conscience has not left us. Faith and hope still abide; and love never fails. The Comforter is with us; and though the man Jesus; no longer blesses the earth, the ideal Christ, formed in the heart, is with us to the end of the world. Let us then build on these. Use good words when we can find them, in the church or out of it. Learn to pray, to pray greatly and strong; learn to reverence what is highest; above all learn to live, to make Religion daily work, and Christianity our common life. All days shall then be the Lord's day; our homes, the House of God, and our labour, the ritual of Religion. Then we shall not glory in men, for all things shall be ours; we shall not be impoverished by success, but enriched by affliction. Our service shall be worship, not idolatry. The burthens of the Bible shall not overlay and crush us; its wisdom shall make us strong, and its piety enchant us. Paul and Jesus shall not be our masters, but elder brothers, who open the pearly gate of truth and cheer us on, leading us to the tree of life. We shall find the Kingdom of Heaven and enjoy it now, not waiting till death ferries us over to the other world. We shall then repose beside the rock of ages, smitten by divine hands, and drink the pure water of life as it flows from the Eternal, to make earth green and glad. We shall serve no longer a bond slave to tradition, in the leprous host of sin, but become free men, by the law and spirit of life. Thus like Paul shall we form the Christ within; and like Jesus, serving and knowing God directly, with no mediator intervening, become one with Him. Is not this worth a man's wish; worth his prayers; worth his work; to seek the living Christianity, the Christianity of Christ? Not having this, we seem but bubbles,—bubbles on an ocean, shoreless and without bottom; bubbles that sparkle a moment in the sun of life, then burst to be no more. But with it we are men, immortal souls, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.—Parker.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

REMINISCENCES OF ARGUMENTATIVE CONVERSATIONS HELD AT SUNDRY TIMES BETWEEN JAMES AULDLIGHT AND JOHN DUBIOUS, MOSTLY REGARDING THINGS SPIRITUAL. WRITTEN AND COLLATED BY ME THE AFORESAID JOHN DUBIOUS.

CHAPTER V.

Locke's Touchstone—Man a Paradox in Belief—Paul and the Thessalonians—Gibbon's Remarks on the Early Success of Christianity.

JAMES.—Weel John, supposin' they did look out for the last day in the tenth century, it was their bounden duty see to do, and moreover it is the duty on' the hale human family in every century to do the same, for is it no' written that the vera angels in heaven ken na the day or the hour of the Son of' Mon's coming? Anither thin'

I wish maist eemphatically to impress upon ye, is this : hoo is a mon to manage if he throws overboard his only true guide, or Polar Star, whilk I hold to be the inspired writin's of the Auld and New Testaments? I should just like to be tauld what kind o' holding' ground he is gaun to cast anchor in.

JOHN.—That grand old philosopher Locke, points to a different test in matters of morality, and which I think not inapplicable to your last remark. He says : "Every man carries about him a touchstone, if he will make use of it, to distinguish substantial gold from superficial glittering, truth from appearances. And indeed the use and benefit of this touchstone, *which is natural reason*, is spoiled and lost only by assumed prejudices, overweening presumption and narrowness of mind. ... A notable champion for the truth, that is, for the doctrines of the sect *that chance or interest has cast him into* need but be furnished with verses of Scripture, containing words and expressions that are but flexible (as all general obscure and doubtful ones are), and his system, that has appropriated them to the orthodoxy of his Church, makes them immediately strong and irrefragable arguments for his opinion." Now, how strongly must terrorising renderings (of the obscure and flexible prophecies of the wrath to come) have worked upon the fears and hopes of a man in past ages, especially a credulous and superstitious man. And how heartily must the jolly monks of old have laughed in their sleeves when they were accepting donations of money or land from their panic-struck victims, writing out the gifts with due formality in this wise, "*Appropinquante mundi termino*" etc. Verily, I say unto you, friend James, that the wonderful things man has invented or made puzzle me not, but most assuredly the wonderful things he has swallowed amaze me utterly.

JAMES.—Ye are far waul than the Thessalonians, what, it seems, were either influenced by cause teachers, or were continually misapprehending' Paul, whilk seems plain from the following verses : "Now we beseech ye, brethren, by the coming' o' our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering' together unto him, that ye be not shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day o' Christ is at hand "(2 These. ii. 1-5). It was therefore appear that in the expectation that our Saviour wad appear, some o' the Thessalonians had become unco negligent o' their warldly concerns; that there were some tods in the fauld—to wit, fause teachers what pretended to ha' been inspired; and that there were it hers among them, what declared that they had been sent by the Apostle will' a letter to the Thessalonians, apprising them that the day o' Christ was at hond, whereas this letter was doubtless a forgery. Paul, taking these premises intil consideration, cautions them not to be shaken in mind, or troubled about these matters, but to pay due attention to their secular affairs; not to be thrown intil confusion, either by any pretended revelation o' the Speerit, obtruded upon them by fause teachers, or by any word o' mouth message as free him, or by any letter forged in his name, importing' that he believed the Day o' Judgment was at hond; for naethin' had fa'en free either by speech or writing' whence they were to infer that "the day o' Christ was at hond." And as for his words in the first Epistle to these Thessalonians—"Then we which are alive and remain," etc.; I can only mak' oot that they just simply misunderstood him, as I tauld ye afore they were conteenually doing'.

JOHN.—You are perfectly welcome to whatever benefit may arise from Paul's doubts and contradictions about the end of the world. But it seems perfectly plain to me that his teaching has raised a fruitful crop of fanatics in all ages, whose characters were a compound of imposture and mental derangement, and for whose unhallowed doings Christendom as well as Pagandom bears record in gigantic mausoleums of murdered fellow-creatures. Indeed, it is an open question now, whether Christianity would ever have attained its present proportions, if its Jewish ingredients had not been manipulated by the Gentile Paul in a Roman crucible. Well might that elegant writer Gibbon, when commenting on the early success of Christianity, exclaim: "That the careless Polytheist, assailed by new and unexpected terrors against which neither his priests nor his philosophers could afford him any certain protection, was very frequently terrified and subdued by the menace of eternal tortures. His fears might assist the progress of his faith and reason; and if he could only persuade himself to suspect that the Christian Religion might possibly be true, it became an easy task to convince him that it was the safest and most prudent plan that he could possibly embrace." A doctrine which held forth eternal life, with every happiness man is capable of enjoying, to all who would embrace it, and threatened everlasting punishment, with all the horrors the human mind can picture, to all who reject it, must, in its very nature have had the strongest possible influence upon the hopes and fears of the people to whom it was addressed. Those who believed this doctrine were to be *saved*, but those who *believed not* were to be *dammèd*. The good, the watchful, those who *continued to the end* were to be *saved*, were to have *deliverance*, salvation, and so on. Anyone that believed *should not perish* in the general conflagration of the world, but *should have everlasting life* in the Kingdom of Heaven. The whole tenour of the Gospels and the Epistles bears out the truth of Mr. Gibbon's remark that "when the promise of eternal happiness was proposed to mankind on condition of adopting the faith and of observing the precepts of the Gospel, it is no wonder that so advantageous an offer should have been accepted by great numbers of every religion, of every rank and of every province in the Roman Empire. The ancient Christians were animated by a contempt for their present existence, and by a just confidence of immortality, of which the doubtful and imperfect faith of modern ages cannot give us an adequate

notion."

Audialterampartem Creek.

Urtica Urens.

(*To be continued.*)

Correspondence.

The Bible and its Real Enemies.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Turning over the leaves of my Bible the other day, I came upon the following passage, which, with your permission, I will transfer to your columns. "Ye shall keep my sabbath and reverence my sanctuary : I am the LORD. Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them : I am the LORD your God. Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and fear thy God : I am the LORD. . . . The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight or in measure : . . . I am the LORD your God "(Levit. xix. 30-37). Observe, here are five consecutive precepts, with nothing to denote any difference in relative importance, nothing to indicate any particular solemnity attached to one more than to another; and each of them concluding with the solemn asseveration "I am the LORD," stamped as it were with the seal of Deity himself. Yet out of these, the first and the fifth are made matters of compulsory observance, more or less, throughout Christendom. The third and fourth are left to be obeyed, with greater or less exactitude, according to the dictates of social decorum; whilst the second is now universally regarded as a mere relic of superstition. Here then is a crucial test for the gentlemen, reverend or laic, who, at religious meetings, persist in saying that the Bible is all true; that other books contain some truth and some error, whereas the Bible is unalloyed truth, and so on *ad nauseam*. If these apologists are right, then to keep the sabbath, to shun wizards, to respect age, to be courteous towards strangers, and to have fair weights and measures, are all alike part of the whole duty of man.

The rev. Mr. Howden in his address to the Congregational Union said much about certain enemies of the Bible. Whom he meant by the term he did not particularise. But if he intended to denote the friends of rational religion, it is only fair to remind him that such persons do not hate the Bible at all, that they only claim to do what Mr. Howden must himself have already done in respect of the biblical notions about science, which he does not pretend to uphold. In fact, free Christians ask leave for themselves to do in the case of the whole Bible only what every sane man must do with such a passage as the one above quoted, namely :—to discriminate, to pick out what reason and conscience recognise as sound and good, and to reject what is unnatural, childish, fabulous or degrading.

Mr. Howden, if he wants them, may find numerous enemies of the Bible, its *real* enemies, in the persons of those who, on the principle of "No Surrender," try to force down the throats of people, especially in these inquiring times, false science and true morality, the grossest views of God's nature as well as the most sublime; in short, everything which happens to be found within the compass of that most venerable but heterogeneous complication, to the confusion of weak minds, and to the disgust of the strong.

Vindex.

Benignity and Beneficence.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Some time ago, whilst I was walking along a leading thoroughfare in this city, I noticed a bare-footed, thinly-clad, half-starved little girl staggering on under the load of a large and apparently heavy bag. The poor child could make only very short stages, a journey of ten yards being enough to exhaust her. She could not have been more than six years of age.

Now if my readers will pardon a bit of egotism which it would be inconvenient to suppress on the present occasion, I would have them understand that there are few mortals more thoroughly benevolent than myself. In my boyish days I never robbed a bird's-nest, and never baited a hook without feeling sorry for the worm. When I hear or read of a tale of woe, involuntary tears start to my eyes, and if sympathy could remove distress, there would be little left in the world; for I think that I have within me an index-haustitle well thereof. The wrongs of

the poor and down-trodden, the selfishness of the luxurious rich, and the grinding despotism of the tyrant make any blood boil when I reflect on them; and often when I lie awake I constrict in my mind social systems which shall provide for the weak and helpless: a road from Purgatory to Paradise, and in which there shall be an aristocracy of the wise and good, not of the rich and powerful.

It may readily be imagined, then, that the scene I have described above was sufficient to touch me to the quick. I stood for some time pensively watching the little creature. "Can this," I said within myself, "be called a Christian land, where law and public opinion seem equally indifferent to such an exhibition of parental barbarism?" I felt a righteous anger rise within me when I beheld the busy citizens pass to and fro, each wrapped in his own concerns, and as unmoved at the spectacle of suffering humanity as at the sight of a fly in the meshes of a web; my indignation being perhaps slightly soothed by the reflection that Sydney contained one person—to wit, myself—whose heart was not destitute of every spark of human sympathy.

Presently, however, my musings were interrupted. I saw a gentleman approach the girl, ask her a question, and, without more ado, throw the bag across his shoulder and march off with the child by his side. For a moment I was rivetted to the spot with surprise. Such eccentric behaviour on the part of a person who was at least my equal in rank, I could not have conceived. Prompted by curiosity, I followed the odd pair after they had proceeded some distance. Selecting the most unfrequented ways, they at last reached a miserable house in a by-street at the door of which our good Samaritan deposited his load and then went his way, with a mind, if physiognomy speak the truth, no more burdened by the consciousness of having done a good action than agitated by schemes for the social regeneration of mankind. I have never seen him since.

How true it is that a single good action, however trifling in itself, may be fruitful in unforeseen blessings. The child's benefactor was unconsciously a benefactor to me also, but in a higher sense; for he, by his silent reproof, did much to relieve me of a far more crushing load than that which she had to bear; a load of self-complacency, of morbid sentiment, of dreamy do-nothing benevolence, which is almost as fatal to self-denying energy of character as selfishness itself. He has taught me in a single simple lesson that there is plenty of *benignity* in the world, but that there is room for much more *beneficence*; that thought not embodied in action is vain; that an ounce of well-doing is worth a ton of well-meaning; that faith without works is dead. Alpha.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Nut-Shell.

To the Editor.

SIR,—The reverend Editor of the loving and Christian *Protestant Standard* has, in a recent issue, made a general attack on Unitarians, Romanists, Ritualists, and men of the highest standing in science and philosophy, on the ground that they will not cramp their minds into the Presbyterian orthodox nut-shell. It is some satisfaction, however, to learn that Unitarian intellect is "clever and shrewd," although "unsanctified," and that we merely come in for an occasional thrust of the fierce onslaught of which the Church of Rome has to bear the brunt. With his inbred coarseness, moreover, this Editor impertinently wonders how the cause of Free Religious Thought in Sydney manages to meet the cost of "printing" and "gas," innocent as he tries to be of the fact that superstition and credulity invariably pay the best.

He seems greatly astonished that you should wish people to "trust in God instead of in documents," but can he assign any valid reason why people should not? Like the drowning man and the straw, he catches at the word "impossible," as applied to Miracles, regardless of the sense in which Dr. Kalisch uses it, and would no doubt be ready to prove by chapter and verse that it is quite possible to limit the limitless and supersede perfection. The *Standard*, I suspect, has yet to recover from the thumping it received from your "Libra" some time back, though its Editor is still equal to the trick of misconstruing a rational estimate of the Bible into a total rejection of its claims. Misrepresent, however, as he may, he stands powerless and condemned in the presence of the five leading principles which appear on the cover of your Periodical, and which, I believe, will stand the test of the most searching criticism that can be brought to bear against them both now and hereafter, placed as they are far above the controversies of historical tradition or the discoveries of modern science. One thing, at any rate, is certain, namely, that a strong dose of these principles occasionally taken by the *Standard* would tend to impart a far more elevated tone to that bigoted and bellicose organ of Orangeism.

Gladly admitting the truth of the *Standard's* remark, "that evangelical theologians are assuredly not quite all of them fools," I may perhaps be permitted to ask how it is that they exhibit such unmistakeable alarm as often as some new truth of science or philosophy is brought to light? The fact is that their revealed truths, so-called, are based, not on the Rock of Truth, but on the unsteady sands of human opinion; and that their instinct of self-preservation *will* assert itself.

Apologising to you, esteemed Sir, for thus rushing to the front, knowing myself to be but a raw recruit in

such matters, I have been constrained to do so from the feeling that such ridiculous diatribes against Free Religious Inquiry as the *Standard* is capable of publishing, are scarcely worthy of veteran steel. Principia.

Biblical Contradictions.

To the Editor.

SIR,—A perusal of the letter in your August number from the Rev. Wazir Beg, emboldens me to place a difficulty before you, in the hope that that gentleman will explain satisfactorily the perplexity under which I am labouring; and as I can conscientiously say that I am "an honest searcher after divine truth," I shall be much obliged by an answer.

My difficulty, then, begins very early in the volume of the sacred lore, namely, at the narrative of the Fall of our first parents: concerning which, if true, I am driven to adopt one of the two following propositions—either that God is not omnipotent, or that He is not the all-loving and merciful God which the churches make Him out to be. For, if He was the latter, He would have disallowed an event (the Fall) which has brought eternal damnation to countless millions of the human race, but if He could not prevent it, then he is not the former. It is an answer to say that God in his mercy has opened a way for us, through His Son, as that event again, even if true, has damned countless millions more for not believing on Him. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." These, truly, are very awful words, but as I prefer still retaining God in my thoughts as "my Father that is in Heaven," who is able to do for his children (and willing as well as able) everything that an earthly parent could, plus *His* Omnipotence, I must reject the story of the Fall and everything which hangs thereby (which is not a little) until Mr. Wazir Beg or some other kind friend will enlighten my darkness.

A great deal of Mr. Wazir Beg's letter I quite agree with, especially that relative to abusive epithets. Abuse, Mr. Editor, never yet strengthened an argument and never will.

Believe me, yours truly,

Nanana, Fiji.
R. B. Leefe.

Editorial Notices.

The cost of Printing and Publishing the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS is not as yet covered by the returns. The Editor makes this statement for the information of friends who may be willing to share with him a loss which, as the A. F. R. P. is steadily increasing its circulation, will be but temporary.

The Editor wishes the readers of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS to know that its pages are at their service for the discussion of questions relating to Free Religious Inquiry. Communications (which must be authenticated by the name and address of the Writer, not necessarily for publication), to be sent to the Editor's residence, 1 Hyde Park Terrace, Sydney.

Orders for copies of the AUSTRALIAN FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, and Advertisements, to be sent to the Publisher, Mr. John Ferguson, 426 George Street.

Yearly Subscription: Six shillings in advance, with an extra shilling for postage. Orders on the Post Office to be made payable to the Editor, who will be happy to receive Subscriptions for the New Volume, and to supply back numbers.

Well-bound volumes of the FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, price 7s. 6d. each, can be obtained at the Publisher's, or from the Editor.

Printed by ROBERT BONE, for the Proprietor, at the "Phoenix Printing Office," 140 Pitt Street, and Published by JOHN FERGUSON, of 426 George Street, Sydney, Nov. 20, 1871.