

Victoria University of Wellington bookplate List of pamphlets in volume  
The Social Future of Labourers.

A Paper. Read Before the Tokomairiro Mutual Improvement Association, by Mr. Robert Stout.  
Friday, 30th June, 1871.

Dunedin Printed By John Mackay, Princes Street North. 1872

NOTE.—The writer confesses his indebtedness to the works of the following writers:—Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Thornton, Mr. W. R. Greg, and Professor Beesly.

## The Social Future of Labourers.

IN attempting to sketch the social future of labourers, I desire to state that I do not pretend to expound prophecy—which in these days often means prophesying afresh. All I can hope to do is to point out the present position of labourers, the various Utopias presented for their amelioration, and what the tendencies of the age are in regard to them. My desire is to take you as it were to an eminence from which we may both the more clearly scan the place from which we have made our ascent; and, if glimpse can be caught, perhaps discern the dim outlines of that Promised Land which our philosophers, our statesmen, and our poets have in all ages longed for and pictured. In scanning even cursorily the present social state, we have two things to do. We shall have to see the many anomalies, the many perplexing enigmas of the age, and also to try if we can get at the laws which guide us as human beings, one to another. That there is an inter-dependence amongst men, who can deny? And if an inter-dependence, what are the ligaments that bind us together. Let us then ascend Pisgah. Before we glance at the future, we must, as I have stated, first examine all those things that shed a light as it were on our future path. We must needs have some notion, however imperfect, of what the present condition of labourers is. Of course, you understand what I mean by the term "labourers;" I confine it at present to the toilers of the race—to those who have, by manual labour, to support themselves. What then is their present condition? Let us glance at the hives of manufacturing industry, and examine their condition in the United Kingdom. Canon Kingsley in one of his novels has given us a touching scene of the human wretchedness one meets with in England. Speaking of a family in London, he says:—

*"There was no bed in the room; no table. It was bare of furniture, comfortless, and freezing cold; but, with the exception of the plaster dropping from the roof, and the broken windows patched with rags and paper, there was a scrupulous neatness about the whole which contrasted strangely with the filth and slovenliness outside. On a broken chair by the chimney sat a miserable old woman, fancying that she was warming her hands over embers that had long been cold, and muttering to herself, with palsied lips, about the Guardians and the Workhouse. While upon a few rags on the floor lay a girl, ugly, marked with the small-pox, hollow-eyed, emaciated; her only bedclothes the skirt of a large handsome new riding habit, at which the other girls, wan and tawdry, were stitching busily as they sat right and left of her on the floor. The old woman took no notice of us as we entered; but one of the girls looked up, and, with a pleasing gesture of recognition, put her fingers on her lips, and whispered, 'Ellen's asleep.'"*

Another master Hand has given the following description of an artisan's dwelling in London:—

*"I shall be as particular," he says, "as a valuer, and describe what I have seen. The family sleeping-room measured 13 feet 6 inches by 14 feet. Opening out of this, and again on the landing of the third floor, was their kitchen and sitting-room; it was not quite so large as the other. Not to be described are the dinginess of the walls, the smokiness of the ceilings the grimy windows, the heavy, ever murky atmosphere of these rooms. The other side of the street was 14 feet distant. Behind, the backs of similar tenements came up black and cowering over the little yard of number Five. As rare in the well thus formed was the circulation of air, as that of cash in the pockets of the inhabitants. I have seen the yard: let me warn you if you are fastidious not to enter it. They poor people knew nothing of sanitary reform, sanitary precautions, endemics, epidemics, deodorisers or disinfectants; they regarded disease with the fatalism of despair."*

Nor can these descriptions be considered as exaggerated, when the following facts are remembered. In Edinburgh, for example, it is said one common stair alone has 260 souls dwelling there; sometimes actually two families in one room. The pauperism in England is reckoned to be about one in every twenty. More than a million paupers in England! And these are relieved by the state; but what of those who are always on the confines of poverty? who are labourers earning small wages, oft out of work, often hungry, having emphatically no place in this earth of ours that they can call by hallowed name of home. Who, when in work, have hours of drudgery, enlivened by no hope but the preservation until an old age of their life, and who look to the Workhouse as their final asylum. Who, after their dull hours of weary toil are over, go to homes where there are nothing but squalor and wretchedness; afflicted with diseases; their natural affections blunted; their children dying around them, by all kinds of diseases. For them, how joyless is life? Not a gleam of sunshine; no

sweetness, no light to cheer them in their earthly career. Even the words of Scripture might be applied to them—"They wait for death, but it cometh not; they rejoice exceedingly and are glad when they find the grave." How hard is their lot. Tell us not of "honest poverty;" chant not its praises. It seems to me one of the greatest of curses. This is not, however, the condition of all "labourers." The ranks of the poor are filled up from other sources; but, as a class, compared with the wealth and luxury which some enjoy, the dukes, and lords, and millionaires, with thousands a day, it is a terrible anomaly. Just think of one class having all that the most luxurious can desire; and of the other, children of the same father, toiling and moiling, and in their efforts to save their lives losing them. But some say this poverty and wretchedness are only known in old countries, surely we in the colonies have got rid of this want. Is there then no pauperism here? And is it not fact that what is, is on the increase? I fear we often overlook the fact that even in the colonies there is much real poverty and misery. It is a great mistake to suppose that we here have not this question of "pauperism" to face. We have not, alas, solved this problem of the age; nay, we have not come one whit nearer a solution. Glance at our Benevolent Asylum, peep into our Hospitals, see our Industrial and other schools; think of the numbers of unemployed often in our midst; see the agitations that are continually arising for the government to step in and do this thing and the other. And what does this cry of government work for the unemployed signify? Does it not mean that the government should perform the function of parish unions in England—find work for those out of work. The patent and distressing fact that every now and then, and especially in the winter season, government has to expend public money in keeping willing workers from want, is a glaring anomaly which no sophistry of ours can explain away. It may be, nay it is true, that the causes of the want of work are different from those in older communities; and it is often also true that the colonial towns are crowded with some lazy and discontented men who get up "unemployed agitations." But, granting these things, the fact is patent that we have the poor in our midst, that we have labourers often in want and often out of work.

There is then here as in European countries a question to solve; and can we wonder when we think of the wretchedness, and even of the crimes which are often caused by poverty, that philanthropists should get impatient and be ready with utopias to set before us to cure our social defects. It is not surprising that benevolent men should, after surveying our social state, get dissatisfied with our present social laws, and demand their abrogation. They and all wise men who have looked at our present state, and also thought on our probable future, have asked—Can it be, that this world of ours is ever to remain a Pandemonium? Is there no future time fast hastening in which we can imagine that the labourers' families, fortified by their own wisdom against all the chances of fortune, would not have any more need, under any circumstances, of imploring the compassion of either the state or of their fellow-citizens? Can it be, that the sad scene pictured by Carlyle in burning words, of "a white European man, standing on his two legs, with his five-fingered hands at his shackle-bones, and miraculous head on his shoulders," should be worth nothing, should never be false. "If," says Mr. Mill, "the bulk of the human race are always to remain as at present, slaves to toil in which they have no interest, and therefore feel no interest, drudging from early morning till late at night for bare necessaries, and with all the intellectual and moral deficiencies which this implies. Without interests or sentiments as members of society, and with a sense of injustice rankling in their minds—equally for what they have not and for what others have, I know not what there is which should make a person with any capacity of reason concern himself about the destinies of the human race. There would be no wisdom for any one, but in extracting from life, with Epicurean indifference, as much personal satisfaction for himself and those with whom he sympathises as it can yield without injury to any one, and let the unmeaning bustle of so-called civilised existence roll by unheeded.'

There is then a problem, and that a vital one, to solve; all are agreed about that. It is only in the mode of solution that differences of opinion arise. Let us glance at the contending Utopias. Of course we shall only have time to take the main ones. They are—1st, Socialism; 2nd, Co-operation; 3rd, Positivism; 4th, Liberty. Regarding the solution offered to us in the colonies, namely "Protection," or as it is grandiloquently termed "Protection of Native Industry," allusion will be made under the head of Liberty.

I shall take Socialism first, because Socialism in one shape or another has been *the* remedy of most of the philanthropists of all ages. Traces of it are discerned amongst the ancient Hebrews, amongst the early Christians, amongst the Chinese, &c. But there is no agreement amongst the Socialists. "Some systems have been based on purely material principles, like Owens's; some have been profoundly religious, like the Moravians; some maintain the family arrangements, some altogether merge them; some recommend celibacy, some enforce it, like the Shakers;" some relax the marriage tie, some control it; some hold it sacred, and some even advocate doctrines regarding it which would destroy that pivot of English life—the family. Some would divide the property equally. But all have this maxim, that labour should be for the common good. Competition is to be unknown; the right to work and just wages is always asserted. The main agreement in the various socialistic Utopias consists in maintaining the equality of men, at least so far as right to support from each other is concerned. Another of the doctrines of most of the socialists is that external circumstances alone constitute the difference between man and man—circumstances are the basis of their morality. Their position may be

asserted as this:—Society, they say, is out of joint; its anomalies, its inequalities, the sufferings of the mass, are monstrous and indefensible. Palliatives won't do, nor slow methods of evolution; we must remedy the evil at once. The society system that can permit such a state of things must be overthrown. Private property must be unknown, and grinding competition banished. The nexus that is to join man to his fellow is not competition, nor money, but "love"—hence we must labour for the common good. Such is very briefly the statement of the socialists. It would be a grave mistake to suppose that these opinions are held by only the revolutionary or the turbulent. Many able men, many philanthropically men, in all countries, are socialists. It would also be erroneous to suppose that they desire their system inaugurated by force. "What we have recently witnessed in France of the Communist rebellion has little to do with socialists; of course many of the communists were and are socialists. But the name "communist" is not from communion, or community of goods, but from the divisions of the city—the "commune" and their fight is for republicanism, and right of cities to certain functions without the control of the Government. So much for socialistic theories; let us glance at their defects. To me they seem to start on an entirely wrong basis. They assert, if their statements mean anything, an equality of men. So far as the right to labour, which means the right to enjoy the fruits of labour are concerned, they place all men on a level. But are all men equal? Can we say, as Carlyle has phrased it, that Quashee the nigger is equal to Socrates? and, if not equal, why should Quashee be told that he is equal? But a far greater difficulty meets us than this one of equality, for it is right in a sense, it is half a truth. Private property is to become unknown, competition to cease, and man to eat though he should not work. Once assert that private property is at an end, and what have we? We cannot have, in our present state, men united together content to surrender their property or their earnings for the benefit of all. Nor, were all the property once surrendered, could we hope that there would be an end of strife or of contention, nor that every one would fulfil his appointed share of work for the common weal. Unfortunately all men are not moral; some wish to live and enjoy the good things of this world without work. Here is the cardinal defect of socialism. It overlooks "human nature;" it is blind to the very patent fact that not only are all men not equal in any sense, but that they are not all unselfish, not all devoted to the common good. Nor does socialism present a remedy for this defect in our nature. Giving the idle, the ill-disposed, the selfish, all that they require—food, clothing, and lodging—and these for ever secured to them, can not rid them of their unselfishness, nor of their evil dispositions. And here I might dismiss socialism, did not there lie at its basis two doctrines erroneous, and found often coming from quarters not at all tinged with socialism. I mean the right of private property and competition. We are often told of usurers; we have it held up to us that money is the root of all evil; and it is pictured, by others than socialists in name, what a benefit it would be if all things were in common, and following this statement comes another, how wrong it is to claim interest. If we would only go to the root of the subject, and picture to ourselves the growth of private property, the beginning of usury, we would not call them by hard names. Go back to man in the savage or semi-savage state, long after that time pictured by one of our scientific men, when our progenitors were of the monkey tribe. He is a hunter. He finds that by making certain implements he can the better catch his prey. Perhaps it is by the aid of a bow and an arrow, or by a polished stone whirled and thrown in a certain manner. He, to enable him to maintain himself, suddenly becomes possessed of his private property; he is a capitalist, for he has that wherewith he can obtain food easily. Through this means he has obtained more food than he needs for some time, and he can therefore rest for a season and apply himself to other pursuits. Getting rid of this continuous hunting, he begins to make other improvements. Once a capitalist, his capital increases. The other huntsmen come to him and examine his capital, and ask him for the loan of it. Now, he says, why should I give my capital for nothing; clearly if I give it to all I will have none for myself. If I give it to any, I enrich its possessor for the time being. But the borrower offers him interest, and promises him a share of the booty he may obtain. Getting usury, he is able to apply himself to other avocations, and in this way commences civilisation, for the arts arise; and competition, the socialists' bugbear, grows with it. "The vast disorganised mob scrambling each for what he can get," as the socialists phrase our social state, begins to be known. But this vast disorganised mob, however unlovely in appearance, has given us all our arts, all our inventions, all our discoveries. "Without competition, if that is thinkable, we would have been wonderfully equal, but the level would have been very low; we would have been all at one state of civilisation, and that a not very advanced one. All machinery would have been unknown. Wide through the woods we would have been roaming, noble, perhaps, but unrobed, and I fear not very intellectual in our pursuits. As to the right to labour, or the right to obtain work and be paid for it, which more than socialists assert, what is this but another way of destroying both private property and competition. For if some in a society have a right to demand labour, or work with pay as this phrase always signifies, from whom? Clearly from the capitalist. Of course from Government simply means from the capitalist, for who pay the taxes? But what is capital but past labour; and if past labour, if one cannot enjoy it, what is this but asserting in another shape that the capitalist, when he by abstinence or care or ability accumulated his labour—his capital—he did so to give it to those who perhaps had like opportunities, but neglected to do as he did.

Closely connected with socialism, in fact springing out of it, came Co-operation as a system. Many of its

founders were tinged with socialism. Holding, however, theoretical views, they determined to become practical. Many of the socialists' Utopias had miserably failed, and they had not the means, if they had the inclination, to enter into any socialistic arrangements. The Rochdale Society, which is the pioneer society of co-operations, sprang from very small beginnings. The founders thought they were paying too dear for their groceries, and, besides, they said they did not get them of very excellent quality. They therefore met, and without any extraneous aid resolved to form a store for the supply of their necessaries. It was a very small beginning; 28 operatives of Rochdale started what is now a great movement. Most of them were flannel weavers, and provident men, who though having small wages had managed to keep out of debt. By payments of twopence or threepence per week they managed to obtain £28, and this was all their capital. With this sum they bought some sacks of flour, some oatmeal, sugar, and butter. They rented a shop at £10 per year. The opening of the shop was anxiously looked forward to by the Rochdale community, and when the weavers took the shutters down and exposed their small store, there was great laughter. But laughter would not dismay men like the Rochdale co-operators. They sold their goods, they gave no credit, and so much has the society increased—from this small beginning—that the business actually done now exceeds £300,000 a year. A great increase on the £28. This Rochdale Society is the parent society, and, emulating its noble example in many respects, thousands of co-operative stores have been opened all over the United Kingdom—I may say throughout Europe and America. Not content, however, with co-operative stores, the co-operators have gone further; they have attempted to solve the labour problem, by trying to get rid of an employer class. According to this section of them, all workmen are to form a partnership, or as they term it—to co-operate. They aim, after paying their foreman, at dividing the profits equally amongst the workmen. This attempt has been applied to many trades. One of the first attempts was in tailoring; but the most successful has been in farming. Time will not allow me to give you full details of the various schemes. While giving them every credit for their endeavours, for who would not give great praise to such efforts as those of the Rochdale and other co-operators? do not let us imagine, as some of them have vainly thought, that co-operation is that solution of the labour problem for which all were so anxiously awaiting the coming. There seems to be defects even in this however successful system: for what, after all, can co-operative stores do? Clearly the only way profit can be made is by the sale of groceries, and salesmen have to be employed. How the salesmen are paid is of little moment. If co-operators pay a little more to the co-operative store than to the grocer next door perhaps, there will of necessity, if the business is properly managed, be some profits to divide at the end of the year. If they obtain profits in any other way, it can only be in this way.—They may obtain a manager or shopmen at lower wage than the grocer, or shopkeeper charges for his care and toil and risk. Whatever they gain thus will also add to their profits; but in no other way can they make profits. Nor after all will it be found that their investment of their capital in co-operative stores will return them more interest or profit than if the investment had been made in another way. For competition is not banished, and there are capitalists with whom they have to come into contact. So far then we see co-operative stores give us nothing but this—a manner of investing capital in the business of grocers, and a probable obtaining at a cheaper rate shopmen to serve them, that the competing shopkeepers charge for their labour. This can hardly be called any solution at all of the labour problem. But co-operators have not been content, as I have stated, with the selling of groceries. They have aimed at something higher, and that is co-operative production as well as co-operative distribution of flour, butter, and sugar. Unfortunately the societies have generally resembled the socialistic Utopias—been miserable failures. And why? The question always to solve, who is to be head? who is to be foreman? who is to decide what work B shall do, and what A? has been left unanswered. All men are not equal, and all tailors share the same frailty. And what has happened? Nothing but perpetual wranglings. You see this was an attempt to get rid of the employer, or managing class, and such was the perversity of human nature, that, all being masters, all wanted to rule; and if a majority did fix on a suitable foreman, there were always some enemies in the camp, who considered they were shabbily treated. Had not one of the masters a right to say for what work he was the most suited? If not, was he not despotically ruled over? And on this rock have co-operative producing societies been wrecked. They alas, like the socialistic dreamers, did not recognise the fact that men are not all masters, but that to be fitted for their systems a long process of evolution is necessary.

Positivism aims to get rid of the evils of both these systems. It asserts with loud tongue that all men are not equal, that all are diverse; and that, as there are different functions to be fulfilled in the social organism, so there are amongst mankind individuals fitted to undertake them. But above this assertion there is a wider one, and one far more beautiful and as captivating as that of you're-as-good-as-another theory of the socialists, and it is that the highest worship is to worship humanity—the good of the mass is the highest duty of man,—and its divinity is man in the aggregate. With its religious views we have nothing to do, nor with its founders' classification of the sciences, etc. That these, and its principles of social reform, are believed in by some of the brightest intellects in England, should make us weigh carefully the solution offered by it. Its sanction is a religious one. It points to socialism, and says to the socialist:—"You have condemned the competition system

because it was a disorganised mob, each of which was clambering and jostling his neighbor to obtain a living; but what are you? You are enthusiasts, who have presupposed what has never yet existed, and by a fatal sort of sleepwalking have proceeded to put into operation your system of unselfishness and love, while all the while men were selfish and at enmity. You have imagined men had reached a high standard of morality, when, alas! they had never approached to a low standard; and what are you but an organised mob waiting the auction of that which could alone unite you—an organised religion? The basis of positivism is therefore religious,"—but a religion of an ideal though earthly kind. It would organise society as an army; over all there would be a supreme pontiff, tinged with infallibility Under him there would be high priests and guilds—(I speak of it as modified and shadowed forth by some of its English disciples)—and under them labourers would be appointed and ruled. These rulers would be the wisest and best, and there would and could be no appeal from their decisions, should the less wise appeal against the decision of those more just than they. There must be no complaining, for those heirarchs are the wisest and best; and what right have the foolish and the bad to complain of the conduct of their superiors? Nor would the guilds and priests look after the labour problem alone. Believing as they do, and as many socialists do, that our marriage laws and customs have everything to do with our well-being, they would regulate marriage. Ruskin, who has in him something of the socialist and much of the positivist, although I believe he disclaims it, grapples with the marriage question in a way that would I have no doubt be pleasing to many in every community. He would have every one—and especially the bachelors—who had not married before twenty-five, looked upon by the community as persons who had committed a great wrong, in fact as social outcasts. Nor could everyone marry. Marriage is to be regulated and looked upon as a reward of merit. The young couple need not, however, be at all put out in money matters. Their honeymoon is to last for seven years—happy couples!—and during this time they are to be paid some two or three hundred a year; and all couples are to be placed upon the same footing. There is not to be one thing for the rich and another for the poor. If the rich have property, it is to be managed during their honeymoon by the Ruskinian bishops, the overseers as he terms them, and returned with accumulations when their sweet seven years of enjoyment are ended. Who would not support this social utopias? Nothing but happiness here! But, though kind to the newly married couples, the interference of the "overseers" and the priests would become perhaps irksome, for these "overseers" would come to the scientific men and say, you must spend your time only in those subjects which are beneficial to the community as a whole; and if he replied, but this will be beneficial, the overseers would reply, we think otherwise, and the heierarchy are supreme. Of the scientific aspects, however, of positivism, Professor Huxley in articles to the Fortnightly Review, republished in his Lay Sermons, has said perhaps all that can be said against its treatment of science and her votaries. With its social system I hardly think we will agree. It is at best a theocracy whose theus is humanity, and whose priests are all-powerful. To me it has two defects. First, it looks upon men, or the vast majority of men, in somewhat a similar way as Carlyle characterised his country- men—thirty-six millions, mostly fools. All men except the pontiff and his staff are in a state of pupilage, and they are ever to remain in this condition, for positivism is not a stepping-stone to something higher; there are always to be the rulers and the ruled, and the method of rule despotic. Its second defect is that it makes no provision, or does not show how the wisest are to be selected as the pontiff and rulers. All admit, and positivists continually affirm, that the men of gold will be always the few, and the men of iron the many. If it is to be a popular election, how can the men of iron select the men of gold; can iron detect gold? Here it fails, and will fail, or will become the purest despotism. Might there not be some of "iron" who imagined they were golden? There is nothing more difficult than to persuade some people that they are not Jacks-of-all-trades. To take an illustration. Tell a good comedian that he is good, praise him well. Ten to one he has a hankering after tragedy, and you cannot insult him more readily than by hinting that comedy is his sphere. Nor is this feeling confined to actors, we meet it cropping out amongst every class. Now positivists, leaving to a few the right to settle for the many their avocation, their wage, etc., what is this but a despotism pure and simple; and, asserting what perhaps is true, that the few mean it for the best, are they infallible? Infallibility is at all events, if it exists at all, a very rare thing. Before, however, dismissing positivism, let me state that to its great founder, M. Comte, we owe much. It is to him we are indebted for the founding of "sociology." It is perhaps not a science, yet but for the efforts of him and his disciples we would have been still far behind in discussing man's social relations in anything but a hap-hazard empirical manner. He has aimed at reducing social phenomena to a science, and if he has not succeeded, he has at all events pointed out the way for future philosophers to walk in. That the time may come when any political or social act will admit of no more discussion as to its effects than any act of the chemist or natural philosopher does at present, we may surely believe; and if so, to the positivists are we indebted for the attempt to found social science.

I now come to the last utopia, to that of Liberty. I have fixed on the name liberty for its brevity and comprehension. I might have termed it political economy, properly understood and, what is rarer, acted up to; or I might have termed it the system of justice. I have taken the term liberty as comprehending these.

Unfortunately it has few disciples, for though there are men who pretend that they as citizens are guided by the dictates of political economy, their action belies their words. Few indeed will allow the liberty system to guide them in everything. Every now and then you find them taking their eye from it and casting about for expedients to rid them of some dilemma. Its followers, ignoring expediency, look to what is right, not to what is expedient. It is never expedient, say they, to do wrong. As a consequence of their action they are looked upon as vain theorists, not at all as practical men. But what is a practical man, and what a theorist? Is not the true difference between what is popularly termed a theorist and a practical man this? The theorist is not guided by his own experience, nor by the doings of the citizens of his own nation; he looks at the past, and scans carefully the present, and he, relying on his survey, gives utterance to his opinions. The practical man, again, takes a narrow range for his vision. He confines himself to his own experience, which is necessarily limited; to his own people and customs, necessarily contracted; and, glancing like the wayfarers of old at one side of the shield and presumes he has seen both, suddenly comes to a conclusion. Practical men are eminently unpractical. But the political economists have another and graver charge made against them than that of being theorists. When they proclaim as the cardinal doctrine of their system "equal liberty to all," and assert that it is not the duty of the Government—of society—to do aught but maintain "equal freedom," they have flung in their teeth, What right have you to speak? Have you not ruled us always. It is sickening to hear, so say some of the opponents of the equal freedom doctrine, this perpetual reference to equal freedom and political economy, as if these were not the causes of all our ills? Is this so—has political economy always guided us? An eminent writer thus retorts:—The assertion that "political economy has hitherto had it all its own way," and is therefore chargeable with the present state of things, we meet with the most indignant and peremptory denial. It is not only not true, but is precisely the reverse of true. Economists affirm, and with perfect justice, that the existing wretchedness of England is directly traceable to ignorance, neglect, and systematic violation of the principles of political economy. It is difficult to name a single precept of that science which has not been either lost sight of, or habitually contravened. Political economy says:—Industry ought to be as unshackled as the wind; restriction cripples it; protection misdirects it; the two together diminish its productiveness, and the number of mouths it can support. When has English industry been free and unimpeded? Political economy, reechoing christianity and common-sense, long since proclaimed "that if any man would not work neither should he eat;" our laws enact that a man shall eat whether he will work or not. Political economy, repeating the simple teachings of morality, pronounced that if a man married without means or prospects, and brought children into the world whom he was unable to support, he acted unjustly and selfishly, as well as imprudently, and that the correction of his fault should be left to its natural results;—the law stepped in between the cause and its consequence, between the folly and its cure, and declared that if he could not support his own children, the prudent, industrious, and the self-denying should do it for him. Political economy, reiterating the dictates of nature, proclaimed that the larger the family a man had to support by his labour, the scantier must be the allowance of each member of it. The common custom till 1834, in England, was to increase the peasant's wages or allowance with every additional child that was born to him. [And to the present day the clergy in some Churches are paid in proportion to the number of their family.] Political economy said to the labourer—If population increases faster than the field of employment enlarges or the demand for labour augments, your position will inevitably deteriorate;—even divines and county magistrates scouted such philosophy, and inculcated upon their hearers "increase and multiply—the strength of a country lies in its numbers—"dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed." Lastly, political economy said—Industry, frugality, forethought, and perseverance shall not fail of their reward; nor indolence, unthrift, and crime escape a bitter retribution. But no such thing. The English poor-laws, by enacting that all have a right to relief, allow the person who has wasted his time, his talents, and his earnings, to live in the workhouse; while the person who was prudent, careful, and abstemious, and perhaps earned less wages, is taxed to keep him there. Political economy has been neglected and wantonly thrown aside, and in these latter days its throwing aside is openly justified for the benefit of the labourer. There is no maxim that admits of more abundant proof than that "a country's wealth cannot be increased by taxing its inhabitants." Yes, this is what the protectionists say, if their statement means anything. The disciples of liberty say that as a society, social organism, or Government, all that should be done by the state is to maintain "equal freedom." What equal freedom is that which would assert the right to tax another to benefit his neighbour; yet what are poor laws, protection systems, etc., doing but this?—A species of robbery by the arm of the law. The liberty system would fail if it stopped at the assertion of the widest and fullest liberty, the doctrine of equal freedom. It goes much further. Like that system which, whether divine or not, has so enriched our world with its moral teachings and its religious enthusiasm, it comes to every soul of man and makes it a personal matter with him, this labour problem. It tells him, in tones of which there can be no mistaking their import, how he must labour, for whom, for what. It says to him that he must live justly, that he must not trample on the rights of any one, and that justice not expediency must be his rule in life; and it also points out clearly and unmistakeably a truth of which we are but slow to recognise the importance—that every infraction of law, of social law as well of

other laws, is followed by punishment. If a labourer will be wasteful, will marry when he cannot afford to do so, will have a larger family than he can provide for, will spend his money in luxuries or in intoxicating beverages, that he will suffer for it. There is no getting rid of that. In terrible reality will he recognise this truth, that his sin will find him out. Nay, it also tells him that he has no right to demand from society when out of work, employment, nor when in want of food, temporary relief. To many it hence seems cruel and harsh. It is not so. It looks at society as an organism, and says that the members can only become strong by exercise. Of course its doctrine of individual sympathy is not left out, nor that of benevolence. But as a state it insists on this, that the individual who has erred in such way as to find himself reaping the reward of his conduct, should not be placed in peculiar circumstances, and freed from the punishment which should follow. Such are its aims. Though it also may lack something, it seems to me most rational, and at the same time most effective. It is not by forced processes that our social anomalies can be remedied; they can only be gradually and slowly got rid of.

But what then will our future be, I fancy you say. May we not state that all the states, though so diverse, may be blended? that the time may come when the "love" of socialism, the "self- help and union" of co-operation, a broad religious sanction like that of positivism, with the justice and liberty of the liberty system, may be united. Signs are not wanting of the tendency to equality in all political rights, and will not social rights soon follow? Before in our literary world how few were the stars; now how covered is the firmament with their radiance. A wealthy man was before a rare man, and even he had how few of the things we possess. A Plantaganet king had no glass in the windows of his house, no piper for its walls, no railways, no newspapers, nor could he were he over so anxious have borrowed immense sums of money to expend as he or his advisers thought fit. The past and present are not the same. We have made a great and a glorious advance, though, alas, the Promised Land is still far distant; and why should we despair, why should we say that a labour utopia is impossible. Impossible, says Carlyle in writing of this question, Impossible, brothers. I answer, *if for you it be impossible*, What is to Become of you? An ingenious calculator has shown that if ever one in a community did two hours' work every day, that would be sufficient to maintain the race in comfort and happiness, and the rest of our time might be spent in recreation and study. A labour utopia is not then impossible, and I think I may assert that the future will show us this, for it is daily becoming more patent that the condition of labourers will be materially improved. Of course the classes above them will also share in that improvement; indeed it reaches them first, but we should not complain of this. From history we learn that material improvement has always begun, and it always will begin, not with those who need it most, but with those who need it least. And hence we see the higher classes of workmen making experiments, by trade unions, co-operative societies, mechanics' institutes, and clubs, which the lower will by and by repeat. Such is the law of progress. In the future, besides material improvement there will also be vast intellectual advance. It will then be no unusual sight to see the labourer, as he homeward wends his way when his allotted task is over, scanning the sky and the earth with appreciative looks. The beauty of the forest, or the play of light and shade in the western sky, will not bring to the artist alone a notion of the sublime and beautiful, nor will the herbs or minerals and their uses be only known to the scientific. The hours of labour will be lessened, and men become more like men,

*"Through all the season of the golden year."*

Do not imagine that this advance can be at once. Poverty will exist, nay, I may say must exist for a long time to come. As long as we find people selfish and ignorant, imprudent and wasteful, poverty will exist as punishment for their selfishness, ignorance, wastefulness and imprudence. If we wish, however, to hasten the arrival of an utopia in which poverty will be reduced to a minimum, how should we act? It is worse than useless, it is mischievous, declaiming against our social state, and portraying in dark colours our terrible anomalies, and stopping there. We have duties to fulfil. It seems to me to be the highest duty in these days to assert and proclaim as loudly as possible, that we have no right to cripple those who come after us. That, on the contrary, it should be our highest aim and our constant desire so to act that those who have to succeed us may be benefited, not injured by our conduct. We must also show to the improvident, and let the self-indulgent know it, that we will not rid them of the penalty of their action. As they sow so must they reap. But, above all, we must regard ourselves not as accidents. We must believe that if there be a moral Governor of the Universe, He has in His wisdom designed us as agents for some purpose. "Not as adventitious, therefore, not as something which may be slighted and made subordinate to questions of policy, or the obtaining of a kind of popularity among our fellows, will we regard the faith that is in us." We may be wrong, as we are fallible, but we will never falter in uttering what we conceive to be the highest truth; nor will we stop until we can get, not by force, but by that which is greater than mere force, the enthusiasm of faith and hope and charity, our idealisms embodied in fact. Acting thus, we will discard all short and easy methods of social improvement, and recognise that it is only bit by bit that real advance is made. Nor will labourers be found competing merely for destructive purposes. They in that future to which we are now advancing will recognise that it is best to throw aside jealousies, rivalries, and everything ignoble. And amongst them the greatest will be those who are the noblest. As in one stage of our progress, the greatest man has been he who was the best warrior; as in another stage, the

greatest was he who had most wealth; as in yet another, the greatest was he who had the highest intellect. So in the future, the greatest will be he who will manifest the greatest self-sacrifice, and who if need be "would be content to lay his body in the trench, that others might use it as a bridge to pass over to that emancipation from degradation, and to that victory which yet awaits our labourers."

*My vision was of shadows thrown before  
Coming events, things that shall surely be;  
Nor now delayed, but until man, no more  
Wholly on blinding lust intent, shall see—  
That his own interest and his kind's are one,  
Blended in individual destiny.*

A Lecture On Education,

By the Rev. W. L. Stanford, of Tokomairiro.

Henry Wise, Bookseller, Etc., Princes Street Dunedin, N. Z. 1872

## Lecture on Education.

It has often been my lot to address an audience upon varying matters, but I do not know that I have ever found myself in a more unenviable predicament than I do to-night. Sometimes you know a lecturer may console himself when he regards the poverty of his matter by the reflection that his audience are certainly more ignorant than himself; but to-night I am sure I should not find one among my audience to agree with me in such an idea, since, on the subject of education, almost everyone thinks that he knows a good deal. Again, I think my nationality is against me; for my Northern brethren, justly proud as they are of the excellent character which the Scotch nation has earned for education, are, I think, inclined to be a little contemptuous in regarding an Englishman's views on the subject: there is always a sort of unconscious reference to what Scotland has done, and a feeling that they speak with a certain experience on this point. Well, again, another of my difficulties is that education is at present a political matter, and I have rather a horror of politics,—rather a prejudice than a principle,—but still a sort of feeling that Provincial politics are like pitch, and very apt to defile one. Then, again, I know I am going to say what many of you will not at all agree with. My judgment on our education here certainly differs very considerably from that, I will not say of the majority, but of those who talk most loudly on the subject. And when, in addition to all these little matters, you understand that I am really and truly going to say what I do think is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I am really quite astonished and delighted at my own courage in addressing you this evening. However, here I am, and to the point—

*Education* is so wide a theme that it is necessary to define and lay out the ground somewhat, and say what parts of it I am going to speak of.

First of all, let us see what it means—what we mean by *education* at all. Then, again, one naturally asks, Who ought to look after it? And then whether religion is not an essential part in true education. Then I am going to say something about our present system here, and a little about this new Bill, which is now withdrawn; and also a little about education in other countries: a large field, you will say; but I think it is the function of a lecturer to say a little about many things rather than a great deal about one.

What, then, shall we understand to be the meaning and object of education? When you speak of a *well educated man*, or, a *capital system of education*, what is the idea which the words convey to our mind? It is, I think, especially necessary to define the meaning of the word, because at least three-fourths of the differences which exist about the *method* and success of teachers arise from the fact that different people look for different things, and apply different tests to the process of education. Were all agreed as to what weapons a properly taught child, emerging from school-life into the world, should be able to wield, it would be far easier to decide on the methods by which he should be equipped. But it is only necessary to hear any two ordinary individuals discussing their own or other people's children to see that parents differ as widely as it is possible to differ about *anything*, in what they want and expect their children to be taught. I might state the question as between two leading parties somewhat in this way:—One party says—I want my child to be made modest, and humble as to his own acquirements, knowing what he *does* know thoroughly, and conscious that at his feet and all around him there lie unknown worlds of thought and action. I want him taught the great lesson, that he must, after all, but begin the real work of self-education as he is ushered, all trembling, into the world of action. I expect that he will have learned *to think*, to gather his facts, and generalise from them until he finds *his* truths. I should like to find him shy of dogmatism, prone to listen, having at least learned that he knows but little; and if



his teacher has but taught him that he must, after all, teach himself, his school-life will have been time well spent. Such is, as I conceive, the hope and desire of a wise parent. On the other hand, another *large*, I think, an increasing body would require of a schoolmaster that he should have instilled into his boy's mind an interminable *succession of hard facts*; that their boy should know everything that will enable him to cut a dash, or (for this is the essence of the wish) *make money*—to keep books, and calculate fractional interests on three months bills, to have his eyes open, and be smart, write a good office hand; that he should not be shy or awkward in talking to older people than himself, but always have an answer and a word on the end of his tongue. Forgetting that the earliest peach has never the sweetest taste, and that the full-flavored grapes that make the best wine are the latest, parents too often want in their *own* children what they detest in *other* people's sons—*that thing* which we call *intelligence* in ourselves and *impudence* in others. In a word, one party wants *instruction*, or the building up of facts; the other wants *true* education, or the evolving, drawing out, and training of the heaven-born, God-given faculties of the human intelligence. *Punch* describes a parent complaining to a schoolmaster in these words—"I see you've put my son into grammar and jography. Now, as I neither mean him for a minister or sea captain, it's no use. Give him a plain business education." This gentleman is only an extreme member of a party that numbers many respectable supporters. The liberal education of the past, with all its serious faults, had this merit, that it was liberal. Its purpose was to give a man something more than the mere power of making money; and to do this it familiarised its disciples with other civilisations than those in which lie lived, and opened to him a world of knowledge and enjoyment beyond the visible present, in which lies his bread and butter. Wherever it is possible, the first eighteen or twenty years of life should be devoted to developing and enriching man's nature in its broadest range. After-life will all too soon render him a mere minister or sea-captain, as the case may be. It is the proper work of education to secure that, over and above his special vocation, he shall be a man.

I am thus particular in expressing the difference that exists between *instruction* and *education*, because I believe that instruction pays more immediately than education, and I notice a continually increasing reference to the question, *Will it pay?* as the test of each subject brought into a school curriculum; and, not only *Will it pay?* but *Will it pay at once?* People cannot bear the idea of waiting even a few years to gain the fruit of their expenditure. Little girls are taught music that they may have something taking to strum to their parents' admiring friends. Little boys are puzzled at public examinations with heartbreaking questions, that one admiring parent may quote her Johnny's precocity, and contrast it with the stupidity of some one else's Sandy. Just now I want you to notice that *that* process which produces a saleable article at the earliest opportunity is certainly not *the* process which we can dignify with the name of *education*. Education is culture and care for the intelligence of a teeming brain. There is a mistake in it if it does not increase happiness; there is a fault in it if it does not correct faults, foster virtues, and deal skilfully as well with the portion of ourselves that clings to time, and that other portion that yearns for immortality. To regard education as merely an equipment with certain acquired facts which the owner thereof may sell to the best advantage is to ignore and set on one side its most important function. Elementary education must indeed, in the first instance, provide a pupil with the means of acquiring other knowledge, viz., reading; and since he would be at a loss among his fellow-men without them, it may go on to give him writing and arithmetic; and, since he would be worse than dead without it, the *most* elementary education of all must give some religion. Beyond this, in all higher matters, in anything beyond the mechanical arts of writing, and so on, it is not education at all unless it is bent on the culture and development of the individual child. A school routine should be, and most usually is, arranged for the guidance and fostering of the single individual acquirements of each child.

Whose duty, then, is it to undertake this fostering care—to watch over the culture of the rising generation?

In discussing that question, I shall not be deterred by what seems the universal opinion around me, but which is really only the panic-stricken cry of a few, and which says that it is the *work of the State to educate*. In defiance of the whole spirit of the age, newspapers repeat, and political orators reiterate the cry, that the State's machinery should be put in force to educate the masses. Had the question been mooted some few hundred years ago, the answer would no doubt have been that a paternal, divinely-appointed sovereign was obviously the right person to care for the education of his children, the people: and *if* the divine right of kings had any real existence, if any sovereign that ever lived were really the father of his people, no doubt he would have to take up this duty along with others of the same kind; but in the face of modern history, in defiance of political economy, against the fruit of all personal experience—in 1871, to take up such a view, and assign such a duty to the State, is surely the most remarkable instance in our times of making old things new. There is not one argument used for the State education which may not be used for the State's undertaking a hundred other private matters. Education is necessary to the well-being of the body politic. *Certainly*. So is *cleanliness*: but is the State therefore to wash our brats or our shirts? Education will check crime. I will allow that it does so, though it is often questioned. But so does total abstinence: is the State then to prevent *all use* of strong drink? Education makes men happier. Granted. But so does money: is the State then to allow us all so many hundreds

a year? All the arguments that are used for State interference in this matter are capital reasons for *having our children educated*, but no reasons at all for the State's performing the task. I have never seen one really sound argument used for the State keeping a school, which might not also be used to prove that it should cook our dinners, make and mend our clothes, choose our wives, marry our daughters, preach our sermons, build our houses, wash our faces, heal our sick, and plough our fields. Nay, while there might be something to be said for the State doing some of these things, there is really nothing to be said in favor of its keeping school, Except this, that we are often too lazy and idle to educate our children ourselves; but if the body corporate were to step in and undertake itself every neglected work, what Superintendent or House of Assembly, what Governor would be sufficient for all these things? But before I go any further, let me say what I believe is the duty of the State toward education. Just the same duty that it performs towards all those matters, *private in themselves*, but which have a *relation* to and an effect upon other people. The duty of a Government is *to see that children are taught*, and, *if necessary*, to punish those who do not teach them. Now, as I am sure this seems a very heterodox notion to many of you, I must justify myself here by quoting one who is universally admitted to be among the most eminent political economists of the present century. I mean Mr. John Stuart Mill. He speaks thus:—"If the Government would make up its mind to *require* for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of *providing* one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees of the poorer classes of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them. The objections which are urged, with reason, against *State* education do not apply to the *enforcement* of education by the State, But to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education. That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in the State's hands, I go as far as anyone in deprecating." I think that is a pretty strong judgment. Or, again, listen to Lord Macaulay on a cognate question. Speaking on the functions of Government, he says:—"Government exists for the purpose of keeping the peace, for the purpose of compelling us to settle our disputes by arbitration instead of settling them by blows, for the purpose of compelling us to supply our wants by industry instead of supplying them by rapine. This is the *only* operation for which the machinery of Government is peculiarly adapted, the *Only* operation which Wise Governments propose to themselves as their chief object." And, again, Mill speaks most plainly and decidedly of the ill effects of Government in any way meddling with the teaching of its people. The real fact of the matter is that the Government at Home, having suddenly awoke to the pressing need of education, and to the fact that they had neglected the duty of enforcing it, are going too far in the other direction in a perfect panic, and undertaking the whole duty themselves. For us in this colony there is less excuse. *No man goes further than I do* in extolling the advantages of education. I believe it must be widely spread indeed to make a happy or prosperous nation; but I also believe that, in handing that and kindred subjects over to the care of Government, we do more to injure energy and freedom of action among ourselves, *do more* to emasculate the vigor and activity of our social life, than any advantage which we can gain by the most universal education will ever repay to us. There must ever be in every healthy community a broad line of demarcation between the private and corporate duties of the citizens, and over that line we can only step at peril of our independence, our progress, and, at last, our very being. Many, indeed, have noticed with regret, in these free colonies, a growing tendency to look to the Government for everything, *always excepting religion*. Just in proportion as we have seen the supreme folly of a State *Church*, so we are shy of taking what is inevitably the next step, and acknowledging no State education. By a natural recoil, I suppose men shun the truth that the proper functions of the body corporate are neither teaching religion nor anything else. It would be easy to cite, by way of illustration, many excellent things which a State should enforce, but about which it should not actively concern itself—things which it should make sure *are done*, but which it does not undertake to *do*. I am compelled by law to keep my chimneys so clean that they do not catch fire, but *no* kind agent of the State steps in to sweep them; the State declares that I shall not go about the roads unless I am clad with breeches or blanket, or *at least a kilt*, but I have never heard of State tailors to make my necessary garments; nay, the State declares with imperious voice that I must pay my quota of taxes, but it never thinks of supplying me with the necessary funds to do so. It cannot, then, be argued that there would be a hardship in the State demanding that our children be educated, since education is so necessary, any more than that they should be clothed, and yet at the same time not providing the means withal. I know but of two arguments which even seem to carry with them some show of *proof* that the State should educate. The one is that, since it is for the *common good* of all that the young should be taught, it is but fair that the *common* purse should pay for the process of teaching. Such an argument seems sound; but is the State to pay directly for *everything* that conduces to the common benefit? Should it pay head money to a parent in a colony for each child brought into the world, because population is desirable? It is for the good of all that men should be industrious. Then, is the State to induce us by money gifts to work? It is for the benefit of all that the community should be *moral, religious*. Then, will you set up a State church? Or, again, men say that the machinery of the State will best ensure the carrying out of so great a national duty. Men *say* such things, you know, in public, and then grumble about officialism and red-tapism,

and deplore the stupidity of each department in turn: say the country is devoured with Government loafers, quite unconscious of the contradiction in their sentiments. Again, it is said that unless the State undertakes the duty it will be, as it has been, neglected. *No*: not if the State vigorously discharges its proper functions, and sees, by impartial inspectors, that every single child is taught. The State is concerned solely—it cannot be too often repeated—with those portions of our conduct which concern one another, and not with those that concern ourselves. The *how* of teaching does not concern the State at all, but merely the attainment of the fact. And certainly, if all these reasons prove clearly that even *elementary* education and State functions are best kept apart, I need not go on, I think, to argue the point in respect to higher education. Even if the four R's—reading, writing, arithmetic, and religion—should be taught at public expense, because the knowledge of them will tend to empty our gaols or benevolent institutions, and make us less liable to the interference of the police, such an argument can hardly be used with respect to the acquirement of Euclid, Latin, French, or Physical Science. I have never seen, and cannot imagine, any plausible argument for teaching these things at public expense. Public expense! why, it is public robbery!—it is taking the poor man's money to educate the rich man's sons. Let us allow that it is a good thing to know all these things; but still, to take the public revenue to educate some two hundred boys and girls who happen to live in Dunedin at the expense of those who live in the country, is, to speak plainly, a job.

And this brings us to another knotty question, on which, for my own part, I feel most strongly. I have said that I hold it not to be the duty of the State to teach either religion or arithmetic; but, in the name of common sense, I protest against its doing *one* without the *other*. What would you think of a cobbler who professed to make boots, but would not undertake to make boot soles? or a tailor who were to make coats, but not coat sleeves? Would you employ him? I trow not. And how then can you ask a schoolmaster to *educate* beings with eternal interests, and forbid him to utter one word which should refer to immortality. A parson who could not preach, a dumb vocalist, a blind optician, a deaf critic, would all be possible, all be easily found before you could find *one good secular schoolmaster*. Sir Roundell Palmer has well observed that the thing is essentially impossible: you cannot *educate* and leave out the most essential item in education.

Let us see then next what those parts are which are essential to true education. Regarding education as "*the drawing out* and developing the culture and care, the training and nourishing of those germs of intelligence which are to be found in all human beings, *however small*, let us see to what this process should be applied. I shall speak more especially upon one point, inasmuch as, owing to certain circumstances, there is a considerable sect among us whose belief it is that *religion is not an* Essential part of education: that is, while not *at present* professing any *disrespect to religion*, they say that the State can and ought *only* to give an education without religion. They allow, no doubt, that the want ought to be supplied by the Christian Church, acting in concert with the State; but they declare that the State *ought to educate*, and yet not teach religion—*i.e.*, they hold that there can be education without religion, or, in other words, that religion is not an inseparable part of education.

In discussing their position, then, we may fairly say that they require the State to spend the public money in teaching secular subjects, to the exclusion of religious subjects. That is the doctrine which the Secularist denomination—to speak quite accurately—holds. I, on the other hand, hold that to teach according to the belief of *their* body (the Secularists), to the exclusion of *mine*, would be most unfair. The Secularists, indeed, assume that they are not a sect, but a national body. Just as the Plymouth Brethren call themselves *Christians*, and seem thereby to assume that *all Christians* belong to them, so the Secularists call themselves Nationalists, as though to assume that *all* the nation belongs to them. The trick is as old as the hills. A set of men separate from the rest on some point of belief, and instantly forget that they are a sect, and call themselves by some all-embracing name, and invite all to join *them*, and *so* make peace. Secular educationists, to narrow the matter to a definition, say religion should *not* be taught by the schoolmaster. Religious educationists say it *should* be taught by the schoolmaster. Which is right? That is' a question I will speak of for a moment presently; but whichever is right, the action of the State, if the State helps at all, is perfectly obvious. I am not contented if my child is not taught at school what I consider essential—*i.e.*, religion. The Secularist is not contented if *his* child *is* so taught. If the State helps either one, and not the other, it is guilty of an act of tyranny and injustice. It must help both, or neither. Have you Secularist schools? I say; and so long as the State helps at all, let it help you and me and all of us; but do not quietly assume that you are so right and I am so wrong that the State should help *you* and not *me*. Such a cry has been the essence of all the persecutions that ever took place. The Secularists have started a new denomination, and endeavour to escape the consequences of their position by assuming that they are *not* a denomination. Let us not, however, be deceived by such a trick. Just as the Church of Rome calls itself the Universal Church, that of England calls itself the Primitive, as the Cambelites and Plymouth Brethren and a hundred others have assumed, in an especial way, the name of Christian, so these good folk try to throw dust in our eyes by assuming the name of the *nation*. We all like big names, but they become particularly objectionable if they are used to misdirect money. For, after all, the alternative which they hold out is perfectly fallacious.

They say, either we must have denominationalism or secularism. Not at all. Secularism in our schools is denominationalism : it would please some, be they many or few, and disgust some, be they many or few. They cannot hope to please *all*, or even, I think, a *majority*: so that really there would be more to be said for making all the schools in this Province Presbyterian than secular; for then, at least, you would satisfy half the tax-payers in Otago. The *just alternative* is between some *sort* of denominational State education and no State education at all. For, supposing that the State were to start a system of pure secularism, the Roman Catholics could no more accept and use it than they do our present Otago system; nor could the far larger number of the Wesleyans or Episcopians. By starting such a system the State does not include and satisfy one more than at present; for I do not understand the Secular body to object to the teaching of the Bible *in itself*, and it would inevitably offend and drive away many who are at present contented. And, after all, for what? That you may have the barren satisfaction of saying to the Catholics, as I saw it rather vain-gloriously put the other day, "*There, See, rather than tyrannise over your consciences, and commit a political injustice, we have given up all religious teaching in our schools.*" What the Catholics object to is not that religion *is* taught, but that Their religion is Not Taught. They say—and they say with perfect truth and justice—you have no right to compel us to pay for what is, in our opinion, a partial and unsound education. While we believe a child is not *educated* unless he is taught our religion, we must not be compelled to pay for any other teaching for them.

You notice that there are two questions often dragged into this matter, about which I shall attempt to say nothing to-night: one is the comparative numbers of the Secular body; and the other, the truth or falsehood of the possible religions taught in schools. Both are really outside the question when we regard it as it should be regarded—as a pure matter of political economy. For this reason: that it is not the province of the State at all to enquire into the religious opinions of its members (a fact, of course, on which Secularists ground many arguments—only, they prove too much); and *therefore* the discussion about a majority for or against religious education, for or against Roman Catholics, is quite beyond the question. In a land of religious liberty and religious equality, to quote numbers on either side is to justify the tyranny of the majority over men's consciences. And so, too, to speak of the truth or falsehood of the doctrines taught is beyond the State's function. If you will but regard the State as a Joint Stock Company (for it is nothing more under a representative Government), of which the purpose of union is the preservation of law and order, you will at once admit that education and such domestic subjects come before it only in its capacity of Magistrate, and that it is concerned only with the *effects*, and not with the process that has produced these effects.

But there is another matter which, it seems to me, has not received the prominence that it deserves. Education of one's own children is surely not one of those matters in which the will of the majority is to be allowed to tyrannise over the minority. Beyond the mere fact that the State may have a right to insist upon some education being given, I do not think the most ardent Secularist would like to insist on forcing his melancholy cold comforts upon all. But a State secular system inevitably, like all monopolies, forces the minority to purchase its goods at one shop. Education is, by it, at once taken out of the list of *free* goods and entered not merely in the *protected* list, but in the monopolised. So that the Secularists say practically to a vast number of parents not merely, You shall not get religion in our shop, but, You shall employ us; not merely, You must abide by our rules *if* you come to us, but, You shall come to us. In a new country especially such "a system practically enforces *this*, Not merely shall your children not hear of God at *our* school, but they shall not hear of Him anywhere else. "Parents, will you submit to such a notion as this?—place the eternal interests of your children at the disposal of the outcry of half a dozen careless politicians? and, because they raise an outcry about the national progressiveness or culture or light, and all the rest of the cant, will you submit to have your children turned into calculating machines, and not at the same time help them to prepare for the eternity they will shortly enter? "Oh," I think I hear some one say, "they can get their religion at home." *What!* is the mother to teach it in the intervals of her wash-tub? or is the father to catechise his boy and hear him the Lord's Prayer in the intervals of forking straw or digging gold or potatoes? or are they both to steal a few sleepy hours from the night because *you* are ashamed of your Christianity? It is true a mother's lessons in religion are worth all the school teaching that can be imagined. Yet he must be himself very ignorant of religion and of his fellow-men who can suppose that such home instruction does not require, in a large number of instances, to be supplemented by the skilful and regular routine of religious lessons in school. Oh, what! it's the minister's business, is it, to teach religion? But when? In the school. Very good. Only that, of course, is uncommonly like the pure denominational system. It contains, at anyrate, nearly all its evils, and very little of its good. In small districts the two offices of parson and master would very shortly be united, and the minister would get a good deal more to say to the school management than would be generally approved of. *What!* *out* of the school is he to teach? *But where is he to catch all the children together except at school?* Oh, you say, at *Sunday school*. Just so: *that is*, you think religion of so little consequence that you would give twenty-five hours per week of secular instruction, and one hour, or say two, for religion. I know, Mr Secularist, that you will pass over such petty details with a lordly wave of your hand. Let us lay down the broad principle, you say, that the State must

not teach religion, and we must leave these matters of minute detail to be settled afterwards. Very good. But, while I do not wish to tyrannise *over you*—while I say have your thin, starved, secular schools if you must, please do not call me a bigot because I love the Bible more than writing, and think eternity holds a larger sum than any book of arithmetic; do not say I am a slave to ideas or churches, ecclesiasticism, because I think that God has written a book that is worth all men's reading books put together, because I would sooner a child of mine learnt to provide for eternity than for time. But really I must not take up your time with slaying the slain. Put it boldly. Say you think temporal matters, after all, are more important than eternal, or say you hate the Roman Catholics so much, you would sooner your child was taught no religion than their's; but do not come with demure looks and sly faces and say, We value religion very much: we yield to no man, &c.; *but* Don't you think, for the sake of *peace*, we ought to kick the Bible out of doors, or at least edge it into some corner where it will not interfere with real work.

But the question of which I am now treating is more especially of the parts essential to true education. And I think the difference of opinion may on its religious side be fairly compared and exhibited thus:—Some hold that religion is not an essential part at all of school work; some, that Bible teaching is essential; others, that doctrinal teaching is essential. Call them for the moment—Secularists, Religionists, and Denominationalists. And, following the usual method of ging such bodies, let us for a moment regard them in their more advanced state—not as they speak while weak and in a minority, but as they speak when they would fairly and openly defend their position in all its parts.

First, the Secularists. I do not hesitate to affirm that their position and views, fairly carried out, will land them in absolute infidelity towards the Bible. This is by no means saying that those who hold such views are bad or irreligious men. On the contrary, there are many Secularists who detest and despise all infidelity as much as I do myself; but *that their views* lead almost inevitably into that pit appears to me plain, both from the character and language of the most talented of their body. I have room for but one example—namely, Professor Huxley, addressing the London School Board, of which he is a member, he used these remarkable words when the question was being discussed whether the Bible should be read in the schools in London or not. He said that, "if these islands had no religion at all, it would not enter into his mind to introduce the religious idea by the agency of the Bible." Just so: that seems to me to express the ultimate belief of all true Secularists—viz., that the Bible should be turned out of the schools *because* it is not *a good means* for teaching the religious idea. I know many who now urge its exclusion will not defend this position for a moment. But the point really is, Is the knowledge of the Bible essential to good citizenship? Professor Huxley would say, "I should never dream of using the Bible to make good citizens." So that I am justified in saying that he treats the Bible with scant faith—*i.e.*, he is towards an infidel.

On the part of the Religionists I will quote a speech of the Rev. R H. Story, of Roseneath, in the Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland; and I believe his happy and felicitous oratory will strike a chord in many a heart here which would never warm toward the cold comforts of Secularism. He says :—"It would be observed that, in the schools of this country, there was always an increasing infusion of the scientific element in the instruction of the young. Professor Huxley and his friends told the public it was their design ultimately to supersede the old system by a new system, and to substitute for the religion of faith the religion of science. He confessed that he should look with great apprehension on the development of national character which might be evolved under a purely secular system. He would say with all earnestness, God help the unfortunate child in whose education the records of the chalk or the annals of the slime should take the place of the songs of Zion or the parables of Galilee. He would teach what amount of science he could; but while he had the control of children in the school, he would keep their hearts pure by higher thoughts, and their young minds open to considerations nobler than any that science could teach them. Give them as much geography or natural history as was possible; but along with that give them the plain Saxon of the old Book, which addressed all men as spiritual creatures girt with mystery, heirs of eternal kingdoms, subjects of a moral discipline, children of one Father, creatures made in their Creator's divine and eternal image. Later in life, if they could digest the theory and accept the evidence, let them come to belief in the ancestral ape who lived up a tree, and wore out his tail by sedentary habits; but while they were young, while they were still wandering through the wonderland of boyhood and girlhood, leave them the belief in the earth as the work of the Creator, and in all they saw around as the expression of the goodness and bounty of God, maker of heaven and earth." Or again, let us listen to one who, from the experience of his position, is well qualified to speak on the material advantages of religious education. I quote from the Chaplain of the Pentonville Model Prison. He advocates its absolute necessity, and argues that, without religion, education is simply a curse and no blessing at all. After giving some statistics, he says:—"Mere education changes the character of crime. It gives increased power to the dishonest for planning schemes of robbery. Education, without sound Christian principles, is as the moving power to machinery which has no regulator, or as the wide-spread sails of a ship which has neither chart nor compass." Or again, hear Fox, the founder of the first reformatory for children :—"Of what use is it to a commonwealth that its rogues should

know how to read and cypher? These acquirements are only so many master-keys put into their hands to break into the sanctuary of human society." Such seems to me most fitly and beautifully to express the reasons on which religious men argue for some religious teaching in schools; and let me add, that, unless religion is taught young, it can never be thoroughly taught at all. It is while a child is depending upon his earthly parent for everything that he can only fully understand that he has a Father in heaven; so it is while he is under absolute authority that he can best learn his relation toward an Omnipotent God.

The Denominationalists, as you know, one and all, abhor a secular, and regard with suspicion a merely Bible teaching system. Not agreeing with them altogether, and yet not objecting on any high grounds, but merely on grounds of expediency, I need not take up your time by defining their position. I understand them to hold that religion can best be taught in school not only by the Bible, but by creeds and catechisms explanatory of the Bible. This view seems to me a mistaken one. I do not believe that doctrines and dogmas take much hold on a young child's mind; and I should never dream myself of entering the educational lists if it were only a question whether children should or should not be taught the catechism; but I would follow the sternest and most rigid of all Denominationalists rather than that the Bible, and with it all religious teaching, should be turned out of our schools. I look forward still with hope to the day when many a now divided Protestant denomination will sit down together, having rounded many a harsh corner, and yielded many a knotty point—when the lion and the lamb of various "isms" shall lie down together, and agree to have the simple story of the Gospels poured into each child's ear as the fount and source of all true life. But until that day arrives, when more definite teaching might be administered in small doses, I shall be content to have our children taught the Bible and no more.

And now I shall say a word or two about our present system, having made it my business to enquire, for some years, what parents usually think about it, and what it has done for the rising generation. It seems neither to be very good nor very bad: certainly I do not think that it is deserving of the high praise that some of the papers have lately showered down upon it. I do not believe that the Otago system is the admiration and envy of all who know of it. I do not think that we have been the model from which Mr Forster has copied his system for England. Like most human undertakings, it has many faults, and I shall not scruple to speak about them to-night. But still, at the same time, it has certain remarkable virtues of its own, and it has proved practically most successful in attracting to itself the children for whom it was intended. Its faults, with one exception, are faults in the working, while its virtues are in its constitution. To begin with the virtues, I do think it remarkable that for so many years it has so nearly satisfied the religious feelings of Protestants. Notwithstanding the somewhat exclusive character of this settlement at first, I do think it is a remarkable and most rare example of the way in which, by treating all Protestants with fairness, you may still and unite their ever-ready voices; while, as it seems to me, the petition that was handed round for signature a little time ago affirmed far more than it should have done, I certainly and willingly allow that, except by a few masters, our system has not been intentionally worked in a spirit of proselytism toward other bodies than the Presbyterian. I would fully exonerate it from the charge so often brought against it of being Denominational in the interests of one body. It is only so, in the inevitable nature of things, where one body is in large numerical majority. Nor do I think that, notwithstanding what has been said of the evil of a political Board of Education, that there is any reason for saying that special or undue favor from low motives has been shown in any localities. I also think that the present method of election for school committees has worked admirably, and ensured advantages which could be obtained in no other way. But beyond these matters I must confess myself to be no admirer of the working of the present system. It has serious faults, which almost destroy its value. There has been no efficient inspection, no provision for the Roman Catholics, and no sufficient provision for securing good masters, *and* the masters' salaries are not dependant upon the results produced. These are grave faults which, many will allow, exist, even while they warmly defend the Otago system taken as a whole.

Inspection, to be of real value, must be individual; the examiner, to be of real service, must question each child separately, noting the results according to a tabulated form arranged according to the ages of the pupils, from seven to seventeen, and the grant-in-aid should be allotted according to the results so ascertained. This is, indeed, the very foundation upon which a school system should be administered. It is too much the habit to regard this as a branch of any educational system, instead of the very root and foundation. As such, many regard it as a thing to be got cheap, and, when times are hard, to be dispensed with altogether. Now, I roundly assert that no system can be properly worked, or is indeed worth much as a working agent, in which this is thought lightly of. It is true of most undertakings, as the poet says, that things by nature deteriorate. If this be true of horses, trees, cows, and bees, it is even more true of schools. When we consider that children rarely stay more than some five years at school, and that the weary task of teaching again from the very beginning has to be begun again as each new generation of urchins makes its appearance at the school door, we must acknowledge that schoolmasters must be more than angels if they do not flag at their task. And when we consider, too, that the process of education is made up of many parts, many minute parts—that there is no royal

road, nor any *great* stroke of success which can cheer the toil of the teacher—that day after day, hour after hour, he must teach the same simple facts to different children—it will not be considered a harsh judgment on schoolmasters to say that they, more than most workers, require stimulating by efficient inspection. At Oxford and other Universities, they ensure a *change of teachers* by a simple arrangement which almost ensures their constantly moving on—viz., that, on marriage, they leave. The public schools are practically inspected by the success of their scholars in winning University or other prizes in life, and also by the test of increased numbers. Private schools, drawing their pupils from all parts of the country, are subjected to the searching test of numbers and money. But the village schoolmaster sits enthroned upon his dais from year to year, until failing strength or gross, open, palpable misconduct drives him from his place—unless he is inspected. And by inspection I do not mean those scenes with which we are familiar, when a few friends or a few admiring parents gather half-yearly to hear the master or some neighbouring minister or friend examine large classes on some given topic. Such so-called examinations are, as those well know who have looked into the matter, a perfect farce. A schoolmaster's mind runs in a groove, and boys taught by him throughout the year know his stock questions as well as he does. Visitors, indeed, may look astonished by the promptitude and exactness of the answer to what sounds a difficult question; but they do not realise how often that very question, and that very answer, from that very child, in that very room in that very tone, have held sweet communion together during the year before. Schoolmasters, indeed, must ever be the worst examiners or inspectors of their own children. Moreover, I do think that such public exhibitions are about the most detestable things for the sake of the children themselves that could well be invented. They foster every vice which a wise teacher would for ever seek to eradicate—conceit, self-consciousness, emulatio, varying strife. Who has not seen and grieved over the little perky conceited fellow who makes a shot at every question, and earns a smile from the bystanders by his impudence? Or who has not seen the white be-muslined female creature, with bright blue bows on her shoulders, whose attention is distracted from the stores of crammed knowledge in her head by the consciousness that she is looking so nice? I can hardly sit by with composure and see these poor children get upon a platform and chant in shrilly tones some piece of poetry at a sixpenny reading; but at school, at the very training ground, to profess to find out the excellence of the teaching by such mental gymnastics is truly contemptible. Nor is the matter much improved in such scenes as I am describing if some clergyman or friend takes the matter in hand instead of the master. If the object of inspection was to find out the cleverest child, then, indeed, such an examination might answer. It is the fault of such trials of strength that some few of the best-informed among the children answer all the questions, while the others hold their peace. This is an irradicable evil. Even if the examiner is up to the trick, and purposely puts his questions to single children, it would take more time, more skill, more impartiality, more judgment, than most amateurs possess to gauge the real instruction, real education that has been given.

Again, I do not think that we have any satisfactory machinery for obtaining good teachers. Either the certificate of a training college or the university degree is indispensable. The teachers' examinations, as they have been conducted, do not suffice; and testimonials, recommendations from irresponsible people, are always worse than useless. I hold that the committee of a country school has no sufficient means of judging a schoolmaster's qualification; and that until there is some recognised certificate of merit, the class of men who enter the profession must continually deteriorate.

Again, I am utterly opposed, on principle, to educating boys and girls together. I know that many parents hesitate to send their girls to school at all, because the inevitable roughness of such school life would be injurious to both manners and morals.

I could, moreover, say much as to the careless and superficial teaching given at the few schools of which I know most. With the exception of arithmetic, which is thoroughly and efficiently taught, the children here are at least one year behind the children in those schools in the midland counties of England with which I am best acquainted.

I know very well that proper inspection will detect and cure these evils by degrees; but at present it has been well said to the admirers of our present education, "How do you know it to be so good?" And the real answer, the true answer, is, "We have had no proper means whatever of testing it; but we have spent so much that, if it isn't good, it ought to be." I speak as I promised—exactly as I think—when I say that, judged by the teaching in the national schools in England, our teaching here is not merely indifferent, but exceedingly bad. No doubt there is a very great difference between the various schools, so that I should be very sorry to condemn all while blaming one. But in one or two points I know that many a parent will agree with me that we are very far astray. I was staying not long ago with a friend near a country school-room, and while by chance passing by, I heard a something between a yell and a roar from inside, and naturally asked if they kept many lunatic patients in that hospital. After a moment's pause the fearful sound was repeated, and said, "What in the world's that?" But, before I could get an answer, I recognised the well-known whine that will, to my dying day, always remind me of a boy reading aloud in an Otago public school. Bedlam at the full moon, the engine-room of a

first-class screw steamer in full work, the Zoological Gardens in London at feeding time all confined in a single room together could not produce a more discordant yelling, or one less worthy of a place of instruction. For if there be one thing which betokens a well-conducted school more than another, it is that, like the Temple at its erection, there should be neither hammer nor the sound of any tool heard within the building.

I could particularise a dozen other more technical objections, though, no doubt, many good masters might differ from me on them; but it would be tiresome to you and an ungracious task to enter into these matters. I should not have touched upon them here if it were not for the impudent assumption that the Otago system was almost, shall I say, divine!

And now one word about this New Bill. I am a little late, since it is deferred until next session; it is, however, only a good measure put off, and I trust will pass almost unaltered next year. I have not time to go into the somewhat political question of the election of school boards, etc. It seems to me that our present arrangement has worked very well except that I do not think that the practical appointment of the schoolmaster should, for the present, rest with the local committees. They are necessarily uninformed as to the qualifications of a candidate, and are out of the way of hearing of good men for the most part. This should certainly, I think, rest with some other more central body than the local committee. Since Provincial institutions are probably doomed, I trust that we shall revert ere long to something like the wise and statesman-like project of Mr Stafford, and have Shire Councils; and then, I think, that this power at present resting with the school committees might devolve upon them. With respect to clauses 52, 53 (better known as the Aided School clauses) I shall speak plainly. Any Bill for the Colony which did not provide such clauses, more especially if it made education compulsory, would be so shamefully tyrannical—so utterly and hopelessly unjust, that it never could work long. It would indeed be religious oppression—persecution—of the narrowest kind. Our present system of taking money from the Roman Catholics, and giving them the schools which they cannot conscientiously in unjust and oppressive; but if you add the pill of compulsory education, you are but paving a sure road for continual agitation and ultimate change. I am by no means an advocate for denominationalism pure and simple for this country; but I am an advocate for simple justice; and I know nothing that can be urged against denominationalism except the exceedingly uninformed cry, that it has failed in England, and wherever it has been tried. This is (often as it has been repeated) simply untrue. English education has fallen through not because of the prevailing system, but in spite of it. Because the Government gave it no help, and did not enforce education at all. In another, the best educated country in the world, it has proved most successful.

The debt indeed which England owes to the clergy of various denominations in the matter of education is but scantily repaid by the grudging acknowledgment that they must not be quite turned out of the schools. For long weary years the clergyman in every scattered hamlet has been supporting his school—often the only school—chiefly out of his own purse, because the laity were too ignorant, or too careless, to lend a helping hand in the work of education. History will give these men their due mede of praise, for their long unselfish toil, but it is both uncourteous and untrue to charge them with the neglect of ignorant masses, because they had not time or money enough to undertake anything, the blame must fall upon their shoulders who are seeking to earn credit by spending the public money upon education, while they never cared to spend their own. It is surely something like a wilful perversion of the facts of this century's history to say that, Denominationalism failed as a system, since in England it did a work fairly well, which no one else cared to undertake. But I do not believe it immediately suited for this province. If the clause in Mr Fox's Bill, granting aid to private associations for educating, were supplemented by a clause, declaring that this aid should never be given, unless there were a public school within five miles, with an average attendance of 35 children, it would I think as nearly satisfy every one as any scheme that could be devised.

And now naturally following upon what I have said about our system here, I turn my eyes towards other countries, and see in what particulars they have excellencies to be copied, I shall look at them from the point of view which will show us the judgment of eminent men in other lands on the advantages of a religious system. In Prussia, for everything must now-a-days begin with Prussia, which is admittedly most successful in teaching—In Prussia, would you be surprised to hear that the schools are purely Denominational. The Archbishop of Posen writes of it:—"The Mixed system has never been applied in Prussia to elementary schools. These have been, and are at the present day purely Denominational. The Revolutionary party has been at work for many years seeking to introduce the Mixed system into these schools; but so far it has met with determined opposition from His Majesty's government. Our elementary schools, if Catholic, have Catholic books and Catholic teachers; if Protestant, their books and teachers are Protestant. The rights of all pastors are recognised by the Government in regard to the schools of the respective creeds." The results of this system are summed up by Mr Gregory in the House of Commons, it is this, "an admirable education pervading the whole community, only two of a one hundred not being able to read, and write, and cypher, and a thorough and cordial acceptance of it by every religious denomination." Now I do think that, to affirm after that, that the Denominational system has failed everywhere, shows an obliquity of moral vision which is strange. In Austria, too, the system which is



most successful, is purely Denominational. All books, teachers, etc. have to be passed by competent religious authorities.

So to, M. Guizot the eminent historian says:—"In order to make popular education good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious." Again, there is no instruction without education—no proper education without morality. "We must take religion as the basis of education. On the other hand, let us see what eminent officials say of the purely Secular system. In Frazer's report on Schools in the United States and Canada, he says, "I know that many of the warmest friends of the American Public Schools would gladly see imported into the system some means of giving more definite religious knowledge if it could be done without compromising the principle of religious freedom, which is the corner stone of American institutions." He says, the schools are giving practically nothing but secular education, and hence a state of public feeling is arising towards them which threatens the permanence and stability of the system in the future. Then, he quotes the Educational Report of the State of Massachusetts, shewing that parents withdraw their young children from what they fear to be the corrupting influence of the public schools, and again he notes that the prevailing vice of American children is untruthfulness.

Again, an eminent inspector of schools in Holland, where a secular system prevails says that, "in the large towns there was an increasing dissatisfaction with the inadequate religious instruction in public schools, and an increasing demand for schools where a real definite religious instruction was given." It would not be difficult to show that in all parts of the Christian world, religious education has proved successful, while the secular system has disgusted a large majority of citizens.

But now, as I draw my remarks towards a close, it may be as well to place before you where I think these matters all naturally direct us. It is convenient, in so large a subject, to repeat one or two leading points. First, then, it seems to me beyond all question that the Government has no more business to provide for our mental wants by keeping school than for our physical; but since I quite understand that, in the present state of public opinion, the State is likely to afford aid, the next question is, How could its aid be best bestowed? or rather, with least of what Mills calls the deadening effect of State interference? And I believe that this may be best effected by giving separate aid to the Catholics and to the other denominations who require it, wherever the average attendance at any one school in any one place was over thirty-five. This is, of course, a modified Denominationalism, and would, I think, contain all the good, and none of the harm, of that system. I hold that the only fault of Denominational systems is that they are not fitted for scattered communities: for thickly populated countries I believe nothing can be so good. I hope to see the day arrive when we shall be ripe for such a system; but I am quite sure that, except in a few large towns, we are not ready yet. For Otago, it seems to me our present system, well worked, with the addition of aided schools for the Catholics, to remove the present cruel injustice which they suffer under, would be quite sufficient.

One word as to the expense of a divided system, though perhaps, when we have borrowed so many millions, that does not so much matter. There is no reason why—judiciously expended, that is, under a system of results—aided schools should cost more than our present ones—that is, of course, where the population was sufficiently large. The money expended upon the enlargement of a school would go to put up a new one; instead of a second master, you would have another head master: and if the Government aid was given only to results, the just system would cost no more than the unjust. Moreover, I do not believe that such a system would split up the community into so many school parties, as is commonly supposed. I believe that many, if not all the Protestant bodies would form a mutual alliance on the basis of the Bible. I do think that there is a growing readiness upon the part of our laymen to accept such a compromise, and make the best of it until, by the natural growth of a place, two schools were found possible. And I should look forward with satisfaction, in such places, to having two, decent, orderly schools in place of one great rowdy, ill-governed establishment such as we too often see. Who can look dispassionately at the matter and not acknowledge that, in the emulation and rivalry between the various masters to produce the best results, you would find a vigour, a vitality, a life, a success, which is, and must be, strange to our present overgrown monopoly. And I may surely be pardoned if I say that, in the interest and personal attention of the various clergy, you would gain an element of reality and force which is most usually lacking in Government officers. But this I do declare that, if a secular system is started here, there will be neither peace nor quiet until it be again altered. It will cause a separation and division among the neighbours of every little township, such as the purest Denominationalism can never produce. In every district you will have another school started; followed by an agitation for a just share of the public funds.

If there is one thing that parents are determined upon, it is that their children should be taught, I do not say, "catechisms," but religion—the grand, old, eternal Truth of God at school, and not mere Secularism. In the name of our common Christianity—in the name of your children's souls—in the name of all posterity, I conjure you not to be led aside by clap trap oratory—by the catchword of "Progress," or the plea of a bastard religion, to sanction so unhappy, so calamitous a trifling with each hallowed and sacred hope as Secularism offers for your acceptance. While we trifle with railroads, or sport about our hundreds—while we put a member into the

house, or turn a ministry out, you do but play at pitch and toss with a few dirty pounds of gold; but if you try these experiments with Education, and while you teach the gentle child to calculate like Babbage—teach him to keep no eternal reckoning—you as it were poison the wells for a whole generation of men. It were better that your children reverted to the type of the ancestral baboon, or crushed a scanty meal upon the root of a cabbage tree like a Maori—better they served Confucius, and learned the juggleries of Vishnu, than that they should pass into the world's ranks cunning indeed in the subtle mysteries of finance, and learned in the unfathomable intricacies of a ready reckoner, but taught by its very avoidance in school to regard God's Book as the dull relic of some barbarous age in which an ancient world believed and trusted, but with which steam and electricity have scant acquaintance—in a word, without learning to know God.

H. Wise, Bookseller, Princes Street, Dunedin.

**The Education of the Country, with Some Suggestions on the Subject.**

By the Rev Andrew Robertson, West Melbourne.

Melbourne Published By George Robertson, Elizabeth Street.

Mason, Firth, And M'Cutcheon, Printers, Flinders Lane, Melbourne.

## Education of the Country.

I Do not deem it necessary to offer an apology for coming forward at this particular crisis with some thoughts and suggestions on the subject of Public Education. Besides being a minister of the gospel, deeply interested in whatever concerns the mental, moral, and religious well-being of the community, I am the citizen of a free country, and have the right as well as the privilege to express my sentiments on any topic which may occupy the public mind, and all the more when it is one upon which it is so needful that the community at large should be fully and correctly informed.

It is now thirty years ago since I began to turn my attention to this question; and from that period to the present I have been more or less engaged in its active agitation. I mention this simply to show that the question is not new to me, and that whatever may be the views which I advance, or the strictures which I offer, they are not the result of hasty or superficial consideration, but the fruits of matured thought and study.

Arriving in Victoria at the close of 1862, I had the pleasing satisfaction of congratulating the late lamented Mr. Heales on his having succeeded in carrying that Act of public instruction which is associated with his honoured name, stating to him how happy I felt in finding myself in a colony which had made such marked and gratifying progress towards solving not a few of those educational problems which were still perplexing and dividing our statesmen and our ecclesiastics at home.

That Act, which is designated the "Common Schools Act," and which is the one at present in force, has never, I have frequently said, received from the people of this country that praise to which it is entitled; nor has it, I conceive, been thoroughly appreciated in regard to its real aims and objects by any who have since attempted to improve on it. It has its defects and omissions, and time has demonstrated that additional legislative provisions must be enacted in order to facilitate the ultimate ends which it contemplates; and it will be my object to show how this, our Common Schools Act, can be perfected so as to meet all the exigencies and requirements of the case.

This Act, when framed, had to deal with schools established prior to its introduction, so that the field was not then clear for an entirely new system. In these circumstances, our Common Schools Act contemplated a twofold object. The first was to provide a good secular education for the children of the colony, and the second, to initiate and encourage a class of public schools which might gradually lead to the absorption of all our denominational schools into national ones; and thus place the whole public educational system of the country where it should be—not in the hands of the sects, but of the citizens. The policy which it embodies is virtually the same as that which is now being pursued by our ablest and most enlightened British statesmen. At this moment they are utilising the denominational schools that exist, and which cannot all at once be suppressed; and yet at the same time making provisions for the ultimate adoption of a completely national system, whereby the denominational schools will be superseded by schools not in any way bound up or connected with churches, but based on the suffrages, support, and management of the people themselves.

As I have observed, Mr. Heales' Act is not free from imperfections, which have impeded its full and successful operation. Of late, however, since the attention of the Board of Education has been turned to these, they have to some extent been rectified; not, however, by an Act of Parliament—which I consider was the only true constitutional course that should have been followed—but by what is called a special educational vote of the Legislative Assembly. For example, the Common Schools Act, as it stands at present, does not admit of any grants of public money being given to schools which have not an average attendance of twenty scholars; but by this special educational vote of the Legislative Assembly, the Board of Education is now supplied with certain

sums whereby it has been enabled to plant what are termed Rural and Half-time Schools in the more thinly-populated districts of the colony, and which, as might have been expected, have proved an immense boon to the settlers.

There is still, however, a great defect felt on the part of the Board of Education, and that is power to amalgamate on equitable conditions schools where amalgamation is imperatively demanded, such as at Brunswick and elsewhere, there being about 300 schools throughout the colony which could with advantage be amalgamated into 150. To obtain this power, a draft Bill has been prepared by the Board, which for the last three years has been waiting the adoption of Parliament, which has as yet done nothing in the matter.

Such being the case, it is not at all surprising that the Board has been growing in favour, and that there are many who have no desire whatever to see it interfered with, but merely assisted in its work. Among those inclined, or lately inclined to this course, are the leaders of the Wesleyan body, and those belonging to the Church of England, whom Bishop Perry represents; together with the Board of Education itself, which in the Report of 1870, as well as that of 1871, submitted to His Excellency the Governor, gives it as its unanimous conviction that if the draft Bill drawn up by the Board for the approval of Parliament were passed, including in it a compulsory, tentative clause in regard to education, "the wants (that is, the educational wants) of the country would be adequately met." The members of the Board of Education who gave this as their conviction in 1870, were the Hon. George Harker, the Hon. Michael O'Grady, the Hon. Angus Mackay, and Henry Henty, Esq. Since that period, Mr. Harker has resigned, and Mr. Richardson has been gazetted in his room, while Dr. Cutts has succeeded the late excellent Dr. Corrigan, whose death proved so great a loss to the cause of public education in this colony; but whilst the Board has undergone these changes, the newly-issued Report of 1871 unanimously reasserts its previously recorded conviction, that if the recommendations submitted by the Board in its Report were adopted by Parliament, "the educational wants of the country would be adequately met. "Now, here I must express my sympathy with the Board of Education, in the extremely difficult and delicate circumstances in which it has all along been placed. It is, from the very nature of the system it administers, a mixed denominational Board, consisting of representatives of the various religious bodies of the colony; and in carrying on its operations it has been hampered and restrained by its own inherent weakness, as well as by the out-side denominational interests and feelings which it has had to consult and to contend with. No one, therefore, acquainted with what that Board, constituted as it is, has had to do, but must render it that need of commendation which it has, especially of late, so justly merited; but with all the regard which I have for the members of that Board, and with every confidence in its secretary, Mr. Kane, whom I have found to an able, liberal, and advanced educationalist, I cannot concur in the let-alone policy which some would recommend. The Board itself even, to deal impartially and successfully with new matters of internal denominational contention that have recently arisen, must be emancipated from the fetters with which its action is cramped; and, now that the Ministry of the day has taken up the subject, the country ought to insist on a thorough investigation and settlement of the whole question. Had the Ministry now raised to office let it alone, it probably would have been in vain to hope for the formation of such a public opinion as would have enabled us to settle this question at once and for ever; but now it is different, the question is stirred and should not be allowed to rest until it is put on a fair and permanent footing. "There is a tide," says the great dramatist, "in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." Such a tide is now beginning to set in on this question, and if we can but seize it at the flood I the friends of an enlightened and unobjectionable system of public instruction will be borne on to victory. This is not indeed, as I hold, a question of party, to be taken up for party purposes. On the contrary, it is a subject for the calm consideration of the citizen, the Christian, and the senator; but while this is the case, experience shows that it is only through the conflicts of parties that the community can be awakened from its lethargy, and led into a full knowledge and just appreciation of the real merits of those public social questions which it is called upon to decide. I look very little, or rather I do not look at all, to mere parties for the adjustment and settlement of this Educational question. Party is a passing and too often a one-sided, biassed, prejudiced thing; principle, however, is permanent and true, and must ever triumph in the long run, so that no party, political or ecclesiastical, need hope to have it in its power to settle this question irrespective of the views and interests of the community as a whole. This is a people's, not a party's question—a parents', not a priests'—and as such must be discussed and determined.

What, then, it may be asked, is the vital point at issue, or what is it in our present educational system that requires immediate eradication or reform? It may be summed up in one word—Denominationalism. Destroy it, remove the denominational element from our system of public instruction, and place the education of the people in the hands, not of the sects, but of the citizens; do this, and you will take away the cause of all the evils and complications that exist, and go far to make this colony, in the matter of public instruction, the first and foremost in the world. In spite of adverse circumstances, some progress has been made in this direction already; but it is slow, and does not promise to be more rapid in the future. The number of public schools, or schools vested in the Board of Education, has increased since 1862 from 193 to 457. I take my facts from the Report of

1870; but there are still 434 denominational schools, including a few private schools which also receive State aid. These denominational schools have diminished, it is true, from 513 to 434, but this is by far too large a number to have upon the list at this advanced period in the history of the Common Schools Act; while from various causes, which I need not particularise, the number is not likely in future to be very largely or speedily reduced. It cannot be so with Roman Catholic schools, which are still slightly on the increase, and which will, of course, multiply with the growth of their denomination; and if the other bodies do not add to the number of their denominational schools, it is simply because it is not deemed wise or expedient at present to do so. The Presbyterians, indeed, have all along from the first displayed a willingness to merge their schools into national ones, but of late they have been refusing to do so, except in a few exceptional cases not worth retaining; the reason for this change of policy on the part of the Presbyterians being the avowed tendency of some of our leading politicians towards a pure and exclusive secularism.

Denominationalism, therefore, if not dealt with now and vigorously, instead of growing weaker will become stronger; and the country, if not roused to energetic action on the subject, will have for many a long day to regret its supineness.

But how can denominationalism, it may be asked, be rooted out, and our public system of instruction purged from this permeating element? Did not Mr. Higinbotham first of all attempt it, and signally fail? He did; but do you know the reasons why? Mr. Higinbotham—than whom one more capable of grappling with this question is not to be found in this colony—did not receive from his colleagues in the Ministry that support to which he was entitled, while his Bill itself was liable to the most grave objections. Not to speak of his insisting by legislative enactment on the kind of religious instruction to be allowed by the local committees in the schools—an error for which I blame, not so much Mr. Higinbotham, as the members of the Royal Commission, of which he happened to be the chairman, Mr. Higinbotham committed two other fatal mistakes. In the provisions of his Bill for the elimination of the denominational element, he required, first, that all schools aided in future by the State should be vested in the Minister of Public Instruction—to many a very doubtful, and, in my opinion, a most dangerous proposition. This was to be done within five years after the passing of his Bill, and then if not complied with—which it would not have been, at least by the Roman Catholics—Mr. Higinbotham gave the country to understand that it would then be an open question for Parliament to consider whether, in such a case, the denomination that did not go into this arrangement might not, after all, have their State aid continued to their schools, although not vested in the Minister of Public Instruction. The Protestant denominations were not to be caught—they foresaw the danger, and were resolved to keep their own schools in their own power, rather than permit the Roman Catholics to become masters of the situation, after their own Protestant schools had slipped through their fingers. Hence the failure of Mr. Higinbotham's well-meant and, in many respects, admirably-conceived measure. But he has acquired experience from the failure, and when the proper time comes, I have no doubt he will head the movement that is now looming in the horizon.

Next after Mr. Higinbotham's failure came the attempt of the M'Culloch Administration. The draft Bill which they drew up with the same view—namely, the destruction of denominationalism—was, if possible, still more objectionable. It contained propositions which one could perceive at a glance to be utterly impracticable, such as no Minister of Public Instruction that might have been appointed could have carried into execution, while it would have involved an amount of expenditure which the country never would have sanctioned.

So much for the past, now for the present. A new Ministry, pledged to make the Education question a Cabinet one, has just been invested with office, and the Attorney-General is employed in framing a measure by which they intend to stand or fall. This is at least manly on their part, while to me and others, to whom it is a matter of comparative indifference what party is in power, provided the best interests of the country are advanced, the resolution of the present Ministry is a subject of unfeigned satisfaction. What, then, is their scheme? From what fell from the lips of the Chief Secretary, their measure will resemble neither that of Mr. Higinbotham nor that of Sir James M'Culloch's Administration. It will not, in fact, attempt to grapple with denominationalism at all, so far as the immediate destruction of it is concerned, but will allow things to continue in this respect as they are, or rather, more correctly speaking, to develop themselves in the way in which they have been so slowly doing under the administration of the Board of Education; the only difference, and it is slight, between the policy of the Board of Education, as set forth in its reports, and that of the Ministry, as announced by them, being simply this, that they, the Ministry, besides making education free without fees, will stop the further increase of what they call sectarian schools. The Board of Education, after all that has been said against it, may congratulate itself upon having its policy thus endorsed by the Ministry; but will this scheme satisfy the country? So far as the Wesleyans, the Church of England, and even the Presbyterians are concerned, it will not trouble them much, having already got all the denominational schools they care to have in the meantime. The only denomination it will touch will be the Roman Catholic one, who will receive no State aid to whatever new schools they may erect. But is this a vigorous, comprehensive, or far-seeing policy? The stoppage of aid put to the very slight increase of Roman Catholic schools may be deemed by many a

masterstroke of policy, both for what it smites and what it spares; but I doubt if it will prove so in the end. With education free, and a compulsory law brought to bear on the community at large, we shall have the Roman Catholics placed in this singular position, either they must send their children to the public schools, or they must send them to those which they themselves establish. If they send them to their own they must pay for them, but if they send them elsewhere they will get their education for nothing, so that the Roman Catholics when this measure comes into play will be dealt with after this fashion—namely, they will be compelled like us Protestants to educate their children, but, unlike us, they will not get education free, not even the secular branches, if they prefer to receive this secular education in their own schools, rather than in those which the Government alone will assist. This, unquestionably, will mark a new era in our colonial history, and introduce an order of things for which it will be impossible in the wide world to find a precedent.

I can hardly believe that the Government seriously intend to agitate the country for such a paltry object as this; and am therefore led to conclude that they are but feeling their way after a wider, more worthy, and statesman-like scheme than that which has been indicated. Indeed, one would be apt to imagine that if this were really the scheme they seriously contemplated, it was nothing more nor less than an artful device, under the pretext of terminating denominationalism at some indefinite period, to rivet it more closely round our necks, by giving the denominationalism that at present exists full time to strike its roots so deeply into the virgin soil of this young and rising colony, as to make it next to impossible for our coming statesmen to eradicate it.

Denominationalism is doomed, but its existence may be needlessly prolonged; and certainly if such a scheme should be adopted by Parliament, denominationalism will hold up its head in this colony for many more years than this generation will witness. I am for its immediate extinction. Our politicians indeed may probably point to England and Scotland, where they are not so much abolishing as utilising denominationalism; but no one who is aware of the complications and difficulties which are experienced in the old countries from the long-standing denominationalism that cannot now be suppressed, would ever counsel a young colony like this, with its mixed and increasing population from all lands, to retain denominationalism in any shape or to any extent in their system of public instruction, for a single instant beyond the time it is in our power to eradicate it.

But is it in our power to eradicate it at present? I maintain that it is, that the present is the most favourable period for doing it; that it can not only be done, but done at once without delay, without involving any additional expenditure to the country; and what is better still, without prejudice or disadvantage to any denomination, but the reverse, including our Roman Catholics among the number. But before unfolding my plan, I shall first brush away some of the fog into which not a few of our public men have got, who cannot see any way of escape out of denominationalism except by the ultimate introduction of a universal, exclusive, and purely secular system.

This call for secularism proceeds in most cases from not understanding properly what our Common Schools Act is. So far as the Government is concerned, it is as pure a secular system as can possibly be had. Nothing could be more out-and-out secular than our present system of public instruction. There are four hours for secular education prescribed by the Act, and for secular education alone, and there are no hours whatever prescribed in the Act for religious instruction. The religious instruction may or may not be given outside the four hours for secular education; this is for the local committees and parents of the children to decide, and in which the Government is in no way concerned. Government takes no cognisance of it, and gives no pay for it. Accordingly, the Board of Education, which administers the Common Schools Act, wholly ignores it. The instructions given by the Board to inspectors of schools are very explicit. They are enjoined "to bear in mind, in performance of their duty as inspectors of Common Schools, that the Board's superintendence extends only to the temporal regulations and secular efficiency of the schools, and that they are therefore carefully to avoid all interference or expressions of opinion either to the teacher or local committee, respecting their arrangements, if they have any, for imparting religious instruction."

No procedure on the part of the Board could be more in harmony with the spirit and letter of Mr. Heales' Act, which leaves the committees at full liberty—no matter whether of vested or denominational schools—not only to say whether or not religious instruction should be imparted, but to determine, likewise, both the kind and amount of it that should be given.

Surely our secular friends do not mean that this discretionary power should be withdrawn by Act of Parliament, so that no religious instruction can be taught by any one, or at any time, within the walls of our public schools. This is not, I should hope, what the Ministry mean when they speak of an ultimate system of secular instruction.

First of all, such a system exists nowhere, and secondly, it receives no countenance whatever from the firmest friends of civil and religious liberty. The Dissenters of Scotland have ever stood foremost in the ranks of this noble army, and what are their views on this subject? In a declaration issued in 1839, by the Scottish Central Board of Dissenters, and which has been faithfully adhered to ever since, the following resolutions are set forth:—"Any system (says that manifesto) of universal education, which is based on the Legislature giving

its sanction to a particular system of religious doctrine and worship, and which is carried into effect by grants of public money for the religious education of the community, is irreconcilable with the rights of conscience and the principles of religious liberty.

"On the other hand (it continues) no system of education can be considered as complete or even safe, which does not contemplate the religious and moral, as well as the intellectual improvement of its subjects. To exclude religious instruction from a system of universal education, if practicable, would be very undesirable; and even if desirable would, in the state of the public mind, be impracticable. The only means (adds this manifesto) of gaining the end (uniting the two kinds of instruction in our national schools) seems to be to provide for the appointment of a local committee in every district where a school is established, consisting of persons chosen by the heads of families, to whom it shall belong to say what kind and measure of religious instruction shall be in the school, and to settle what additional fee should be payable for such instruction. Provision also should be made that where there is a minority who object to this course of religious instruction, their children shall not be subjected to it, nor liable for the additional fee."

Now, this declaration, with the exception of the additional fee for religious instruction which is not insisted on in this colony, proposes substantially the very system in operation amongst us, and I trust there is no intention to depart from it.

No objections in Scotland would be raised against the principles embodied in our Common Schools Act. As to England, the Nonconformists, arising from circumstances into which I do not enter, have lost ground in the educational controversy that is being now waged in England, and some of them seem disposed to fall back upon secularism; yet no one who is at all familiar with the facts, but knows that pure and unalloyed secularism has not the ghost of a chance in England, any more than in Scotland, neither with the people nor the Parliament.

A third, and still weightier reason against secularism is that it would fail in effecting one of the main objects for which a national education is called for.

As Christians we ought not to ignore our own Christianity in our own schools. But not to speak of ourselves as Christians, what is it, which, as citizens, we ask from the State? Is it not security? among other things, security for character, property, and life. For this purpose we have our courts of justice, civil and criminal. But of what use would these courts of justice be in the way of protection, if these courts had no means of securing us against false witnessing? It is by means of the solemnities of an oath that this object is attained. Now, what is an oath? The oath which we citizens swear is not a heathen but a Christian oath, and embodies some of the most vital truths of our holy religion. It implies for example, a knowledge and belief in God, in a future state, in a universal judgment, and in a final adjudication of rewards and punishment—while he who takes an oath solemnly avows that, as he shall have to answer at the last unto God, he shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Now secularism would exclude from the teaching of our public schools all the truths which go to the construction of an oath—the very security which, as citizens, we require for the proper administration of law and justice between man and man. Occasionally we hear or read in newspapers of persons so ignorant that they have no idea either of the nature or meaning of an oath, and whenever a case of this kind occurs there is sure to be a cry for more education—and especially for compulsory education; and yet these secularists who probably are the loudest in the cry, could not on their principles allow a child to be taught in our public schools the truths implied in an oath, or if they did they would contradict themselves by permitting that very religious instruction to be given to which they so inconsiderately object.

Another point to which I would briefly refer is the intention, if I have interpreted the Chief Secretary's remarks aright, to release the teachers of our public schools from the giving of such supplementary religious instruction as the parents may desire their children to receive. I contend that no teacher should be eligible to a school, whose moral character and habits are not unexceptionable, and who is not qualified to impart a knowledge of the simple, primary, elementary truths of morality and religion.

It is well known to those who are conversant with the facts that in not a few of our schools there is no religious instruction at all, partly from the indifference of local committees, who bestow comparatively little attention to the affairs of the schools entrusted to their charge; and partly, and in some instances chiefly, to the indisposition, aversion, or moral unfitness of the teachers to the work. In the report of one of the inspectors of schools, dated Castlemaine, 17th January, 1870, the following statements are made in regard to an extensive and important district, with which I myself have had connection:—"The good schools," says this inspector in his report, "are 35 in number, 65 schools are entitled to be called 'moderate.' The thoroughly bad schools are 15 in number. Of these, it may be said, they are generally placed in low neighbourhoods, taught by low teachers, and often controlled by committees even worse than the teachers. The work of regenerating these schools is hard, especially where the committees are themselves averse to the process, apparently valuing a teacher in proportion to his capacity for perjury and strong drink."

Will such statements be believed, and yet I am quoting from a public document which has actually been presented by the Board of Education to his Excellency the Governor, giving an account of the state of

educational matters in the colony? It is time that a system which permits of such committees and teachers being tolerated ought to be reformed, and that no teachers should have committed to them the training of youth whose characters are of the description given in the Board of Education report.

So far from doing anything to lower the moral and religious character of our teachers, we should take care to have our system of public instruction, so framed and administered that our teachers should be men who will find it to be, not their aversion, but their delight to have the opportunity of imparting to their scholars the elementary truths of morality and religion.

Besides, the idea which the Chief Secretary seems to entertain of handing over the religious instruction to the ministers of the various denominations, is not only unworkable except in rare and exceptional cases, but would introduce in its worst and most objectionable form the very sectarianism he is so anxious to extinguish. After the four school hours, the secular teacher, according to the Chief Secretary, is to take his departure, and the ministers of religion are to step into the field. Of course the scholars must be arranged under their different ecclesiastical banners, and either in separate rooms or on different days, the work of supplementary religious instruction will have to be carried on. Thus, the first lesson the children are to receive at school is a lesson in denominationalism, and no doubt they will soon come to know each other in these professedly non-sectarian schools by the distinctive appellations of the sects to which they respectively belong. Happy device, ingenious mode of banishing denominationalism from our public schools!—a mode which I trust, if ever seriously contemplated, will be departed from by those who have undertaken to grapple with this all-important question.

Having cleared the way by these preliminary remarks for the consideration of my scheme for the entire and immediate elimination of that denominationalism which is clogging and impeding the full and successful operation of our present public system of instruction, and which I believe the proposed measure of the Government will tend rather to perpetuate than annihilate, to aggravate than subdue, I now submit my plan.

My first intention was to present it in the shape of an Amended Common Schools Act, but as this would have thrown it into too technical and legal a shape for popular apprehension, I shall content myself with stating it in a few easily-understood propositions.

There are, then, three prominent things in the system, as now existing, from which the denominational element should be extracted.

The first is, the Board of Education; the second, the local committees; and the third, the inequalities made in the distribution of aid between the two classes of Common Schools, the vested and the non-vested ones.

As to the first—the Board of Education—it is a mixed denominational one, consisting of five laymen; no two of whom, according to the Act, can belong to one and the same religious denomination. As might have been expected, it has had a difficult and delicate task to perform, having had internal denominational contentions to struggle with, as well as outside feelings of the same class to consult and contend with. This Board, which administers the system of public instruction, demands to be speedily reconstructed, and to have its members taken from the citizens, and not as at present from the sects. It should, therefore, when the amended Act comes into force, say a year hence, be dissolved, and a new Board substituted in its stead—to be called the "Education Department," having likewise, as the present Board, a Secretary and a President.

The President should be a member of Parliament, and should be styled "The Minister of Public Instruction," whose duty it should be to preside at the meetings of the Education Department, to give in its yearly reports to Parliament, and to answer in his place such questions as may be put to him. I may simply add that the new Act "for public elementary education in England and Wales" designates the ruling authority by the title I propose, namely, the "Education Department."

As to the local committees, the second thing I mentioned, the sooner we get quit of them, the better for public education in this colony. All along one round of complaint has been heard from the Inspectors of schools, and even now, although somewhat improved by the recent action of the Board, they are still spoken of hopelessly as mere makeshifts for want of something better to put in their place. I would terminate them at once, substituting for them district boards, having, instead of only one school, several schools under their charge. Besides the present local committees proving in general a failure, they are practically denominational in all the non-vested schools; and to the extent to which any denomination may succeed in establishing schools, to the same extent it has in its hands the educational patronage of the colony. All teachers may be legally entitled to apply for vacant schools, but does the country imagine that these vacancies are filled up irrespective of denominational preferences and connections? Give to the district boards the powers of the local committees in the selection and appointment of teachers, and you put an extinguisher on this peculiar species of patronage at once, by placing all teachers on the same level, and giving to each and all of them a fair and equal chance.

Now, this idea of district boards is one which has often been thought of by educationalists; it has been taken advantage of by Mr. Forster, in his measure for England, while it has been unanimously approved of by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, which adopted the following resolution:—"That school districts should be formed, and that the board for each district should have the supervision of all the

schools in its district;" and that the members of these boards "should be elected by the ratepayers and parents for a specified period, and that a certain proportion of them should retire annually, parents being ratepayers having a double vote."

Such district boards would, as the Rev. Mr. Nish, of Sandhurst, remarked to Sir James M'Culloch, "work well in this colony, and would have a dignity and responsibility which local committees do not possess."

In these district boards you would have men who would really advance the cause of education, while a seat in these boards would be coveted by the best portion of our citizens as much, if not more than a seat in Parliament itself, both for the honour and usefulness it would bring.

The third, and not the least important amendment I would submit is the placing of all schools that receive Government support on precisely the same footing, whether vested in the Education Department or not. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church suggests that all vested schools should be the property of the district in which they are situated; but whether the property of the districts or vested in denominational bodies, these ought, I conceive, to be treated alike in regard to grants for repairs, &c. The vested schools are privileged in this respect, and it was done purposely to induce the denominations to merge their schools into national ones, and in several instances this has succeeded, but it will not succeed now. The fact is that the denominations are beginning to feel that the possession of their schools is making them the actual masters of the situation, and hence the extreme tenderness with which it is proposed to deal with them in the present proposed measure of Mr. Francis' Cabinet, in which the Church of England schools and those of the other denominations are to be continued with this proviso, that no more sectarian schools are to be permitted to go upon the public exchequer—by which it is well known the Roman Catholic schools are chiefly aimed at, although the increase of such schools can be but small. Such an attempt to abolish denominationalism is not deserving of the name of an attempt, it is rather a confession of impotence; an acknowledgment that they are afraid to touch denominationalism, except in the infinitesimal way they have indicated, marvellously harmless to the Protestant sects, but somewhat needlessly provoking to the Roman Catholics, giving them, however, just that sufficient amount of fighting ground, which they will no doubt turn to profitable account in that earnest struggle which the ministerial proposals will originate, but cannot possibly terminate. The programme of the ministry as shadowed forth by them, may be policy as practised by politicians in this colony, but it is unstatesman-like and short-sighted. Boldly face the question, and deal with it, not on the passing prejudices and party expediencies of the hour, but on the broad and enduring principles of equity and truth. Applying this maxim to the case before us, abolish the Board of Education as now denominationally constructed, and establish a non-sectarian Education Department; sweep away the local committees as being hindrances, not helps, in the way of a progressive and well-conducted system of public instruction, and substitute district boards in their place; and then, having freed the system from the noxious element of denominationalism, put all your schools, vested and non-vested, on the same level, treating them alike as to building, repairs, &c.; and not only as to this, but likewise in regard to their right of standing on the same platform—the vested schools having no greater claims on the Education Department than the non-vested—a thing which is not done, for reasons already stated, under the present system, but which will now, after what has transpired, lead in future, if persevered in, to serious complication and most bitter sectarian animosities. If vested schools are to have a preference over non-vested in the giving or withdrawing of aid, it requires little penetration to perceive how this can be brought to bear, not only on the future schools that may be established, but on those that already exist; not only those of the Church of Rome, but of the Church of England as well. The result of the whole in this case would be that all our non-vested schools will by-and-bye be turned into private ones, and with a higher course of instruction and with a superior class of teachers, the public schools will be driven to the wall, or converted into mere charity schools for the children of the poorer portion of the community.

But it may be said, if you give grants for repairs, &c., to the non-vested schools, the owners of these may withdraw from the control of the Education Department, and a great deal of money lost to the country. I would insert a clause in the amended Act to prevent this, to the effect that in the case of any common school, not vested in the Education Department, desiring to withdraw from it, due notice should be given of this intention, and a valuation made of what ought to be refunded to the Education Department for the grants for repairs, &c., that have been allowed to the school.

Now, such a power of withdrawal is essential, I contend, to the efficient working of a system of public instruction. The late Dr. Chalmers used to say that an Established Church required a body of Dissenters to keep it right and active; so unless there be freedom of educational action there will be no sufficient security against inertness, and it may be departmental wrongheadedness, or it may be improper Ministerial influence and abuse.

Having made these suggestions as to the Board of Education, the local committees, and the vested and non-vested schools, I do not intend to complicate the matter by any further suggestions, except to submit for consideration the propriety of doing away entirely with all the limiting clauses of the Common Schools Act, as to the average number of scholars required, the distances between schools, &c., all which restrictions are not



only fettering the freedom, expansion, and flexibility of our public system of instruction, in a country which, above all others, is subject to constant changes and fluctuations in population, and towns, &c., but which limiting clauses are not needed, especially when the Education Department will have to meet the wants of the country in regard to schools, not on denominational grounds, but on the simple merits of each case; and when this department, directly responsible to Parliament, will have to satisfy the country, through its representatives, as to the equity and necessity of its procedure.

In conclusion, an amended Act, embodying the propositions I have stated, would require to give immediate power to the Board of Education to prepare the way for the new Act coming into force, by mapping the country and towns into school districts, and taking steps for the coming election of the district boards.

Thus, in the course of a single year, we might enter on a new era of educational progress and improvement, freeing this young and rising colony from the curse of national animosities and of sectarian strifes, keeping our rulers to the task which properly falls to them, and which involves the most sacred trust that any order of men can have committed to them in a free and democratic country, that is, to protect us in our civil and religious rights, and to deal out justice between man and man, and between all of us alike, on the safe, enduring, and unassailable ground of an equal and a common citizenship.

*Mason, Firth, and M'Cutcheon, Printers, Flinders Lane West, Melbourne.*

Primary and Classical Education.

An Address. *Delivered before the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh, on Friday, November 1, 1867*

By The Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P.

*Revised by the Author.*

Edinburgh Edmonston and Douglas 1867

Price One Shilling.

## LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

THE Chairman has informed you that the subject which I am to bring before you to-night is that of education; I may add, of education considered in its relation to the State. It is a subject of infinite importance. It is the question of the day. It is a matter of great difficulty, and one on which there is great diversity of opinion. I have not come here to seek popularity, I have not come here to say what might be agreeable to the audience; I have come here to tell you the result of some experience and much reflection on this subject; and therefore I throw myself on your indulgence, that, in case—as I fear myself it may be—I may say anything that may be displeasing to any part of you, you will think I do it merely in the discharge of what I conceive to be my duty on such an occasion as this, and that you will kindly excuse it, and not take offence at what may be said. I have much to say, and I am anxious not to trespass on your patience; and, therefore, without further preface, I will address myself to the subject of the evening. The question of education naturally divides itself into two branches—the education of the poor or primary education, and the education of the middle or upper classes. I have a word or two to say of each in their turn.

And, first, I will address myself to that which appears to be of the greater consequence of the two—the education of the poor as far as it is connected with the State. Now, we have had for many years a system of State-aided education; and I think, without wearying you with what you know very well—the general outlines of that system—that we can infer from what has been already done, that certain principles are pretty well agreed upon and established among us. I shall not waste time in demonstrating these principles, but merely state them and pass on to the matter which appears to me to be disputable.

I think we may assume that it is now agreed on all hands that the education of the poor is not a matter to be left wholly or entirely to private enterprise, but is a duty of the State. I do not say at this moment to what extent; but after we have now for twenty years been in the habit of giving aid out of the State funds to carrying on these schools, it would be too late for any one to argue that the State had neither duty nor care in the matter.

Then, I think, we are at liberty to infer also that we are agreed that the State represents in the matter of education not the religious but the secular element. The plan of education which is now pursued is to entrust the management of the schools to persons actuated generally by strong religious feelings, and who found the schools for the purposes of some particular sect. Then the State assists them, stipulating in return for a certain amount of secular instruction. The inspectors who go to the school owe a sort of divided allegiance. They are the servants of the State in so far as they ascertain the amount of secular instruction given; and they are the servants of the different denominations in so far as they examine into religious matters. Therefore, it is quite clear that those advance no new doctrine at all, but merely state the present system of education, who say that the State's relation to it is a secular relation, and that its business is with the secular part of popular instruction.

The third principle is, first, that the best way of carrying on education is not either to have a centralised

department through which the whole shall be managed, nor is it to leave it wholly to local energy without any interference of the State, as is done in America; but that the best way is to combine the two—a local agency, the best that can be found for the purpose for carrying on the process of education, while reserving to the Government the duty of superintending and testing it—that it is this mixture of the local and central principle which gives us the best hope of sound education. That is the third principle I venture to speak on as one to be taken for granted.

The fourth principle is that it is the duty of the State, above all things, to test and ascertain the nature of the education given; that it is not right to leave to the persons who give the instruction the power of testing their own work, but that the instruction, having been given by one set of persons, should have its value set on it by another set of persons.

The fifth principle, which I may also take for granted, is this—that when the State gives aid for schools, it ought not to give it merely for the school being in existence, or for having on its books a certain number of scholars or a certain attendance, but that it ought to be given in exchange for a certain amount of efficiency; that the State's business is to ascertain the results of the instruction given, and then to pay in proportion to those results.

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the five principles which I think may be taken as agreed upon and ascertained with regard to education. I shall, therefore, say no more about them, but proceed to where I think the disputable matter begins, and that is where we come to consider what is the precise duty of the State with regard to the communication of instruction.

Of course, there have been a great many different opinions on this subject. For instance, Plato thought so very highly of the duty of the State on this subject, that he went the length of saying that he would not trust any parent with the education of his own child; and in order that the parent might not interfere in the education of his own child, he proposed that on parent should know his own child, and that on child, however wise, should know his own parent. I think we need not go quite as far as that. I do not think it is necessary, in order to educate the people, to do as Plato wanted to do—to destroy the institution of the family, around which all the institutions of this country group and cluster themselves. But I think, in the main, though he may have carried his principle a little too far, that Plato was right. He regarded the education of youth as the primary duty of the State; he did not put it as one to be taken up after all other duties were discharged, but he seemed to think it almost superseded all other duties. He seemed to think that if persons are well educated, they will want few laws—they will be laws to themselves; that if persons are well educated, they will want few police, or little executive government—that they will be able to govern themselves—each man, putting a restraint on his own inordinate desires and passions, will be a law to himself, and will require no external force to keep himself in the path of duty. I do not, perhaps, go quite so far as that, because it must be remembered these things were said of small communities; but this I will say, that I consider the education of the people to be exactly as much a part of the duty of the State as the making of laws, the administration of the government, the regulation of foreign affairs, the management of the army and navy, as the regulation of the police, or the administration of the judicial functions of government. The question stands exactly on the same ground, and the Government is no more excusable for neglecting that duty than it would be for neglecting the protection of persons or property at home, the maintenance of the national honour abroad, or the making of such laws as were demonstrably necessary for the welfare of the subject. That is the general principle from which I start, and now let us see how far we come up to it. I am sorry to say the existing system falls far short of it, because the existing system in England is that the Government shall certainly admit its duty to educate the people, but shall not occupy a position that enables it to do it. The initiative is not with the Government. We have in truth no Minister of Education. It is only on the motion of private individuals that the Government can aid a school where it is wanted. All it can do is to follow where private enterprise leads it. Where people are good enough to found schools, Government can assist them; but where they are not, Government can do nothing. The consequence is that money is generally forthcoming in those places where education is most abundant; and, therefore, Government money is spent in giving assistance where it is least wanted, and withheld where it is most required. That is the cardinal defect of the system, and that is a defect that is not collateral to or extraneous, but inherent in its very nature; because the system being to base education on religious zeal and feeling, necessarily implies a voluntary system, for it is manifest that as you cannot create by Act of Parliament religious feeling and zeal, you can only act where they are to be found, where they are willing to put themselves in motion. Therefore it follows, from the essence of the system, that we must have Government placed in an unworthy position, merely following the will of private persons, obliged to stand looking on with folded arms and see masses of the population of the country growing up in vice and ignorance, while its assistance is lavished on places where there are sufficient resources to found schools and maintain them without Government aid at all. This is a very serious defect. Theoretically, nothing can be more objectionable; but I will confess to you that had it had not been for certain recent occurrences, I should not have been disposed, defective as our system is,

to meddle with it, because it is impossible to meddle with, to supplement this system—it is impossible to give assistance to any place where a school does not exist, without impairing, perhaps destroying, the voluntary system on which we rely; since it is manifest, if by withholding their contributions people can get the same thing done from other quarters, we are giving a premium to withhold those contributions, and thus to destroy those voluntary principles on which we trust. And it is not to be denied that this system, though partial, is one of great efficiency, for I believe the instruction communicated in these schools may compare favourably with that of any country in the world. Certainly, when one compares them with America, which is held up to us as a model, the difference is enormous, because in America the State makes a grant for the education to a Society or Township; but that grant is not given with reference to any system of inspection—indeed, inspection is unknown in their schools—and examination, such as is practised under the Revised Code in England, and as I hope will soon be practised in Scotland, is totally unknown, so that the assistance given to schools is granted there without any test of their efficiency. But this system has in it other recommendations. It is homogeneous with the habits and feelings of the people, particularly in the country districts of these islands; it enlists in its cause the best local agency that can be found—the gentlemen and clergymen resident in the parish. For these reasons I confess I should have been very unwilling to meddle with it. It has existed some time—it is existing—and to alter it will imply, I have no doubt, a very considerable sacrifice of efficiency, a great dislocation of energy and effort, during which much evil will accrue; but we have arrived at a time when we should no longer deliberate on these questions.

I am not going to enter on political matters, but we are all aware that the Government of the country, the voice potential in the Government, is placed in the hands of persons in a lower position of life than has hitherto been the case. It is not merely desirable, it is of the utmost importance, it is necessary for the preservation of the institutions of the country, that those people should be able properly and intelligently to discharge the duties devolving on them. Even supposing that the classes now enfranchised possess this knowledge, we require a much better guarantee than we have at present that those who are to come after them will possess it also; and if, as I fear is the case in many cases, they do not possess the knowledge, we are bound to strain every nerve to give it them. There is no effort we should not make—there is no sacrifice, either of money, or prejudice, or feeling, we should not submit to—rather than allow a generation to grow up in ignorance, in whose hands are reposed the destinies of all of us, the destinies of the nation. Therefore, gentlemen, though I should have been very glad to have allowed the system to have gone on quietly, peacefully, unostentatiously spreading itself, as it has hitherto done, I am firmly of opinion that the time has arrived when it is our duty to vindicate for the State its real function in this matter. Nor is it our duty to make the State the henchman or follower of private enterprise, but rather the representative of the whole community, having a vital interest in the education of every one of its members. I shall now submit to you what I consider would be a fitting outline of a plan by which this might be accomplished. I cannot do complete justice to it without trenching on politics. It is a thing which must be done, and done immediately. We cannot suffer any large number of our citizens, now that they have obtained the right of influencing the destinies of the country, to remain uneducated. It was a great evil that we did so before—it was an evil and a reproach, a moral stigma upon us. But now it is a question of self-preservation—it is a question of existence, even of the existence of our Constitution, and upon those who shall obstruct or prevent such a measure passing, will rest a responsibility the heaviest that mortal man can possibly lie under. Now, my friend Mr. Bruce had a scheme which, I think, in the circumstances under which he proposed it, was a good one, and which I would have willingly supported—a scheme for permitting persons to tax themselves for the purposes of education. I am sorry to say that in the circumstances in which we are now placed I consider that scheme not nearly drastic enough for what is wanted. Permission can only make a general system, what we want is an universal one. We must go farther than permitting—we must compel. We must insist that there shall be some means or other by which education shall completely pervade in this country. We must carry out in some way or other the great work of the Reformers in Scotland when they placed a school in every parish. I am going to show you how I believe, with such experience as I have, this can be effected.

I think the first sacrifice the advocates and friends of the present system must make is that they must give up the denominational system of inspection. I think the State will have to confine itself to the secular part of education; to give up what is at present a sort of joint partnership in inspectors with the different denominations. You will see in a moment why I put this in the front. I think also that the present schools must be made as efficient as possible for the education of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects; and therefore that the State ought not, for the future, to give sums of public money for the assistance or maintenance of schools unless they have what is called a con-science-clause—that is, unless persons of all denominations are admitted without having anything done that shall violate or infringe upon their religious opinions. These two things being premised, what I would propose is this:—I would say, Commence an educational survey of these islands; do not wait for people to come to you and say they want public money. Commence a survey, and report upon Great Britain parish by parish; report to the Privy Council in London the educational wants in each parish, the

number of schools, the number of children, and what is wanted to be done in order to place within the reach of the people of that parish a sufficient amount of education. When that has been done, I think it should be the duty of the Privy Council to give notice to that parish that they should found a school, or whatever may be wanted for the purposes of that parish. If the parish found a school, then it would be the duty of the Privy Council to assist it, and that in the same way as it assists the schools already in existence. I would say, in passing, that I do not think we should disturb the schools already existing, except that they must submit to undenominational inspection, and to a conscience-clause. If the parish does not agree to what is done, then I think there ought to be power vested in the Privy Council, or the Secretary of State, or some other great responsible public officer, to make a compulsory rate on them to found that school. I think the schools they found should be entitled to the same inspection and examination as the schools already in existence, and receive the same grants or results. That simple machinery would, in a short time, alter the whole face of the question, and place education within the reach of every one of Her Majesty's subjects. Then, and not till then, it will be right to talk about compulsory education, because I can imagine nothing more unjust, nothing more unfair upon a child, than to say that a man shall not be allowed to employ the child because he has never been educated, when the State has not placed within the reach of that child the means of education.

Well, gentlemen, that is the outline of what I have to say on this subject I am happy to say it resembles in many respects the report of the Commission that has sat on Scotch education—a report which, as far as an Englishman may be permitted to give an opinion, appears to me to be founded on sound principles, and characterised by a great deal of common sense. But I hope that in Scotland no delay will occur in the introduction of the Revised Code. As far as I may judge—and it is a matter about which I know something—this Revised Code would have very beneficial effects in Scotland, which it has not in England. It appears to me one of the faults of the Scotch schools is, that they were rather deficient in school appliances and equipments; that though the masters are of a high class, there is a want, more or less, of assistance in teaching. The masters receive high salaries, but the rest of the school was less abundantly furnished with assistance and teaching appliances in Scotland than in England; and I believe that if the public grant, instead of going as at present in the way of augmentation to the masters, were given to the heritors or managers of the schools, where they are voluntarily established, it would be more beneficially expended than in augmenting the already liberal salaries of masters. I must say, that I cannot agree with the Commissioners in what they say in regard to the children of those in easier circumstances who are sent to those schools. It is very desirable; no one can object to it, that persons in easy circumstances should send their children to the parish schools in Scotland. It is a happy symptom, where such a thing can take place; but I must say, with great deference to the Commissioner's, that if people are able to pay for the education of their children they ought to pay, and not take from the public funds. This is a matter on which they lay great stress; but I cannot say we do right in taxing the heritors of the parish indiscriminately for the education of children of rich parents who are able to educate them themselves; and on that point I beg to record my dissent.

One word more on this subject before I quit it. I am not sanguine in the belief that what I wish will be done. Those who are concerned in the present system, and who have taken it up, are actuated by the best motives, and will be most vehement and urgent in resisting any change. The change will trench on their prejudices and feelings, and it is not unreasonable to suppose, without saying anything disrespectful of them, that they will think more of the disturbance of that which has cost them much pain and some money to establish, than they will of the larger public views I have endeavoured to explain to you. But while these people will be warm and earnest, I am afraid the friends of education will be comparatively lukewarm. A man acts with very different energy when he is striving for a particular thing he is connected with than he does when he is merely fighting the battle of the public at large. I will give you an instance of it. In the colony of Victoria, in Australia, recently, the Attorney-General—a gentleman of great influence—introduced a bill for the purpose of providing a national system of education, something of the sort I am describing. You know that there the Legislature is elected by universal suffrage; therefore you would think that the Attorney-General would have received the strong support of the people, because the people were invested with the power of electing the Legislature. As soon as he had broached his scheme—which was more necessary there than here, in consequence of the sparse population of the pastoral part of the country rendering it impossible for more than one school to be erected in a large district—the Roman Catholic bishop entered a formal protest, the bishop of the Church of England entered his protest, all the religious bodies entered their protests, while the people for whose benefit the scheme was designed were silent and apathetic, so that the Attorney-General was obliged to withdraw his bill, and the hopes of a real secular education in that country are postponed. We hear a great deal of the certainty that such a measure will be carried. I do not share in that expectation. I hope most sincerely I shall be disappointed. But whether it be carried or not, it is the duty of those who have at heart the good of this country and of its institutions, so powerful for good or for evil, to strain every nerve to get it done, or at all events to free themselves from the responsibility of not doing it, and throwing it on those who oppose them.

And now I will pass from this to the second part of my subject, which is, as I told you, the education of the middle and upper classes. And first, I will endeavour to explain to you what I conceive to be the business of education. It seems to me, if one can form an abstract idea of what ought to be taught, that it is to teach a person everything important to know, and, at the same time, to discipline his mind. But as the period during which education can be communicated is very short, we must qualify that view, I think, by saying that the business of education is to teach persons as much of that which it is important they should know as can be taught within a limited time, and with reference to the ordinary faculties of mankind, and that also in so doing care should be taken to discipline the mind of the pupil as far as possible. That is what I conceive to be the object of education. Well, that being so, you see a question arises of very great difficulty—What is it most important that persons should know?—and till we can answer that question, we cannot satisfactorily solve the question which I am now proposing to consider—What is the education that ought to be given to the middle and upper classes of this country? We must invent for ourselves a sort of new science—a science of weights and measures; of ponderation, if I may coin a word—in which we shall put into the scales all the different objects of human knowledge, and decide upon their relative importance. All knowledge is valuable, and there is nothing that it is not worth while to know; but it is a question of relative importance—not of decrying this branch of knowledge, and praising and puffing that—but of taking as far as possible the whole scale of human knowledge, and deciding what should have priority, which should be taught first, and to which our attention should be most urgently directed. That is a problem, you will allow, of most enormous difficulty. I can only suggest one or two considerations which may assist us in solving it. I think it will be admitted by all who hear me that as we live in a universe of things, and not of words, the knowledge of things is more important to us than the knowledge of words. The first few months and the first few years of a child's existence are employed in learning both, but a great deal more in making itself acquainted with the world than with the knowledge of language. What is the order of Nature? Nature begins with the knowledge of things—then with their names. It is more important to know what a thing is, than what it is called. To take an easy illustration, it is more important to know where the liver is situated, and what are the principles which effect its healthy action, than to know that it is called *jecur* in Latin or Greek script in Greek. I go a little farther. Where there is a question between true and false, it is more important to know what is true than what is false. It is more important to know the history of England than the mythologies of Greece and Rome. I think it more important that we should know those transactions out of which the present state of our political and social relations have arisen, than that we should know all the lives and loves of all the gods and goddesses that are contained in Lempriere's dictionary. And yet, according to my experience—I hope things are better managed now—we used to learn a great deal more about the Pagan than the Christian religion in the schools. The one was put by to Sunday, and dismissed in a very short time; the other was every day's work, and the manner in which it was followed out was by no means agreeable. The slightest slip in the name or history of any of the innumerable children of the genealogy of Jupiter or Mars was followed by a form and degree of punishment which I never remember being bestowed upon any one for any slip in divinity. Then, gentlemen, I venture to think, as we cannot teach people everything, it is more important that we should teach them practical things than speculative things. There must be speculation, and there must be practice, but I think if we cannot do both, we should rather lean to the practical side. For instance, I think it more important that a man should be able to work out a sum in arithmetic, than that he should be acquainted with all the abstract principles of Aristotle's logic, and that the moods of a syllogism are not so important as the rule of three, practice, and keeping accounts. If we must choose in the matter, we should lean to the practical side. One more rule I will venture to submit—they are four in all—if we must choose in these matters, the present is more important to us than the past. Institutions, communities, kingdoms, countries, with which we are daily brought into contact, are more important than institutions, kingdoms, and countries that have ceased to exist for upwards of 2000 years. I will pursue this topic no farther.

Having made these general observations as my little contribution towards the new science of ponderation or measurement which I am anxious to found, to enable us to compare one branch of knowledge with another, I will proceed, with your permission, to inquire how far the education of the middle and upper classes corresponds with this idea. Without going into detail, I may say the principal subjects of education—I don't say in Scotch Universities, for you are more liberal than we are in England, though even in your universities not quite sufficiently so—in Oxford and Cambridge are analytical mathematics, and what are called the learned languages—viz. Latin and Greek.

Now I admit that mathematics are a most admirable study, and are calculated to train the mind to strict habits of reasoning, and habits of close and sustained attention. But these are the synthetical, not the analytical mathematics. Consider to what this form of study trains a man. It educates him to approach a subject analytically. He takes his conclusion for granted, and then investigates the conditions upon which it rests. Well, that is not a good way of reasoning. The best way of reasoning is to fix upon principles and facts and see what conclusion they give you, and not to begin with a conclusion and see what principles or facts you may be able

to pick up in order to support it. Then any one who has gone through this training, knows that you go by steps. One understands step by step, but the whole very often eludes our grasp, and we find ourselves landed in a conclusion without knowing how. We see each step we have taken, but we see not how we arrived at the conclusion. This is a system in one sense too easy, because each step is easy; and in the other it is too difficult, because it is an immense strain on the mind to grasp the whole effect of what is done. Then you are aware of this also, that perhaps the most useful lesson a man can learn is the estimation of probabilities and sifting of evidence. But this is wholly excluded from mathematics, which deal purely with necessary truth. Therefore, it has often been observed, and by no one more forcibly than your own Sir William Hamilton, that a mind formed upon this kind of study is apt to oscillate between the extreme of credulity and scepticism, and is little trained to take those sensible and practical views of the probabilities and the possibilities affecting our daily life, upon which, far more than upon abstract reasoning, the happiness of mankind depends. I may here mention in illustration what was said by a great judge of men and ability—Napoleon Buonaparte. He took for one of his ministers La Place—one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest of mathematicians, and he said of him—"He was a geometer of the first rank; but whose only idea of transacting the business of his department was with reference to the differential and integral calculus."

Now, I pass on to the other study that is the principal occupation of our youth, and that is the study of the Latin and Greek languages, and the history, science, geography, and mythology connected with them—the principal study being language, and the rest only accessories to it. Now, it strikes one, in the first instance, it is rather a narrow view of education that it should be devoted mainly—I had almost said exclusively—to the acquisition of any language whatever. Language is the vehicle of thought, and when thought and knowledge are present, it is desirable as the means of conveying it. It is not a thing to be substituted for it—it is not its equivalent. It presupposes knowledge of things, and is only useful where that knowledge is attained for the purpose, namely, of communicating it I will venture to read a few lines from Pope in illustration of what I say; I should only weaken the thought if I attempted to state the effect of them. They are 140 or 150 years old, and that only shows you how abuses and mistakes may be pointed out in the most vigorous language, and with the most conclusive reasoning, and yet they may remain utterly uncared for:—

*"Since man from beasts by words is known,  
Words are man's province; words we teach alone,  
When reason doubtful, like the Samian letter  
Points him two ways, the narrower is the better.  
Placed at the door of learning youth to guide,  
We never suffer it to stand too wide,  
To ask, to guess, to know, as they commence,  
As fancy opens the quick springs of sense,  
We ply the memory, we load the brain,  
Bind rebel wit, and double chain on chain,  
Confine the thought, to exercise the breath,  
And keep them in the pale of words till death."*

I think it is a poor and imperfect conception of education that should limit it to the learning of any languages whatever; but surely if we are to make language the whole or a part of education, it should be the language which we are most concerned with; and I must be permitted to say that in my science of ponderation I think English has a prior claim over Latin and Greek. I do not disparage Latin or Greek; but I am speaking of what is most important to be taken first; and I think it is melancholy to consider the ignorance of our own language in which the best educated of our young men are brought up. Latin is, of course, of great use. It is the only means of opening up a great store of information which is locked up in it, and which is not to be found elsewhere. It has a noble literature of its own, and it is the key to most of the modern languages, and therefore it is a study of very great importance. But we must remember that those persons who spoke a language which was the most marked by felicity of expression, and which is the model of all literature—the inhabitants of Greece, I mean—knew no language but their own. The Romans knew just enough Greek to make them neglect their Latin, and the consequence is their literature is inferior to that of the race that came before them who knew one language. And only see how you set about learning these languages. Learning the language is a joke compared with learning the grammar. The grammar is one thing, and the language another. I agree with the German wit, Heine, who said—"How fortunate the Romans were that they had not to learn the Latin grammar, because if they had done so they never would have had time to conquer the world." Montaigne, 300 years ago, saw this, and pointed it out most forcibly, and by learning the language colloquially, "without a lash, without a tear," he

became able to speak it by being talked to in Latin. But that would not answer the purpose. Because it is said "you must discipline the mind," therefore a boy is put through torture of elaborate grammars, which he is forced to learn by heart, and every syllable of which he forgets before he is twenty years of age. There seems something like a worship of inutility in this matter; it seems to be considered very fine to learn something that cannot by possibility do anybody anything of good—

*"The languages, especially the dead—  
The sciences, especially the abstruse—  
The arts, at least all such as could be said  
To be the most remote from common use."*

It is an idea that a thing cannot be good discipline for the mind unless it be something that is utterly useless in future life. Now, I do not think so. There is no doubt that Greek is a language of wonderful felicity of expression; but what is more beautiful, more refined, what will exercise taste better than the study of the best modern French prose to be found in M. Prevost Paradol, Sainte Beuve, and other French writers? There is nothing that can approach it in the English language. If a man wishes to exercise himself in these things he cannot possibly have a better subject than French prose. The discipline of the mind is quite as good, and it has this advantage, that when he goes to Paris he will be able to go to a hotel and make known his wants without becoming a laughing-stock to everybody; but this would be too useful, and therefore this must be put aside for some discipline in the Greek language, which he is sure to forget before he is thirty. It depends upon what you mean to make men. If you want to make them a race of sophists, poetasters, and schoolmasters, we are going about it in the right way; but for the business of life we have a little too much Latin and Greek, and if we are to have them taught, they ought to be taught on a very different system. There is nothing more absurd than to attempt to untie knots that have never been tied. If language had been made on a set of general principles—if it had been laid down by the wise men of all nations that the nominative should always agree with the verb, and a verb should always govern the accusative—and language had been made like Euclid—every one of these rules which had been tied we could untie, and a language having been put together in that way we could analyse it into rules. But, gentlemen, language was not so made. Language grew we know not how—like a tree or a plant; it was not made under general rules, and therefore, when you are trying to form general rules for it, you are sowing the sand—you will never attain to what you want; and the result is that when you come to reflect, you will find that you have wasted much time, and the best years of your life have been made miserable by studying rules, whose exceptions are often as numerous as their illustrations, and of which you never know whether they apply or not.

Well, then, gentlemen, there is another thing I enter my protest against, and that is Latin verses. I do not think the history of poets is so prosperous that the end and object of mankind should be to make as many young people as possible poetasters. One of the least profitable of the little talents that a man can have is that of scribbling verses, and yet years of our lives are taken up in the attempt to teach us to write Latin verses, which, after all, are a mere cento of expressions stolen from different authors, the meaning of which we may not ourselves know. I know that I have been highly commended for verses I could not construe myself. This of course gives a most unfair predominance to boys who have been early taught how to use a gradus. The knack is so absurd and repulsive that no one ever acquired it late in life. It must be taught early if at all. I have known men of high classical attainments who have not got honours because they have not had the knack of stringing words together, called doing Latin verses. There is a movement going on against the system, and I hope we shall get rid of it. Another absurd thing is this—I think that a man knows a language when he can read with fluency and ease a good plain straightforward author who writes grammatically and sensibly. This may very soon be done in Latin and Greek; but that is not half enough. There is no torture in that—that is very simple. But what you must do is to take a place that is hopelessly corrupt, where the amanuensis has gone to sleep, or has been tipsy, or has dropped a line, or something or other; you must read two or three pages of notes by everybody who has read at these places, written in bad Latin, stating their idea of how they ought to be reformed and translated. If Æschylus came to life again he would be easily plucked in one of his own choruses; and as for Homer, I am quite certain he did not know the difference between the nominative and accusative case; and yet the best hours of our lives are spent in this profitless analysis of works produced by men utterly unconscious of the rules we are endeavouring to draw from them.

Well, gentlemen, I have nothing more to say on that point; but I proceed to another thing which has always struck me very forcibly, and that is the preference that is given to ancient history. Do not misunderstand me. Ancient history is a very important matter, and a very beautiful study; but it is not so important as modern history, and it does not bear nearly so much upon our transactions. Consider what it is. Ancient history has but

two phases—the one is a monarchy, the other is a municipality. The notion of a large community existing by virtue of the principle of representation—of a popular government extended beyond the limits of a single town—is a thing that never entered into the minds of the ancients, so that the best years of our lives are spent in studying history in which that which makes the difference between modern history and ancient—the leading characteristic of our society—that principle of representation which has made it possible in some degree to reconcile the existence of a large country with the existence of a certain amount of freedom—was utterly unknown. The Roman Empire was established, from the necessity of the case, because when Rome became too large to be a municipality, the ancients knew of no other means than to place a Cæsar—a tyrant—over the whole of it, and the idea of sending, as we should do, representatives of the different provinces to meet in Rome, and consult upon the general welfare of the Empire, never occurred to them. That was not known at that time. That was a discovery of many hundred years later. And yet to study all this history, which wants the one thing that is the leading characteristic of modern history, the best time of our life is devoted. I do not say that the time is thrown away, but it is melancholy to reflect that this history is taught, not as an adjunct but as a substitute for modern history. If a man has a knowledge of modern and mediæval history, it is important that he should have this knowledge of ancient history with which he has to compare it; but if he has no modern history he has not the means of comparison. It is useless then by itself. That state of things has utterly passed away. It perished, never to return, with the fall of the Roman Empire, and on its rains sprung up a new state of things—the feudal system and the polity of the Middle Ages, which ripened into the present state of things. Of all that our youth are taught nothing—they know nothing of it. The subject is never brought before them, and their study is limited and confined to the wars and intrigues of petty republics, the whole mass of which would hardly, perhaps, amount to as many people as are in this great city. There is a well-known passage in a letter by Servius Sulpicius, one of Cicero's friends, in which he endeavours to console him for the death of his daughter Tullia. This is a translation of it:—"Behind me lay Ægina, before me Megæra, on my right Piræus, on my left Corinth; these cities, once so flourishing, now lie prostrate and demolished before my eyes. I thought, 'Are we little mortals afflicted when one of us perishes, whose life must at any rate be brief, when in one place lie the corpses of so many towns?'" Well, that is one way of looking at the question. I have been in the same place, and also had my thoughts, and I thought how many irretrievable years of my life have I spent in reading and learning the wars, and the intrigues, and the revolutions of these little towns, the whole of which may be taken in at a single glance from the Acropolis of Athens, and would not make a decently-sized English county. I think that reflection must force itself on the mind of any one who has gone to Greece, and has seen the wonderfully small scale on which these republics are laid out, to which the earlier years of his life were almost exclusively devoted.

Then, gentlemen, there is another great fault in this exclusive direction of the mind of youth to antiquity, and that is, that their conception of knowledge wants entirely that which is our leading conception in the present day. I do not think that you will find anywhere in the study of antiquity that which is now in everybody's mouth—the idea of progress. The notion of the ancients was that knowledge was a sort of permanent fixed quantity—that it could not be increased—that it was to be sought for; and if a man wanted to seek for knowledge he did not sit down and interrogate Nature, and study her phenomena, and also analyse and inquire, but he put on his seven-leagued boots and travelled to Egypt or Persia, or as far as he possibly could, in the expectation of finding some wise man there who could tell him all about it. That was the case with Plato, and almost all the great men of antiquity. Now it is no small fault of the modern system of education that it withholds that conception, the key of modern society—that is, not to look at things as stationary, but to look at the human race as, like a glacier, always advancing, always going on from good to better, from better to worse, as the case may be—an endless change and development that never ceases, although we may not be able to mark it every day. That conception is entirely wanting in the antique world; and therefore it is not too much to ask that that idea should be imparted to youth before we give so much time to study the state of society in which it is wholly wanting. I won't detain you with any discussion in this place on the morals and metaphysics of the ancients. I suspect that they knew as much of the mental sciences as we do now—neither much more nor much less; and, without speaking disrespectfully of them, we may say this, that no two of them had the same opinion on the same subject. Then we are dosed with the antiquities of the ancients. Every man is expected to know how many Archons there were at Athens, though he does not know how many Lords of the Treasury there are in London; he must know all the forms of their courts, though he knows hardly the names of our own. He must be dosed with their laws and institutions—things excessively repulsive to the young mind—things only valuable for comparing with our own institutions, of which he is kept profoundly ignorant.

Then another thing, not a little irritating, is Ancient Geography. A large portion of time is spent in studying divisions of countries that have long ceased to exist, or have any practical bearing on the world. Of course, if you are to study the language of the ancients, these things must be learned; but is it not melancholy to think how much modern geography is sacrificed to this knowledge? There is nothing in which young men are more



deficient than in geography. I shall just mention a few things within my own knowledge. Take, for instance, Australia. It is very rare to find a person who knows where the colonies of Australia are. The island of Java is said to have been given up by Lord Castlereagh at the Treaty of Vienna to the Dutch because he could not find it in the map, and was ashamed to confess his ignorance. I remember a very eminent member of the House of Commons indeed—I will not mention his name—who made a speech in which it was quite manifest to me that he thought that Upper Canada was nearest the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and Lower Canada was higher up the river. If I were to tell you his name you would be astonished. Well, we are going to make an expedition to Abyssinia. The whole thing depends upon the nature of the country. Now, what do we know about it. There is a great deal to be known about it. A great many men have travelled there, and a great deal has been written about it? It is as much as most men can do to find it on the map, and very few know a single town in it. I have amused myself trying to see how few men know where Gondar, the capital of this country, is situated on the map; and as the prisoners we are going to attempt to rescue can probably only be reached by going there, and so to Magdala, it is nearly as important to know where it is as to know that Halicarnassus was the capital city of Caria, or that there were twenty-three cities of the Volscians in the Campagna of Rome. There is another illustration I may give. The name of the place is in the Bible, and we might have hoped better things. You will remember that Mr. Bright in last session of Parliament denominated certain gentlemen by a name derived from a cave. Well, I assure you, gentlemen, there was not one person in twenty whom I met who knew anything about the Cave of Adullam, and I was under the melancholy and cruel necessity of explaining it to them, and of pointing the arrow that was aimed against my own breast. After all, gentlemen, education is a preparation for actual life, and I ask you—though no doubt the memory is exercised and the faculties are sharpened by these studies in some degree—whether they really in any degree fulfill that condition. I say there is nothing so valuable for a man as to avoid credulity. If he discounts a man's bill, he should inquire before he does it. But what we are taught by this kind of study, our attention being so much placed upon words, is to take everything for granted. We find a statement in Thucydides, or Cornelius Nepos, who wrote 500 years afterwards, and we never are instructed that the statement of the latter is not quite as good as the former. And so with other things. The study of the dead languages precludes the inquiring habit of mind which measures probability, which is one of the most important that a man can acquire.

I will now give you a catalogue of things which a highly-educated man—one who may have received the best education at the highest public schools, or at Oxford—maybe in total ignorance of. He probably will know nothing of the anatomy of his own body. He will have not the slightest idea of the difference between the arteries and the veins, and he may not know whether the spleen is placed on the right or the left side of his spine. He may have no knowledge of the simplest truths of physics, and would not be able to explain the barometer or thermometer. He knows nothing of the simplest laws of animal or vegetable life. He need not know, he very often does not know, anything about arithmetic, and that ignorance sticks to him through life; he knows nothing of accounts, he does not know the meaning of double entry, or even a common debtor and creditor account. He may write an execrable hand; good clear writing—perhaps the most important qualification a gentleman or man of business can possess—is totally neglected. He may be perfectly deficient in spelling. I knew an eminent person who got a first-class honour, and in his essay—a most excellent English essay—there were forty-six mis-spellings. He may know nothing of the modern geography of his own country; he may know nothing of the history of England. I knew an instance not long ago of a gentleman who had attained high honours at the University, and who became a contributor to a periodical, in which it was suggested he should illustrate some fact by reference to Lord Melbourne's Ministry. He said he had never heard of Lord Melbourne. He need know nothing whatever of modern history—how the present polity of Europe came into effect. He need know nothing of mediæval history, and that is a matter of serious importance, because important results have flowed from ignorance of that history. Great schisms have arisen in the Church of England from absurdly-exaggerated ideas of the perfection of everything in that dreadful period; and the state of gross ignorance in which people are left as to these times seems almost to lead them to suppose that the best thing that modern society could aim at would be to return to the state of things which existed when the first crusade was projected. He may be in a state of utter ignorance of the antiquities or the law of England; he knows the laws and antiquities of Greece and Rome. The English laws and antiquities are bound up with our freedom and history, and are important to every clay's business; but he knows about them nothing whatever. We have, I here say boldly, a literature unparalleled in the world. Which of our great classical authors is a young man required to read in order to attain the highest honours our educational institutions can give him? He studies in the most minute manner the ancient writings of Rome or Greece. But as for Chaucer and Spenser, or the earlier classics, the old dramatists, or the writers of the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and Charles I., he knows nothing of them; and the consequence is that our style is impoverished, and the noble old language of our forefathers drops out of use, while the minds of our young men are employed instead in stringing together scraps of Latin poets learned by heart, and making them into execrable hexameters. Then as for modern

languages.—There is some feeble sort of attempt to teach them, but nothing effective; and yet surely, if English is to have a preference over modern languages, as it ought to have, modern languages ought to have a preference, as far as the practical affairs of life are concerned, over ancient languages. I have been with a party of half-a-dozen first-class Oxford gentlemen on the Continent, and not one spoke a word of French or German; and if the waiter had not been better educated than we, and known some other language than his own, we might all have starved. That is not nearly all, but that is enough. I think you will agree with me that, as Dr. Johnson said of the provisions in the Highland inn, the negative catalogue is very copious, and I therefore sum up what I have to say on this point by making this remark, that our education does not communicate to us knowledge, that it does not communicate to us the means of obtaining knowledge, and that it does not communicate to us the means of communicating knowledge.

These three capital deficiencies are undoubted; and what makes these so painful is the thought of the enormous quantities of things eminently worth knowing in this world. I have spoken only of modern history, of modern languages; but what are modern history and languages compared with the boundless field that nature opens out—with the new world which chemistry is expanding before us—with the old world that geology has called again into existence—with the wonderful generalisation with regard to plants and animals, and all those noble studies and speculations which are the glory and distinction and life-blood of the time in which we live, and of which our youth remain, almost without exception, totally ignorant? It is not too much to say, that the man who becomes really well educated must begin his education after it has closed. After all had been done for him that the present miserable, contracted, and poor system can do, he has to begin and educate himself over again, with a feeling that he has wasted the best and most precious years of his life on things neither useless nor unprofitable in themselves, but which were the mere bypaths or appanages to the knowledge which constitute the mental stock of a man of erudition. How are we to account for this phenomenon—how, with physical science in the state that it is, with such a history as ours, with such a literature as ours, with such a literature as that of modern Europe before us, we should turn aside from this rich banquet, and content ourselves with gnawing at mouldy crusts of speculations which have passed away upwards of two thousand years? How are we to account for this? It is easily accounted for. It is mainly the fault of educational endowments. When the educational endowments of Universities were made, there really existed no English literature. Modern history had not begun; mediæval history was only to be found in meagre annals of monkish chroniclers. Physical science was not in existence at all; and there really was nothing to direct the mind except Latin and Greek, and Aristotelian logic. No blame, therefore, attaches to these noble and philanthropic persons who made these foundations. The blame is in those who, after the immense expansion of knowledge, have not found means to expand the objects to which these endowments may apply in a similar proportion. Nor does any blame attach to our Universities, considered strictly as such—meaning by a University a body that ought to examine and test the advancement of its pupils; because our Universities do give examinations, and are willing, I am sure, to give them on any subject on which pupils can be found. But the blame lies with the Government of this country, because these endowments which are now exclusively given to Latin, Greek, and mathematics, are really, in my opinion, public property, for the use of which the State, as representing the public, is responsible. So long as they answer the end that endowments should answer, they should be let alone. When they do not, it is our business to reform them. Now what end do they answer? The end that they answer is this—they give an enormous bounty, an enormous premium, on the study of the dead languages, and of pure mathematics. Well, the studies of the dead languages, and of pure mathematics, are noble and valuable studies, and if that was all I would not object. But you know very well you cannot give a premium to one study without discouraging another, and though their first effect is to give a premium to these studies, their collateral and far more important effect is to discourage, and, I would say, prevent, all those other studies which appear to me infinitely more worthy of a place in education. If a young man has talent, and is in want of money, as any young man is apt to be, and wants to turn his talent to advantage, suppose he devotes himself to physical science in Oxford, he can gain a first-class, whatever good that will do him. But there is hardly an endowment open to him; whereas, if he gave the same trouble to Latin and Greek, he might be a Fellow of half-a-dozen different colleges with the most perfect ease. How can you expect these studies to get fair-play, when they are so handicapped, when the whole weight of these endowments, amounting to about half-a-million annually, is thrown into the scale of the dead languages, and the study of pure mathematics? The fault lies, therefore with the Government, which has not reformed these endowments; and the remedy, as it appears to me, is that these endowments should be emancipated from this narrow application, so that the emoluments that are to be obtained for learning, may be impartially distributed among all the branches of human knowledge—not proscribing the subjects to which I have alluded, but not giving them these invidious preferences over all the rest. The same thing applies to our public schools. They are really adventure schools, kept by masters for their own profit. There is a foundation which forms the nucleus, and that foundation is generally for the purpose of teaching Latin and Greek, and that overrules and dominates the schools. The remedy is in the hands of parents;

but these schools have got a goodwill such as no other institution in the country has got. A man that has been at a school, however badly taught he has been, however much he has been flogged, always goes away with an affection for it. He forgets his troubles. It is a time that appears to us all very pleasant in the retrospect; and as these troubles are to be undergone not again by himself, but by his son, he always sends him there. No doubt, if we could only secure a fair stage and no favour for all the different branches of instruction, the thing would remedy itself. Do not misunderstand me. I do not think it is any part of the duty of Government to prescribe what people should learn, except in the case of the poor, where time is so limited that we must fix upon a few elementary subjects to get anything done at all. I think it is the duty of the parents to fix what their children should learn. But then the State should stand impartial, and not by endowments necessarily force education into these channels, and leave those others dry. And, therefore, what I would press is, that somehow or other the endowments should be so recast as to give all subjects—physical science, modern history, English history, English law, ancient languages, ancient literature, ancient history, ancient philosophy all a fair and equal start. You will say, How is it possible for this to be done? I don't presume to say what is the best way of doing it, but I can tell you one way it can be done, because I have done it myself. I was Secretary to the India Board at the time when the writer-ships were thrown open to public competition. We had of course the problem to solve then, because if we had restricted them to Latin and Greek, of course we should have excluded a great number of very meritorious candidates—gentlemen, for instance, coming from the Scotch Universities, who, though very well versed in the philosophy of mind, and many other valuable studies, would not have been able to compete perhaps successfully in classics with boys trained in the English public schools. And therefore we had to attempt to do something of the kind that I have endeavoured to point out to you as being necessary to do. In order to solve the problem of education, I, with the assistance of Lord Macaulay and other eminent men, prepared a scale which has since, with very little change, been the scale upon which these offices have been distributed; that is, we took every-thing that we could think of that a well-educated man could learn. We took all the languages: we took Latin and Greek, we took French and English, and all the modern languages of Europe; we took the principal branches of physical science, we took history, English Literature, philosophy of mind as taught in Scotland, and at Oxford, and at other places; we took everything, and we gave marks to each according to their relative importance, as near as we could arrive to it; and under that system all persons have been admitted equally and fairly to the benefits of those offices, whatever their line of study may have been. Instead of loading the dice in favour of the dead languages, we gave them all a fair start, and the thing, so far as I know, has worked perfectly smoothly and with perfect success. Now, I say something of that kind should be done if we are to reform endowments so as to place all studies on a level, and then let the best study win. I won't pretend to influence the decision of parents, but I should give to them no bribe, no inducement, to choose one study more than another. but allow them to take whatever they like best. And I think you would find that the public appetite for Latin verses, the difficult parts of Greek choruses, and the abstruser rules of grammar, such as are given in the Latin Primer recently issued for the use of public schools, would begin to abate; and the people would think it is better to know something of the world around them, something about the history of their own country, something about their own bodies and their own souls, than it is to devote themselves entirely to the study of the literature of the republics of Greece and Rome.

Well, gentlemen, I am afraid I have detained you at very great length, and you will be happy to hear that I have come to an end to what I propose to say to you. There is one more proposal that I wish to make. I have said I am most anxious to educate the lower classes of this country, in order to qualify them for the power that has passed, and perhaps will pass in a still greater degree, into their hands. I am also anxious to educate, in a manner very different from the present, the higher classes of this country, and also for a political reason. The time has gone past evidently when the higher classes can hope by any indirect influence, either of property or coercion of any kind, to direct the course of public affairs. Power has passed out of their hands, and what they do must be done by the influence of superior education and superior cultivation; by the influence of mind over mind—"the sign and signet of the Almighty to command," which never fails being recognised wherever it is truly tested. Well, then, gentlemen, how is this likely to be done? Is it by confining the attention of the sons of the wealthier classes of the country to the history of these old languages and those Pagan republics, of which working men never heard, with which they are never brought in contact in any of their affairs, and of which, from the necessity of the case, they know nothing? Is it not better that gentlemen should know the things which the working men know, only know them infinitely better in their principles and in their details, so that they may be able, in their intercourse and their commerce with them, to assert the superiority over them which greater intelligence and leisure is sure to give, and to conquer back by means of a wider and more enlightened cultivation some of the influence which they have lost by political change? I confess, for myself, that, whenever I talk with an intelligent workman, so far from being able to assert any such superiority, I am always tormented with the conception, "What a fool the man must think me when he finds me, upon whose education thousands of pounds have been spent, utterly ignorant of the matters which experience teaches him, and which he

naturally thinks every educated man ought to know." I think this ought easily to be managed. The lower classes ought to be educated to discharge the duties cast upon them. They should also be educated that they may appreciate and defer to a higher cultivation when they meet it; and the higher classes ought to be educated in a very different manner, in order that they may exhibit to the lower classes that higher education to which, if it were shown to them, they would bow down and defer.

The End.

*Printed by R. Clark, Edinburgh.*

On Primary and Technical Education

*Two Lectures delivered to the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh*

BY Lyon Playfair, C.B., M.P.

Edinburgh Edmonston and Douglas 1870.

*Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas Constable,*

For

Edmonston and Douglas.

London Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

Cambridge Macmillan and Co.

Glasgow James Maclehose.

## Lecture I.

### On Primary Education.

I NEED scarcely say that we are not about to traverse the whole field of primary education, but merely such portions of it as bear upon the technical instruction of the people; and in doing so I shall endeavour to avoid subjects of political controversy.

During the discussions of the Scotch Education Bill in the last session, the Vice-President of the Council took two occasions to warn the Scottish people that they were resting too much on the traditions of the past, and that they might lose their proud pre-eminence in education, unless they infused new life into it. This warning struck me forcibly, as coming from a man whom all parties unite in praising for prudence, foresight, and sagacity. He did not deny that Scotland was in advance of England in the general education of her people, but when two are running a race, the last man may become first, if he accelerate his pace, while the former slackens his rate. Now it is perfectly true that England is bestowing an extraordinary amount of attention on the subject of education, in relation both to the primary and secondary instruction of the people, while Scotland dreams of her past triumphs, and has not begun to buckle herself for a new race. Last session England passed an Act of the most revolutionary kind, in order to throw the gigantic resources of the old endowed schools into the common educational movement of the country; while Scotland allowed the corporations, now managing those schools, to obtain a feeble permissive Act, under which improvements may doubtless be effected, though without coherence or system, and purely local in character. So Scotland lost her chance of getting a graded system of education, such as is being established in England. It lost, in fact, the peculiar merit of the Scotch national system, held up to us as an example by the reformers of the 16th century, that schools should be so connected with each other that the meritorious poor, without favour or patronage, and by the freest competition, should find an easy ascent to the University through different roads representing varieties in their talents and attainments. Well, England has adopted this fine old Scotch principle in regard to her own endowed schools, and when I fought in the last session of Parliament to secure it for Scotland also, there were only two persons who spoke in favour of it. I need not tell you that the wealth and energy of England will enable her to make gigantic educational strides, now that she has fairly begun her course. I wish that I saw the same prospect for my own country in an access of educational zeal, for that would compensate in the future, as it has done in the past, for our national poverty. But I am bound to say that I think Mr. Forster, the Vice-President of the Council, was justified in his warning. The Scotch members fought their educational measure last session with but little backing from their constituencies.

The recent animated and excellent discussion of the bill by the Edinburgh Town-Council is, I hope, a sign of reviving interest.

There was certainly no want of denominational zeal on the part of the churches, nor was there any lack of interest on the side of teachers, but the people of Scotland stood aloof, and gave us little support. We had at our head Moncreiff, a veteran educational reformer and hero of a hundred fights, but he had heavy difficulties to

contend with from dissensions in his own ranks, the opposing interests of churches, and above all, from the want of expression of the public will; and now we are deprived of his aid, though I hope he will continue to look with interest on our struggles, in the placid contentment that is derived from fixity of tenure. The measure earned through the House of Commons, but rejected by the Lords, was far from being a perfect one, though it contained important general principles, to have gained which would have been a victory. One of them, not opposed, I am proud to say, by any church or party in Scotland, was that the inspections of schools should be undenominational. Under the present system, inspectors waste their own time and powers, and the money of the nation, by visiting only schools of one particular denomination,—four sets of inspectors doing one kind of work in the same locality. Had the measure become law, we should by this time have had district inspections all over the country. By such a consolidation of the duties of inspectors, new reforms in education would arise. The time is coming when there must be special inspectors of subjects, and not merely of localities. Take, for example, the subject of drill, strangely neglected in our Scotch schools, and which is so important, not only in its educational and disciplinary relations, but also in many national points of view, that before long it will become the special concern of the State. Then the hygienic state of schools will rise in importance when compulsory education becomes law; for if existing schools be filled to overflowing, this will increase their power, already marked, of propagating epidemic diseases. Had the Scotch measure passed, we would have been already preparing provision for 90,000 children,

The Royal Commissioners say 92,000. Rep. II. p. 173.

who are perishing for lack of knowledge, and for 80,000 more who are wretchedly fed. Had it passed into law, Scotland would have been assured that its own national system of education would have been preserved and superintended by a Board of Education in Edinburgh, instead of being regulated by clerks in the Privy Council Office in London. Had the bill passed into an Act, you would have confirmed for all Scotland, and have given an example to England, that it is the duty of localities to educate the people by rates levied in them. Then there was in the bill the seeds of a great reform, for it gave power to districts to form educational unions for the promotion of special branches of knowledge, and their utility would have prepared the public mind for one of the greatest improvements in the education of the people,—the division of the country into educational unions large enough for the efficient administration of all instructional measures.

Now with these positive advantages, how was it that the measure was only coldly supported by some of the representatives of the people? Doubtless because it was transparently a bill of compromises and not of general principles. Yet how could it have been otherwise? The education of Scotland has been created by a variety of churches, and their views required to be consulted. Originating in the efforts of the Church of Rome to raise the people as a check on the power of the nobles, it was carried on by the Church of Scotland through a parochial system, and was then largely supplemented by the Free Church, which, since its formation, has spent £600,000 on schools. Under such existing systems, no bill could be carried that is not based on compromises. My own views as to the desirableness of having an unsectarian system of education are pronounced, but when I know that Scotch schools are practically, though not theoretically, carried on in an undenominational spirit, am I to see so many children of the nation starving for want of the bread of education, because I cannot get it in the form of a whole loaf, when most of its substance lies before me in the form of slices? If we wait for an Education Bill that will satisfy all parties, we must wait till the crack of doom. This is not a place to refer to politics, and I shall not transgress a proper reserve. But it may be permitted me to say, that those who look to Ireland as an example of how we should reform education in Scotland, have little knowledge of the working of the two systems. The practical working is, in fact, in the inverse ratio of the professions made. Ireland professes to have an undenominational system, and in practice is quite denominational; while Scotland, with a denominational profession, is practically undenominational in the actual teaching of all her Presbyterian schools. In my view, the Scotch Education Bill, as it was introduced to the House of Lords, and even as it left the Commons, had in it so much of good, that its operation would have insured excellent education for the people. Scotland deceives herself if she believe that there is any longer a national system of education in the country. It is true that a really national system was created in 1696, while England did not begin seriously till 1839. On this glorious recollection of the past we are apt to reason with complacency, when in truth it is a national system no longer. The parochial system began when none of the towns in Scotland were worthy of the name. Though Glasgow, Greenock, and Paisley existed, their real development was after the Union. The parochial system does not apply to towns; and this is the age of towns. If you separate the towns in Scotland having populations above 10,000, you will find that they contain thirty-three per cent., or one-third of the whole people. To such towns the old educational system is inapplicable, and it is vain any longer to deceive ourselves with the belief that Scotland possesses a national education.

The present Lord Advocate, a few days since, in replying to a deputation of the Town-Council, threw it out "for consideration," whether it would not be well for the present to leave the country districts alone, and legislate only for the burghs, giving them, as I understand, permissive powers to rate themselves for the support

of schools. I have given to this subject the consideration which his Lordship invites, and I will tell you what is likely to be the upshot of this proposal. There are now in Scotland 365,288 children of school ages, the sons and daughters of the wage-making class. Of this number 146,549 reside in burghs with a population above 3000, and the towns with a less population have scarcely grown out of the reach of the parochial system. Now, assuming that every one of these towns rated itself for the support of schools, there would still remain 218,739 school children for the parochial system. But parish schools can only take 76,493 of these, so that 142,246 children would be left beyond the pale of a national or rate-supported system.

The burghs in Scotland with a population above 3000, have 1,228,109 inhabitants, 83.5 per cent, of whom are likely to use national schools for their children. According to the usual computation, one in seven of the reduced population is supposed to be on the roll of some school. I need not, however, tell you that it is entirely hopeless for us to look to a universal rating under a permissive system. We know how inoperative the Free Libraries Act has been, and that trusted to self-imposed taxation. One or two large towns, in extreme educational destitution, might impose such rates; but the great bulk of them would be content as hitherto to repose on the efforts resulting from denominational zeal; for "ignorant impatience of taxation" thrives wonderfully under a permissive system. If the rates for towns had been compulsory on them, as the educational rates on land are on parishes, the proposed measure might have met one-half of our educational wants. In this case, like Captain Cuttle in Dickens's novel, I would have been prepared to say, "that half a loaf is better than no bread;" but, in the view of the petty results that can alone be expected from the measure offered to us, I cannot coincide with that notable personage in saying, "that the same remark applies to crumbs." The educational crumbs, which the Lord Advocate offers, will satisfy nobody, and least of all those members of the House of Commons who objected to the Bill of last year because of its incompleteness. After the long and able inquiry of a Royal Commission; after the Queen, in her opening speech, had promised that Government would bring in a national measure of education for Scotland; after the House of Commons had shown, by passing a Bill, that they considered the subject ripe for legislation, I cannot believe that the Lord Advocate was serious in suggesting such a small measure, and I apprehend, therefore, that he threw it out merely as a test to ascertain whether Scotland earnestly desires a national system of education.

Unless the people of Scotland press upon Government and the Legislature the necessity of passing a measure,—better if you can get it, no worse, let us hope, than that of last session,—our education will be postponed to the exigencies of that of England and Ireland. England intends to reform her primary education this year, and Ireland will press for educational schemes in the following year; so unless our constituencies manifest an unmistakable will, the interests of our nation will certainly suffer. There is a great temptation to shunt the Scotch Bill into a siding, for though, in the opinion of many, it was not advanced enough, it was far too advanced for England and Ireland, and would be an unpleasant example to both. The Scottish members are willing and ready to do their duty, but unless the country gives to them full and adequate support, they will not be able to resist the convenience of the Government, which would like the Scotch Bill to be out of sight while England and Ireland settle their educational reforms. This danger for Scotland may be avoided by an adequate expression of the public will.

This danger, however, is not that which is implied in Mr. Forster's warning. He doubtless meant two things,—first, that England, with its Revised Code and access of educational zeal, will ultimately distance Scotland in primary education; and next, that the secondary schools of Scotland have no chance of remaining equal to those of England, now that the latter has thrown her endowed schools into the educational movement under public authorities alive to the importance of modern requirements, while our public endowments are subject to no such public authorities, and may, if they like, keep themselves altogether outside the general education of the country. I have elsewhere expressed my own views in sufficiently strong terms about the latter question, and so do not enlarge upon it.

I would ask your attention, however, to the general question, Whether our parochial and higher schools are sufficiently alive to the changing character of education in schools, so as to fit them to the requirements of the age? I could point to some in Edinburgh and Perth that undoubtedly are so; but I could also indicate many others which are not. Nor is this surprising when we bear in mind how our present school system arose. It was systematized by John Knox, but it had its origin long before his time. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries schools, generally attached to monasteries, were in the chief towns of Scotland; and they were regularly inspected by a monk detailed for this purpose as district inspector. The instruction in these ancient schools was far from despicable, and, in some points, was more comprehensive than that in modern schools.

Alcuin, in his letters to Charlemagne, gives the curriculum of the school at York as far back as the middle of the eighth century, and states that it included grammar and rhetoric, jurisprudence, poetry, astronomy, natural history, mathematics, chronology, and the Holy Scriptures.

In the Perth school, during the sixteenth century, it is recorded that the boys spoke Latin during the day, and French in the boarding-houses in the evening—accomplishments that even my friend Dr. Millar, the Rector

of that academy, could not claim for his pupils. Naturally, after the revival of letters, Latin was the chief, though by no means the exclusive, object of study. When James IV. of Scotland passed his celebrated Statute of 1494, ordaining that the eldest sons of barons and freeholders should have a compulsory elementary education, he ordered, at the same time, that they should pursue a technical instruction to fit them to perform aright their duties in life, for they were to attend, during three years, a school of law, in order that they might administer, discreetly and wisely, justices' justice to the poor people of the realm. What a pity this compulsory education for eldest sons does not now prevail! When John Knox systematized the education of his time, he was far too wise to limit it to a mere linguistic scheme; for all youth are charged, when attending burgh schools, to devote "a certain time to grammar and the Latin tongue, and a certain time to the arts of philosophy and *other tongues*, and a certain time to *that study which they intend chiefly to pursue for the profit of the commonwealth*;" in other words, that each boy was to receive an education, such as we now call technical or professional, meaning thereby having special adaptation to his future avocations. Now how is it that John Knox's wise counsel has been neglected, and that the higher education, as given in our parish and superior primary schools, should mainly, though not exclusively, consist of classics? We have not to look far to find the reason. The Church of the Reformation threw itself warmly into the parochial system of education, and, to some extent, usurped the examination of the schools. The Book of Discipline did not give the visitation to the ministers and elders alone, but directed that they should associate with themselves all the people of learning in the district

"And for this purpuss must discret learned and grave men be appointed to visit all scholles for the tryall of their exercise, proffit, and continewance; to wit, the ministeris and elderis, with the best learned in everie toun" (in edition 1621, "and the rest of the learned men in every town") "shall every quarter take examination how the youth hath profited."—*Knox's Works*, vol ii. p. 211.

in a quarterly examination of pupils. But as the Church depended on the schools for a supply of its future ministers, it naturally looked carefully after them. Every presbytery was enjoined to send up to the universities boys of promise, and to pay the expenses of their education, either by bursaries and benefactions or by church collections. The best preparation for these future ministers was obviously a classical one, so that Latin and Greek became not only the ornaments, but even the necessities, of the upper classes in the parochial schools. Every Scotch peasant hoped, like the father and mother of Dominie Sampson, to live to see his son "wag his head in the pulpit." It was not till 1747 that the presbyteries were discharged from this pious duty, and then only on account "of the multitude of probationers in the Church," the supply being in fact greater than the demand. But you will readily understand how the impress of classical instruction was made upon our schools. Towards the end of that century, the vernacular began to be used by the learned classes, who had been long separated from, but now began again to intermingle with, the industrial classes of the community. The active productive classes had been amassing knowledge by the inventions and experience of centuries, while the learned class had been asleep on Greek and Roman beds, which had never been made anew, but remained the same as when their original occupants left them. Luckily they were only a class, getting gradually more and more separated from the nation, otherwise they would have done infinite harm. In China all intellectual effort belongs to one class, who, unfortunately, will think of nothing that is not to be found in the books of Confucius, and so for twenty-three centuries that strange nation has not advanced. Now the world which we inhabit is not a stationary globe. Truly it moves round and round on one axis, but then it goes forward at the same time. Since I began to address you this evening we have gone twenty thousand miles onwards through space. The intellectual world, like the physical world, moves with a re-sistless onward sweep. The splendid achievements of the ancients, which our classicists so justly admire, were not attained by reposing on a period prior to their own time. Their philosophers were actively engaged in life; for most of them were merchants or traders, who drew their knowledge from familiar contact with the people. Aristotle, the son of a doctor, as is shown by his *Problems*, was amassing knowledge from the masons, carpenters, and engineers around him. Thales was an oil-merchant, Socrates a sculptor, Thucydides a gold-miner, while Plato and Solon derived profits from commerce. The men of our own time, who have advanced civilisation as much as any of these intellectual heroes of antiquity, have also derived their experience and mental strength from the productive classes around them. Stephenson was a stoker and a collier; Harrison a carpenter; Arkwright a barber; Brindley a millwright; Watt a philosophical instrument maker; Dalton the son of a weaver; Davy a druggist; and Faraday a bookbinder. Any exclusive system of education which expends a fourth of a life-time in acquiring a small amount of two extinct languages, and, during that period, separates the youth from the experience of their generation, must retard the progress of a nation. Of course our parochial schools are not responsible for this error of purely classical schools, but they have been influenced by their origin, and by the prevailing custom, to look to Latin and Greek as the chief aim of their highest instruction, and so they make the pupils who stay long enough go drearily round on this treadmill handed down by tradition. In the parish and other schools inspected and examined during this year by the presbyteries, 5670 boys were studying Latin, and 664 Greek, while only 3239 were occupied with French, and 156 with German. As to the natural and physical sciences, they have not even a place in the schedule of the

Church, though about 2000 boys seem to be engaged with mathematics, the language of the sciences. The sort of secondary instruction given in our parish schools is no longer abreast of the age, and though fitted fairly enough for men who are to enter professions, does not at all adapt itself to the classes who ought chiefly to be benefited by such schools. It is not the object of the State to expend money on primary schools for the cultivation of professions, but for the advancement of knowledge among the poor industrial classes of the community, so that they may be better adapted for their occupations. No doubt these schools teach excellently what they profess, and send up the largest proportion of young men to our Scotch universities for professions; they might send up still more if they gave an education that tended in the direction of productive industry. When we examine the results of the preliminary examinations at the university, for those who are about to study medicine, we find that they closely correspond with the proportionate attention given to the ancient and modern subjects of instruction in our primary schools. While there are from 80 to 90 per cent, of passes in classics and mathematics, the modern languages, including English, the physical and the mental sciences show exceedingly variable results. Thus in 1868, at one of the half-yearly examinations, more than half of the candidates were rejected in English, the language in which Shake- speare and Milton wrote, but which does not possess the same charms to schoolmasters as the languages of Homer and Horace. The other subjects, like English, oscillate so much that it is obvious they are less acquired by a process of steady instruction than by the art of cram.

In verification of this remark, I append instances of the failures, to show that the candidates have no great powers of applying their knowledge to special cases. The following answers are literally extracted:—"Epidemic" is a powder given to excite vomiting. "Hypothesis," to one candidate, means after death; to another, an implement for drawing out water. The word "Idea" is derived from the Latin words *Id* and *Ea*. "Sepulchre" arises from *se*, negative, and *pulcher*, fair, because "it is the place where beauty fades." "Cabal" is a sort of a cabinet, it is a conspiracy of five members; it is a rope for mooring a ship. An "abstract noun" is a noun that abstracts or pulls away something from another noun; it is a proper name like Cæsar; or it is a noun drawn out in some way from another noun. "Catechism" is a word derived from ##### and ##su#, a gap, from being a set of questions designed to keep persons from falling into a gap, or, in other words, the bottomless pit of hell. After such examples, I need not say that the failures in science are novel and startling. A student on being asked to name one of the central forces, besides gravity, that acts inversely as the square of the distance, boldly replies, "the force of habit." A "statical couple" is the mode of harnessing two horses in a carriage. As to the names of men who have made science glorious, the answers are singularly wild. The favourite idea is that Galileo and Copernicus are famous Italian painters, or ancient Roman warriors, who both perished in mortal combat with each other. One student knew Galileo as the name of an Italian who was notorious in his own country by the commission of five murders; and another, with some chemical perceptions, was sure that Copernicus was a rare kind of metal, and was derived from *Copper* and *Nicus*, perhaps having heard of *kupfernichel*.

I am speaking of secondary subjects, as they are taught in Scotch primary schools, and which, in this respect, are wholly unlike English primary schools. Nor can we afford to dispense with this aid until the secondary schools of Scotland are augmented and rendered efficient. I have no desire to exclude from the former Latin and Greek, when pupils have special aptitudes for them, or require them for a professional career. But our schools must remember that Scotchmen do not distinguish themselves greatly at competitive examinations for employment. Dr. Cleghorn of St. Andrews, who is one of the Examiners for the Forest Department in India, is constantly deploring to me that Scotch boys come up so ignorant in French, German, and chemistry, that they have few chances of passing in competition with English and Irish boys. Our schools ought to remember that the country at large feels an imperative necessity that those who are destined for industrial occupations should have an education suited to their callings; and if our schools wish to keep the place which they have so long done in the scheme of education, they must meet this growing demand. They must not only train our ministers and dominies, hut they must lay the foundation for the success of the next generation of emigrants, tradesmen, and manufacturers, who more and more find that the principles of science and art form the basis of their several callings. Unless they do so, Government will not understand their peculiar mission in the country, and will restrict them, as they do English schools, to the humble task of teaching the three R.'s; for I found by experience, that it is hard to make the House of Commons understand that our primary schools should be allowed to teach Latin and Greek to four per cent, of the scholars. The Government and the Legislature fear, in spite of our long experience to the contrary, that the State is thus paying for rich cake to these few, and is diminishing the amount of wholesome bread to the many. As our schoolmasters are men of great ability and sagacity, they will see how the wind is blowing in time to trim the sails to meet it. If they do not, it does not require a prophet to say that they will be taken aback before long.

I now pass from subjects exclusively relating to Scotland, and invite your attention to an obstacle which is in the way of the primary instruction of the working classes all over the kingdom. I allude to the difficulty of



teaching new and higher subjects during the short average time devoted to education by the children of the wage-making class. Unless we sow the seed of scientific and artistic instruction in primary schools, we cannot expect to reap crops in technical schools. The difficulty is not confined to the poor, but meets us in another way among the middle classes, who are also pressed by the wants of industry into active service, and do not, to the extent desirable, avail themselves of higher university or technical instruction. Even the great public schools like Rugby, Eton, Winchester, and Harrow, though they offer many scholarships and other inducements for their scholars to advance in an educational course, are unable to send more than a third of them to the universities, two-thirds receiving no further education than that they have got at school. So also in Scotland, for, although there are 16,000 scholars at our burgh and other secondary schools, they send less than 1500 to the universities. In the case of the middle classes, therefore, it is necessary to develop the instruction given in secondary schools, as they have to equip such a large proportion of the youth of the country for their battle of life. But how much stronger does the case become when we descend the social scale, and find that the primary school is the only means of preparation for working men. At the present time, little more than three years, between the ages of six and ten, is the period devoted to the education of the working classes. Only six in the hundred attend four years at one school. What are we to do against such difficulties? How are we to economize precious time, so as to make the most of it, and how are we to induce parents to give us more time for the benefit of their children? Our ancestors appear to have had a greater educational power than we now possess, for John Knox tells us, in his First Book of Discipline, that two years "are more than sufficient for to learn to read perfectly, to answer the Catechism, and to have entries in the first rudiments of grammar." Germany, with her trained staff of teachers, organized and recognised as a profession, gives three years for elementary instruction, such as is embraced in our Privy Council Standards; but in this country we do not succeed in accomplishing it. Mr. Morrison, the well-known teacher in Glasgow, thinks if a child had been well trained in an infant-school before entering the primary one, that four and a half years might suffice to give him a fair elementary education. Certainly the statistics of the Committee of Council are very depressing as to the results of our educational efforts. You are aware that inspectors conduct an individual examination of such scholars as are presented to them at schools, aided by the Government. Few are presented above Standard III., which simply requires that the child shall read a short paragraph from an elementary book, write it when dictated in single words, and work a sum in a simple rule as far as short division. This standard of attainments is very small,—but what is the sum-total of our educational achievements in this country? I reply in the very words of the Committee of Council, lest you should think me guilty of gross exaggeration. In describing the attainments of boys of ten years of age, when the ordinary schooling of this class of children ends, the Report says,—"Of four-fifths of the scholars about to leave school, either no account, or an unsatisfactory one, is given by an examination of the most elementary kind." Should we then give up the whole subject in despair, and abandon the hope of introducing higher subjects into schools, inasmuch as the lower subjects are not acquired? If we did so, it would be in imitation of the course pursued by a Scotch minister, who said that whenever he encountered difficulties he looked them full in the face, and then passed them by on the other side. Let us rather look at them on all sides, and see whether they cannot be pushed out of our path. Now what we have to look at has three aspects, each of which must be briefly examined in answering the following questions:—

- How can a compulsory education of the poorer classes be best enforced?
- Would administrative reforms in schools tend to economy of time and efficiency of instruction?
- Is it possible to give a higher education in primary schools than is attempted by the Revised Code?

If compulsory education be enforced, there are two methods of effecting it. The first is the direct method, by which police agency enforces the law on parents and guardians who neglect the education of their children. The second is the indirect method, in which employers of labour are prohibited from employing children unless they are in possession of elementary education. Both of these systems are in successful operation in Continental States, and, in some of them, both methods are in force in the same State. The first also exists in theory, though the practice is not efficient, in the United States of America. As to the abstract principle involved in the two methods, there is nothing to choose between them. It is quite as respectable and humane to drive children into school by the policeman's truncheon, as it is to threaten them with starvation by refusing employment to the uneducated. The choice between them, to my mind, is one of simple expediency. That we have come to this pass I must assume, though I am aware that there are some sanguine people who think we can get along without compulsion, which they fancy is very un-English. One thing is very certain, that it is peculiarly English to have one-half of our children growing up without elementary education worthy of the name, and the sooner England can free herself from this disgrace to her civilisation the better. But if compulsory education be objected to because it is inconsistent with liberty, I deny that altogether. Retention of a population in ignorance is slavery. Elevation to knowledge is emancipation. As England forced the slave-owners to liberate their slaves, so may she force parents to give intellectual liberty to their children. In Scotland, which has valued liberty above all things for many centuries, the notion of compulsion has become familiarized by our traditions. I have already

alluded to the compulsory law of 1494, which affected the nobles and freeholders only. But the Church looked after the people, and, with a dash of wholesome despotism, used to drive truants into church and into school. John Knox had no doubts about the matter when he says, "for this must be carefully avoided, that no father, of what estate or condition that ever he be, use his children at his own fantasie, especially in their youthhead, but all must be *compelled* to bring up children in learning and virtue," and so the Church decreed in their Book of Discipline, and acted on it for many years. Poverty was not admitted as an excuse for ignorance, as the following extract shows:—"The rich and potent may not be permitted to suffer their children to spend their youth in vaine idlenesse .... for they must train them up to the good of the commonwealth at their own expense, because they are able. The children of the poor must be supported and sustained on the charge of the Kirk, tryall being taken whether the spirit of docility be in them found or not." So we are just arriving at the perception of compulsion which our forefathers used in Scotland centuries ago. The fact of Scotland having long been subject to a rating system for education, naturally prepares us for compulsion. For it is a logical sequence, that if it be right to compel a community to educate its population, it is equally right to compel each individual of that community to receive education.

Now, as regards compulsion, my own preference, as a matter of expediency, is for the indirect principle. Direct compulsion, by fine and imprisonment of the parent, is only attainable where there is a strong public feeling to support it; when the feeling prevailing among the working classes is that the parent who keeps his child away from school is as unnatural a brute, and as much to be despised, as he who starves it or beats it with a red-hot poker. With one-half of the children of the working classes growing up without education, or, at the best, with a miserable caricature of it, you can have no such universal feeling to support the Executive in the administration of a compulsory law. It is true Prussia may be quoted as a nation in which such a law works successfully. But then the compulsory system began in 1763, in the reign of Frederick the Great; that king who, even as a boy, "got a lively, and, in some sort, genial perception of things round him—of the strange confusedly opulent universe he had got into; and of the noble and supreme function which intelligence holds there; supreme in art as in nature, beyond all other functions whatsoever." It was well that the conception began in the reign of such a king, though troublous times, then and later, made education go on with many haltings: still even the existing law dates from 1825, though it has since received additional supports. In constitutional governments it has not been found possible to work a law of direct compulsion until the great bulk of the people had become educated, and, under the best conditions, this requires two generations to effect. In consequence of this difficulty many educationalists see a solution of it in an extension of the Factory and Workshops Act. Mr. Forster would seem to look in this direction, if we recollect his Manchester speeches, before he entered office. The principle of the Factory Act is, that children between eight and thirteen must attend school once each day that they are employed. The faults of the Act render it inoperative, for it provides no security for the quality of the education. Nevertheless, in a few of these half-time schools the results are eminently satisfactory, though in most of them they are far from being so. To render them efficient would require such a system of superintendence and inspection on the part of the State, as Parliament is not likely to sanction. Besides, factory schools, under the present system, must be very wasteful of educational powers, for children enter them in all stages of ignorance, and defy adequate classification.

I do not see any solution of our difficulties by an extension of the factory system on its present basis, though I by no means desire to abolish half-time schools. On the contrary, I desire that they should become the natural secondary schools for the working classes, to whom they might give knowledge in the sciences and arts bearing on their trades. Experience proves that boys of twelve years of age, if they have a fair primary training, may receive an excellent secondary education of the kind indicated in two or three years; in fact, two years are considered sufficient in the famous "École Martinière" of Lyons.

Let me explain myself. The Scandinavian States and those of North Germany have wisely ruled that education is the first tool which a labouring child should possess for any occupation, and that no employer should be permitted to use him till he is in possession of that tool. A similar condition for work is partially included in our Collieries Act, which prohibits young children from being employed, until they can read and write to the satisfaction of a schoolmaster. But the law is inoperative, for there is no power to enforce it, and some schoolmasters of lax conscience trade upon the looseness of the Act by selling certificates without examination. This failure seems to have discouraged even such an ardent educational reformer as the Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce, for in his Colliery Bill of last year the old educational clause was omitted. I therefore thought it my duty to move an amendment to the effect that no boy should be allowed to work in collieries till he had passed Standard II. of the Revised Code; it ought to have been Standard III., but I desired moderation. I am glad to see that Mr. Tremenheere advocates a similar principle in relation to agricultural labourers. Now, if we could make elementary education, however moderate in quantity, an absolute condition for employment, we would obtain far more advantages than on the present half-time system, and I shall explain why.

The factory half-time system, instead of encouraging elementary education, positively discourages it as a

duty of the parent, and throws it from him to the employers of labour. Parents naturally say, As our children must attend school from eight to thirteen while in factories, let us postpone all attempts to educate them till they begin to earn wages for themselves. Hence the results at the best are poor. Hear what the Rev. Alfred Dewes, a hard-working Lancashire clergyman, gives as the result of his experience of education under this law:—"In the course of eighteen years, I have known many hundreds of children who have passed through schools as half-timers, and if I were to say that ten per cent, could read and write with ease when they left school, I should be guilty of great exaggeration." Now let us consider the moral and intellectual advantages of making a defined educational standard, say Standard III. of the Revised Code, the only entrance to labour, and then we may ascertain whether the disadvantages outweigh them. The first advantage is that you enlist every parent on the side of education, from noble motives if he possess them, from ignoble motives if he do not. Poor parents require the fruit of their children's labour to aid in their support, so that if wages can only be obtained through education, that will be pressed on their children with all the power at their command. If reading, writing, and arithmetic be made essential tools for labour, parents will insist on them, as they would on a hammer, chisel, and gimlet, if their sons were to be carpenters. This possession of the educational tools is our aim, and if an educated parent aid the schoolmaster in obtaining them for his child in a short period, there will be no necessity for forcing a given number of days of gross attendance on a school. The examination and certificate of results should be only attainable at an inspected school, and under official authority.

A great many years since, I sent in a paper to the Treasury, proposing that an educational door of this kind should be the only means of entrance to Government employment. The proposal was then thought very absurd, although it was published in one of the dreary Blue-Books which so few people read. The Civil Service Commissioners, however, now guard such a door with great efficiency. The proposal of an indirect educational compulsion for the poor is nothing more than this Government condition for employment, and only applies to them that which is obligatory on the professions of the upper and middle classes. The Army and Navy, the Public Offices, the Medical Profession, the Law, the Church, have such preliminary examinations as a condition for employment. Even the mercantile classes are considering whether they should not adopt them. Therefore, I only propose to apply to the labour of the poor that which is nearly universally a condition for the labour of the rich. There must be some merit in a scheme which enlists the very vices of the parents—their selfishness, their improvidence, their recklessness—as well as their virtues—parental affection, prudence, and love of duty—in the promotion of education. But the chief merit of it in my eyes is, that it would then be possible to make factory schools secondary schools, like the "improvement schools" of the Continent. Instead of confining them as at present to the three R's, the mere tools of education, they would find these ready made, and could use them for fashioning utilities. Thus would be solved one of our greatest difficulties in the technical education of the people. Let us follow out the application in the case of the typical boy, the universal John Smith. You, John Smith, shall not enter into employment till you can pass Standard III., and even then you shall not be more than a half-timer till sixteen, perhaps till you are of legal age, unless you pass higher standards, which will not be those of the Revised Code, but such as will be of direct use to you in your trade. It depends upon yourself at what age you may earn two-third wages or full wages. We do not desire to keep you at school longer than is for your own good, and it lies within your power to increase your wages beyond those of your fellows by application and industry which may be exhibited either at school or in your own home. Note this difference, for it is important. The factory law says that you must attend school as long as you continue of a certain age. We do not compel a uniform time for school attendance, but insist on an educational standard which you must attain. If you are incorrigibly idle, as you grow older you will still be treated as a child, and be kept as a half-timer till you do learn what it is necessary for a good citizen to know, and that for as long as you are a minor in the eye of the law, after which the State washes its hands of you, and I hope, in the course of reform, will refuse such an ignominy as you the honours of citizenship, for you are unfit to be intrusted with the exercise of the suffrage.

Now for the objections to such a scheme. The first is that there must be some exceptions for the absolutely idiotic or incompetent, who never could master the third Standard, low as it is. To shut them out from work altogether would be inhuman, but such work as they can perform involves little skill and requires small knowledge. The second objection is that you are punishing the child for the neglect of the parent. I deny that it would be a punishment, for you are rendering him at the same time more productive to himself and to the community. But I admit that, though the scheme enlists every motive of the parent to educate his children, there will still be a residue of the neglected. Well, you may still punish the parent for a double crime against his children and society, but it would pay better to make the localities responsible for such neglect, and compel them to sweep this residue (which would always be decreasing) into industrial schools, until the elementary qualification is attained. As children are a source of profit to wage-making parents, a large residue is most unlikely. Your invitation to school would be made in such a pressing fashion that there would be no need to go into the highways and hedges to compel them to come in. As long ago as Henry VIII. compulsory education

was enforced on the idle and vagrant children.

27 Henry VIII. cap. 25, "That they might not be driven by want or incapacity to dishonest courses." We require little legislation for this residuum, which may now be swept in by the existing Acts for poor-law and industrial schools. The compulsory powers are sufficient if they are applied, but we require to compel the localities to enforce them. Instead of having eighty or ninety industrial schools in the kingdom, we ought to have a number sufficient to give full account of the residuum. Neither the one system of compulsion nor the other can be abruptly carried into effect; in the first place, because there is a deficiency of schools; and next, because it will take years before the neglected classes would know the requirements of the law. A considerable time is requisite before knowledge of any kind percolates the lowest stratum of society. In proof of this, go to a prison, and find out how many prisoners are yet ignorant of the fact that Queen Victoria is on the throne, how many are ignorant of the name of Wellington, though that of Nelson has reached them; or, if you have not time for such inquiries, read Mr. Clay's reports.

Nor is this surprising, when it is borne in mind that out of 130,000 persons committed to prison in 1867, only 4137 could read and write well.

Nevertheless, I think that, within half a generation, we might have a compulsory system in full operation. It will take you two generations to do this by the direct system. We cannot wait so long as that for the result, because mighty influences are at work in other States. As Jules Simon says:—"*Le peuple qui a les meilleures écoles est le premier peuple; s'il ne l'est pas aujourd'hui, il le sera, demain.*" The nations having a compulsory system of education already include the United States of America, Austria, Prussia, Baden, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, the German Duchies, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, most of Switzerland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, and the Principalities. France, Holland, and England still retain the voluntary principle. France is making itself ready for a compulsory law, and Holland has reduced her uneducated to twenty-three per cent, of the population, and has a system both of primary and secondary education far ahead of that of England. How much longer will this country remain isolated in the ignorance of her people? This ignorance certainly exists in any way we may take the statistics of the question. It may be true, as many assert, that there are two millions of children of school age in England absolutely devoid of all education, or it may be true, as the Union assert, that there are only half a million. But what is understood by the term "education" in both estimates is no education at all, when compared with that given by foreign States to their working people. No one claims more than fifty per cent, of our children as being efficiently instructed in the most elementary subjects of reading and writing with ease, and that is the highest production we can claim for all our educational machinery. Now is there any machine in the world that would be thought to do its work in a tolerable manner, if it performed only half of the work for which it was designed, and even that half in the most incomplete fashion? Is it not time that our engineers in Whitehall should overhaul the whole machine, and put it in real working order?

The next point for our consideration is, whether we can economize school-time, and promote teaching efficiency, by improved methods of administration. Some most important facts have been gathered on this head by my friend Edwin Chadwick, the great social reformer, whose labours will be appreciated by posterity even more than at the present day. He has proved that, up to a certain point, the teaching power is in direct proportion to the numbers taught. Thus, a small school of twenty will not produce such a good educational outcome as a larger school of one hundred, provided the master has adequate assistance. In the larger school, classification of pupils is more easy, while the vigour and emulation of a large class carry forward sluggish children in spite of themselves. The average price of education in Scotch schools is twenty-six shillings and sixpence per boy annually; in England it is twenty-nine shillings; and for these sums only elementary education of a low type is procured. The annual cost of a higher education in a well-organized school of 400 boys is about twenty shillings, and there is a saving of from one and a half to two years in the attainments of each boy of average ability. In the Jewish school in London, with 1500 boys, and 30 masters, the cost is thirty-two shillings; but then, out of the most wretched boys on entrance, many of whom are so degraded that they neither know their own names nor those of their parents, are turned out veritable youthful scholars, who are taught mathematics, algebra, mechanics, history, geography, grammar, political economy, physiology, and an ancient language, viz., Hebrew. A scheme of consolidation of small schools, by which a maximum of educational attainment is combined "with a minimum expenditure, both in money and in time, is one worthy of attention, and the more so because it involves a large augmentation in the salaries of teachers—a point of the first importance. I have visited many of those large schools, and I can testify that the results appear to me much more satisfactory than in the smaller ones, both as regards average attainments and special distinctions. The reverse is seen in Ireland, where the multiplication of small schools has produced evils of a most serious character. One of the most pronounced of these has been the lowering of the position, and necessarily of the qualifications, of the male teachers, whose average emoluments are stated on good authority

*Evidence of Irish National Teachers' Association*, p. x.

to be £35, of which 84 per cent, are furnished by the State, local subscriptions amounting to only 4 per

cent., and school-fees making up the remainder. Can any one be surprised that these educated men, the victims of an administrative error, should in far too many cases side with the disaffected of the population. If, by consolidation, we can raise the position of teachers and gain one or two years in school-time, that becomes of great importance for the future technical education of the people. But to work out this problem, large subjects crowd upon us, and I can do no more than state them as questions. Are we to waste teaching power by separating boys from girls in primary education? How are we to map out the country into educational unions so as to facilitate consolidation, administration, and inspection? The system of such unions is illustrated in district poor-law union schools in England; and in special cases at Faversham and Merthyr Tydvil. In Holland this union system is in effective work. But these questions are too large for me to dwell upon now.

I come now to the final subject proposed for our consideration, viz., Whether the Privy Council wisely restrict their subjects to the three R's? I know that the answer in Scotland is emphatically No; but I fear such a negative answer would not be unanimously given in England. There is still there a lurking, though inexpressed fear, that the lower orders may be too highly educated, and there is a sentiment, the offspring of that fear, that the State has done its duty when it imparts the mere rudiments of knowledge. This, as you all know, has not been our practice in Scotland, and we are convinced that the prosperity of the country is largely due to the higher education given in our primary schools. No nation, except England, takes such a mean view of the functions of primary schools. I might prove this to you by quoting the subjects taught in the primary schools of the chief Continental States, but you will be satisfied with one illustration on my assuring you that it is a fair average example. I take Holland, because I have to refer to its secondary schools in my next lecture. The Dutch primary schools, in addition to the three R's, have the following subjects as their compulsory *minimum*, viz., the form of bodies, principles of the Dutch language, geography, history, elements of natural science and singing. But should any locality express a desire for further instruction in their primary schools, then the following branches are added, viz., rudiments of modern languages, mathematics, agriculture, calisthenics, drawing from nature and copy, and fancy work for girls. Foreign nations perceive that if they are to educate their working classes in a knowledge of the principles of their occupations, they must sow the seed in the primary schools, and having thus given a taste for science and art, then rely on the people to follow out these studies in the "improvement" schools.

The principle of our Revised Code is, that the State will pay for passes in certain definite standards, which are made the measure of successful work. Now I know this principle is not popular in Scotland, but it is easy to work in application, and may be considered as thoroughly established. I believe the discontent and unpopularity of the Code rest chiefly on the vulgarism of the standards adopted, not mainly on the abstract principle of paying by results. Scotch teachers believe that its operation is to lower true education, as distinguished from cramming, effort on the part of teachers; and hence, except in lessening the demands on the Exchequer, they allege that it has failed as a scheme of education. Why? Because it has mistaken the foundation for the superstructure. Instead of considering Standards I, II, III., as achievements worthy of a nation, these are the foundations which the localities might be asked to lay down before the State gave its aid. For a higher development of education the State should be liberal; but only if the foundation had been laid on a broad basis in the whole school. The State mistakes her functions when she lowers and vulgarizes education, as she now does by the limitation of the Code. I shall show you in next lecture that this is the reason why our kingdom obtains such small results, with much larger educational votes, than those of any Continental State. In Scotland our experience is that an infusion of higher subjects into primary schools brings out a life and ambition, which act powerfully in developing the elementary branches. But then these higher subjects ought to be adapted to the wage-making class. The life of a labourer is spent in dealing with things and converting them into utilities. In doing so he must take the properties inherent in each kind of matter, and combine them into utilities by an intelligent application of natural forces; for man has not the power to give to things a single new property, or to bring to bear upon them a single new force. Yet the primary education aided by the State ignores all this. Not even in the training of our pupil-teachers is physical or natural science made a necessity. Words, not things, are held out by the State as only worthy of attention and reward.

I have kept you long upon a topic which has become dreary by constant discussion and repetition; but the Managers selected the subject, and I have complied with their request. We have seen that, by compulsion and the improved administration of educational resources, we might make our factory and workshop schools means of educating the working population in the principles of science and art suited to their trades. We might thus bestow upon them a higher life—a life of intelligence and knowledge, in which their will might govern effects,—instead of one of mere animal instinct and manipulative dexterity, which keep them in subjection to the effects produced around them, without their minds being able in the slightest degree to modify or expand them. We might thus improve the industrial resources of the nation, and enable our country to hold a proud position in the advancing industrial competition of the world. As Martin Luther long since said: "The prosperity of a State rests neither on its revenues, its fortresses, nor its beautiful edifices; its highest interest, its security

and its power, depend on its possession of cultivated and honourable citizens, who have been educated to a clear intelligence."

No maxim is more trite than that "Knowledge is power;" nor none more true than that ignorance is power also. The one is a power for good; the other is a power for evil. Shakespeare points this well in the dialogue between Oliver and Orlando. "*Oliver*.—Now, sir, what *make* you here? *Orlando*.—Nothing. I am not taught to make anything. *Oliver*.—What *mar* you then, sir? *Orlando*.—Many sir, I am helping you to mar, that which God made, a poor unworthy brother of yours by idleness." Knowledge is like that great power rayed to the world by the sun, which is the physical source of almost all power on the earth; for knowledge like it can be made convertible to suit the exigencies and add to the comforts of intellectual beings who know how to apply it. Ignorance, on the other hand, may be compared to gravity, which drags down everything to itself. We cannot go on as a nation in our present state, for the ignorant classes are augmenting fearfully, and must drag us down in proportion to their mass. Yet they are capable of being breathed upon by the spirit of religion and intelligence, and, like the dry bones of the valley, may be vivified into forms of spiritual and intellectual life. The dry bones, seen in the first part of the vision of Ezekiel, became covered with sinews and flesh and skin, "yet did they not live." Let us pray like the prophet, "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live."

## Lecture II.

# On Technical Education.

THE term "Technical" Education is objected to by many persons, who, however, do not supply us with an efficient substitute.

Nevertheless the word is quite defensible. "Technics" is defined in Webster's and other dictionaries as "such branches of learning as respect the arts." "Technology" in Knapp's work is defined clearly, though not elegantly, as "that definition, or *o#o#*, of the rational principles, upon which all processes in the arts (#####) are based."

In the sense in which it is used there is no implied purpose of teaching a man the actual trade or occupation that he is to pursue in life. That was the old compulsory education of the apprentice system,

Speaking of the apprentice system of the sixteenth century, Froude says,—"*The educative theory, for such it is, was simple and effective; it was based on the single principle that, next to the knowledge of a man's duty to God, and as a means towards doing that duty, the first essential of a worthy life was the ability to maintain it in independence. Varieties of inapplicable knowledge might be good, but they were not essential; such knowledge might be left to the leisure of after years, or it might be dispensed with without vital injury. Ability to labour could not be dispensed with, and this, therefore, the State felt it to be its duty to see provided; so reaching, I cannot but think, the heart of the whole matter.*"—Froude's *Hist, of Eng.* vol. i. p. 44.

as provided for in the ancient Statutes of the realm; but the advocates of the new movement do not contemplate any such actual technical instruction, which can only be acquired in the workshop, not in the school. Their limited object is to teach the principles of science and art that may be involved in the future occupations of the pupils, and to point out how these principles have led to practical applications.

There are two kinds of crops raised by farmers. The one kind consists of those green crops grown not for their fruit, but merely to be ploughed into the land, with the hope of some prospective advantage that future crops may obtain from their decay—a strange system, in which a soil receives no new mineral food, and yet is expected to yield new treasures, though these are constantly abstracted and never restored. The other kind of crops is sown directly as seed, and harvested when in the ear. Analogous to these systems are our methods of education. Educational crops of Latin and Greek are raised, not for any direct use to which they can be applied in future life, but for the purpose of ploughing them into the soil, in order that they may decay—and in nine cases out of ten they do decay rapidly enough—and with the hope that they will, in some mysterious way, benefit all future crops, however different in character, that may be grown on that soil. This is the indirect system of education; it has been carried on, by the tyranny of custom, until it has produced a reaction which distresses teachers and guardians who have not yet opened their eyes wide enough to these reactionary signs. The boys and youths of the easy classes, brought up at schools and universities on this green-crop system, do not see its wonderful wisdom or adaptation to themselves, and observe that in life their fellows get on pretty much at the same rate, whether they were parts of tall or stunted green crops. So the very finest youth of the country aim at being gymnasts rather than scholars, and the newspapers teem with the accounts of their athletic

rather than their scholarly performances. When will the true meaning of this reaction be understood by the scholastic profession?

The direct or natural method of education consists in growing the desired crops by a preparation of the soil and by a tillage specially adapted to each variety. You recognise this kind of education in professional courses, such as those for the Church, Law, and Medicine, in all of which men are carefully instructed in the general principles and applications of the sciences bearing upon each profession. These were the only recognised professions of former times. But now industry has divided itself into professions involving as much knowledge as any of them, and occupying millions of people instead of hundreds. These new professions depend on principles and economics which regulate the welfare of nations, according to their high or low application.

Now we have come to this pass, that the youth of our country, distrusting the green-crop system of education, and finding the great universities still resting in the full belief of its wisdom, turn from them altogether. Even in such places as Eton and Rugby, Harrow and Winchester, two-thirds of the boys pass away and are absorbed into the duties of life, while only one-third go to Oxford and Cambridge to become good cricketers and good rowers, but only by happy accidents good scholars. This neglect of the universities is a necessity of the times; for those who have to grow their own corn and harvest their grain, in the face of a perpetually increasing competition among individuals and nations, have no time to attend institutions which do not aid them in actual preparation for their callings. The discipline of the mind and mental culture should always go hand-in-hand with technical instruction, and in reality do so in well-organized schools of this kind. But the ordinary classical schools confine themselves in culture, though not in discipline, to the flowers of education, neglecting its corn. When men are placed in fields to reap the harvests, should they be taught only to cull the poppies, without knowing how to apply the sickle to the standing corn?

I do not intend to argue this question on the panic cry that this country is losing her position among manufacturing nations. I believe this cry to be true, and that the industrial supremacy of England is endangered for lack of knowledge, in spite of the practical aptitudes of her people. But I prefer to rest the argument on general principles, which will convince your understanding that the immense attention bestowed upon the scientific and artistic education of the people in foreign States arises from a necessity of modern civilisation, and must be followed by this kingdom. The question does not involve any suppression of classical systems of education for scholars who desire to follow them. In France, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries, which are moving so earnestly to promote the technical education of the industrial classes, the lycées and gymnasia are, to say the least, equally numerous and good as our corresponding classical schools. The difference is that a much greater portion of the population has been induced to cultivate a higher education than formerly, because the idea has been abandoned that one kind of education is suitable to all. Schools and colleges have been erected to teach the principles involved in occupations the very names of which were unknown to Herodotus and Pliny.

In the early history of nations, the possession of raw materials or of local advantages determined their industries. Calicut, for a time, had an advantage over the rest of the world on account of her indigenous cotton. Under Abderrahman III. cotton was introduced into Spain, and the most notable improvements were made by Arabs and Spaniards in its manufactured products. Instead of painting calico by hand, the former invented the system of printing by blocks, and the latter invented cotton paper. But, in process of time, the cotton manufacture migrated from Hindustan, Arabia, and Spain, and settled in this country, far distant as it is from the source of the raw material. Why was this? Because, gradually, though certainly, the value of the raw material as a factor in industry became less and less, while the value of the second factor—the skill and intelligence applied to it—became greater and greater. Note that the increasing factor was not mere human labour, for that is still cheaper in the countries from which the manufacture has departed than it is in England. That is to say, it was not the brute labour of men, but the intelligent labour of artisans, either in possession of intelligence themselves, or reflecting the skill and science of their employers. No nation continues in the full enjoyment of a high state of national life unless the conditions of its existence remain the same, or unless it possesses sufficient elasticity to adapt itself to new conditions. Permanence of existence demands immutability of, or adaptability to, the surrounding conditions. This is the law of animated beings, as it is the law of nations. At one time the islands in which we live were inhabited by gigantic saurian reptiles, whose exuviae we still use to fertilize our fields. They have passed away, or at the best are represented by degenerate types. Even among the lower creatures of the sea, living in conditions of greater permanence, and who have persisted through various geological periods to the present day, we see many changes, some of degeneracy, some of development. The recent dredging expedition found certain creatures, which are fully developed about the coasts of Arran, dwindled into dwarfed varieties, from having been drifted out of their favourable feeding grounds to other parts not so suited for their growth. Now this law of individuals is also the law of nations. Countries high in industrial position, like Greece and Arabia, have degenerated, because nations cannot be stationary, and they did not, or could not, adapt themselves to the changing conditions around them. Nations, like animals, have

their struggles for existence. To remain prosperous they must possess the conditions which Herbert Spencer prescribes for individual welfare—"A constant progress towards a higher degree of skill, intelligence, and self-regulation—a better coordination of actions—a more complete life."

*Theory of Population derived from the General Law of Fertility*, p. 34.

As the world progresses the conceptions of the head relieve the labour of the hands. In olden times women and oxen did the brute labours of the household. Women ground the corn, till science taught mankind how to use the natural powers of water to turn mills. How exultant the old Greek poet is when women were relieved from the drudgery of turning the heavy grindstones. He exclaims, "Woman! you who have hitherto had to grind corn, let your arms rest for the future. It is no longer for you that the birds announce by their songs the dawn of the morning. Ceres has ordered the *water-nymphs* to move the heavy mill-stones and perform your labour." In modern times the puffing, panting engine represents the old brute labour employed in the early stages of manufacturing industry. We saw this recently illustrated, when 18,000 forced labourers on the Suez Canal were suddenly withdrawn, and their brute force was substituted by steam-engines, which did all the work with greater efficiency and economy. In cotton factories the brute strength of the man has been substituted by the quick fingers and eyesight of women and children, while the man's educated intelligence is employed instead of his physical force. The growth of the factory system changed our civilisation. With the rapid production due to steam power, the wares could no longer be sold by packmen carrying them on their backs for distribution throughout the country, so these human beasts of burden were thrust aside by the railway train. No wonder that, with this rapid change of conditions, loud cries of distress came from uneducated labourers who knew nothing except their acquired handicraft. No wonder that even now astonishment and consternation exist among like labourers, who see industries failing, and yet hope to preserve them by protective laws. They will as little affect the progress of intellectual industry as the Inquisition affected the revolution of the earth, though it burned Bruno and imprisoned Galileo. Now if it be true that intelligent labour is continually supplementing brute labour, it must be equally true that no nation can remain in a condition of permanent prosperity, that does not give to its population as full an intelligence and as high an intellectual life as all other competing nations. This thought made Michel Chevalier recently say, in speaking of the great technical school at Paris, "If the *École centrale des Arts et Manufactures* were not in existence, it would be necessary to create it as the complement of the treaties of commerce." It is this conviction, shadowily conceived, and even yet imperfectly expressed, which makes Manchester lay the foundation of a future industrial university by developing Owens College. I was a resident in Manchester when that institution was first established, and earnestly protested against its feeble imitation of the English universities. The managers have not even yet emancipated themselves from these old traditions, though the wants of the population are gradually carrying them into the convictions that Pope's maxim is a wise one, when he counsels us to "consult the genius of the place in all." It is a similar conviction that has induced my own University of Edinburgh to grant degrees in science,

The degrees in science, which some of our universities think are unwise and a modern innovation, were, in point of fact, recognised by our ancestors. In the organization of the Scottish universities after the Reformation, such degrees were distinctly referred to. In St. Andrews, one of the three colleges was to devote itself to teaching dialectics, mathematics, including arithmetic and geometry, cosmography, astronomy, and natural philosophy. The student who attended this course for three years and passed a successful examination "shall be laureat and graduat in philosophy."

engineering, and agriculture.

We may take another illustration of our general principle from the art of war. The old Trojan and Grecian heroes did everything to develop their physical powers, for their combats and battles were chiefly won by endurance and strength. Sometimes, indeed, Pallas, the goddess of wisdom, punished them for prizing too exclusively their physical force, as when she tripped Ajax in his race with the wise Ulysses, who had prayed to her for aid; while the former, relying on brute force alone, was left grovelling in the offal of the lowing kine. But now war is a game of science and skill, not of mere strength and valour. The charges of our infantry and cavalry, with bayonets and swords, please women at reviews, but are rapidly becoming traditions of the past. Before long they will be as innocent weapons in wars of the future as are the halberds of those formidable beef-eaters who protect the Queen's palace at a levee. Chassepots, Sniders, Whitworth small cannon, and Adam's revolvers, firing their ten and twenty shots in a minute, would annihilate any regiment that attempted a dashing charge. The animal courage and brute strength which rendered the English soldiers irresistible, must give place to the skill and intelligence required to manage the new arms. Every Prussian in the late war was a man of education, and, throughout the campaign, was specially instructed by regimental classes in the science as well as in the practice of war. It was not true, in this case, as Napoleon used to say, that "God loved the great battalions." The valour on both sides was equal, but the science and intelligence were unequal, and the campaign was won by the latter. Austria herself has recognised this, and is now spending more than any other European State in giving a higher education to her people.



A mere elementary instruction is of small value, except by way of preparation for this competition among nations. A scientific education of a higher kind is still better as a preparative, but even that is insufficient. There is a wide gap between science and practice, and this must be bridged over by men having technical information and special aptitudes. The history of science and its applications is as old as human history. From Tubal-Cain, skilled in all metal work, to King Ptolemy Philadelphus, working with his furnaces and crucibles, through Dalton drawing atoms to illustrate his Atomic theory, there is a consecutive history, which has ended in chemical arts that have added so much to the resources and happiness of mankind. From Eratosthenes measuring the earth, to the faith of Christopher Columbus in its rotundity, and the French savans measuring the meridian as the basis of a metrical system, there is a sequence of progress which may be interrupted but is never lost. The little fire on the solitary tower of Pharos made Ptolemy II. the first discoverer of lighthouses, and many intermediate inventions only culminated in the dioptric lenses of Fresnel and Brewster. The revolving engine of Hero, made practical by Avery, was the precursor of numerous inventions which led to the double-acting engine of Watt. No great discoveries are made by a bound; for all are legitimate offspring of those which have preceded. And though science lies at the foundation of the arts, her immediate cultivators are rarely the appliers of the knowledge which they help to discover. Science may be likened to a perennial stream with a bountiful supply of fertilizing waters; but those who desire to use them must cut channels for irrigation. It is neither in the interest of science nor of manufactures, that the cultivators of the former should direct their attention from it in order to minister to the wants of productive industry. This is the proper function of the productive classes. Hence the necessity that they should receive a high education, so that they may apply science to their wants and necessities. This is now recognised pretty generally by manufacturers, who are content to admit that such knowledge should be possessed by their foremen and managers, though they do not see any necessity for it among the artisans. At least they act on this view in practice, even when they deny it in theory. I was lately attacked in a vigorous and effective way, for my views on technical education, by an eminent manufacturer in the north of England. To show my appreciation of a worthy opponent, I called at his works, but at a time when he was obliged to leave them. He nevertheless politely instructed his manager to show me everything. I found that the manager was a Frenchman, who had received a thorough technical education at the *École des Arts et Métiers* of Angers! A distinguished engineer lately expressed this view in a lecture delivered in our city, and on that occasion he gave the following description of what should and should not be the education of a working man. His definition is as follows:—"Clearly every branch that can help him to perfection in work, but as clearly nothing that will simply occupy his time without furthering the all-important acquisition of manipulative skill." The engineer who wrote this is a man of professional attainments, but when I read the passage, I said to myself, Does he view an artisan as a man made in God's own image, or as a mere ambidextrous monkey? We need not be surprised if such ideas are prevalent, that employers of labour speak of their workmen as so many "hands," and rarely think or use them as having so many heads and hearts. This limitation of men to mere handicraft skill, in which their ten fingers work disassociated from their head and heart, has made poets rail against mechanical inventions, when in reality these, if rightly used and intelligently understood, are means of intellectual elevation, because their very purpose is to substitute the sweat of the brow by the thought of the brain.

The true education of a labourer is to make him an intelligent being, not a mere dexterous manipulator, so that he may have the moral dignity and intellectual force derived from a thorough understanding of the principles of the work in which he is engaged. Instruction in manipulative skill is no education at all; and, such as it is, belongs to the workshop, not to the school. They may, it is true, be often combined with mutual advantage, as in the half-time system of factories and union schools, or in the way it is done in Scotch universities by winter study and summer work. If Faraday's education had been limited to that which bore on his manipulative skill as a newsboy or a bookbinder, many arts would be far behind their present position, and science might have had to wait another century for a knowledge of the laws which are now the property of mankind. Faraday's first experiment, made as a newsboy while waiting outside for a paper, was to put his head through a railing and then speculate on which side he was! Here we see the philosopher acknowledging the head as of preponderating importance, though it was incapable of being disassociated from the body. He got a practical proof of the fact, that both ought to be kept in good connexion; for, while he speculated, the door opened and he received a severe wrench. Faraday never afterwards disassociated his manipulative skill, great as it was, from his wise head and warm heart. If Wheatstone had limited his education to the manipulative skill of making musical instruments, space would not have been abridged or time abbreviated by the electric telegraph. If George Stephenson had only acquired the manipulative skill of shovelling coals adroitly into the furnace when he acted as a stoker, we might still have to go from London to Edinburgh by a four-horse coach. No! the proper education of a man is the widest that is attainable by him, and the greater his knowledge the more useful will he prove to himself and to those around him

As a contrast to the above description of what the education of a working man should be, I give another

from a great practical body—the Steam Navigation Company—the "*Messagcries Imperiale*" of France. A committee of their Directors, in recommending a further development of their excellent schools, report as follows:—"The instructions to be given to the working man ought, in our opinion, to be such as will raise his intellectual and moral level, facilitate the practice of his trade, make him more skilful in his craft, increase his power of production, and consequently his own means and the common weal, by gradually suppressing the ignorance and vice which are the cause of so much misery and the ruin of families. In addition to the subjects taught in elementary primary schools, we think technical education ought to comprise—Man's duty to God, his fellow-creatures, and himself; the study and recitation of select passages in prose and verse; caligraphy; the rules of French grammar and parsing; complete practical arithmetic; the elements of geometry; the elements of applied physics; industrial chemistry; industrial mechanics; linear drawing applied to ornament, machines, and naval constructions; the rudiments of sanitary science; the elements of history, especially that of France; the English language; the elements of geography, particularly as regards France; and gymnastics.

"For those of our pupils who desire to become foremen, heads of workshops, managers of factories, and engineers, the preparatory technical instruction must have the same basis as for the workman, but be far more extended, so as to enable them to enter a school of arts or trades, or the Central School of Arts and Manufactures, which for the working classes may be regarded as the schools of application, just as the Schools of Bridges and Roads, the School of Naval Engineers, etc., are for the upper classes."

The working man should be a partner in the intellect of labour. In our country his share is miserably small. Brain may monopolize, in the persons of the managers, 95 per cent, of the intellect, and allow the 5 per cent, to be spread over perhaps a thousand "hands."

Having said so much in regard to the principles of technical education, I now propose to illustrate them by showing how certain countries have conquered nature, and made for themselves important positions, in spite of local disadvantages or deficiency in the raw materials of industry, and then we will take a contrast to heighten the effect of these examples. My illustrations will be Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland; their contrast must be Ireland. The three countries have some common features, in the fact that their civilisation has been retarded by cruel and bloody wars of independence, and by those resulting from religious intolerance; yet all of them, owing to the education of their people, enjoy an amount of material prosperity disproportionate to their area and geographical position.

Let us begin with Switzerland. It is a country far removed from the ocean, and girt by mountains, many of which are covered with eternal snow. Her land is poor in the raw material of industries. Even in such a staple as iron, she can only produce two-fifths of her consumption; for fuel, she has only wood, and must import coal from the mines of France, Belgium, and Germany. Until 1864, the surrounding countries drew a cordon around her by hostile tariffs, so that this small nation presented the strange spectacle of seeking an outlet for her manufactures in the most distant markets of the world. To show you how little the raw material of manufacture compares in value with the skill and intellect applied to its production, I may mention that Switzerland imports cotton from America, and sends it back again across the ocean in a manufactured state, so as to undersell the products of the American mills. In like manner she imports tobacco from Havannah, and making it into cigars, undersells the indigenous country in the South American markets. Now the question before us is,—What has enabled this little nation, so remote from the pathways of commerce, and so poor in the mineral resources of industry, to carry on manufacturing production by the aid of a prosperous and contented people, while England, washed by the ocean, and abounding in mineral wealth, is burdened with an ever-increasing proportion of the unproductive poor? There is only one answer, that Switzerland has a highly educated people. Education in that republic, where liberty has long asserted her independence, is compulsory from five to sixteen years of age. In one or two of the Cantons this is not the case, but even in these, from the force of the surrounding examples, there is no need of compulsion. The compulsion is both direct and indirect—that is, it extends not only to the parent, but also to the employer of labour. From six years of age to twelve or thirteen, the children must attend primary schools, which, as the age advances, become practical in the character of instruction; for, instead of being confined to the miserable three R standards, they include geometry, natural history, geography and history, drawing, singing, and calisthenics, all of which are rendered compulsory. After this elementary course of six years, follow three years at what are termed the "improvement" schools, in which every effort is made to apply to practical purposes what has been learned in the primary school. These improvement schools must be attended, or proof must be given to the State that the scholars are receiving equally good instruction elsewhere. Then come the Cantonal schools of a high class, like our High School and Academy, but divided into two quite distinct divisions—the classical and the trade schools. Any of us who have visited them can testify that, as classical schools, they leave nothing to be desired, when compared with our own standards, while we have no analogues at all to the trade schools, in spite of our wealthy endowments managed by merchant and trading companies. The little canton of Zurich, with a population midway between that of Edinburgh and Glasgow, has

sixty-seven of the various secondary schools to which I have alluded. Above them all, are two universities. The University of Zurich belongs wholly to the Canton, and is supported by it. The professors are 42 in number, and have 29 assistants. They are men of eminence, and do their work well; but the demand for this university is not nearly so great as for the Technical Institute, to which I am about to allude. This great institution is supported by the Federal Government. The Canton supplied the buildings, which are larger than those of Buckingham Palace, and, in addition, subscribes a large annual sum in its aid. In it there are 40 professors and 20 assistant-professors, who have 700 students in attendance. In our own University we rather boast at having 20 or 30 students of engineering. At the institution in Zurich there are 150 for civil engineering and 169 for mechanical engineering. Of the 600 matriculated students, there are 216 from Germany, but only 9 from England. I wish every Edinburgh citizen could inspect this noble institution, with its two sets of splendidly equipped laboratories, its excellent apparatus, and its educational museums. I am sure that then the pride, as well as the interest of the Scottish metropolis, would not let our University be so poorly provided with educational appliances as it is at the present time. Recollect that I am speaking of a small State, republican in government, and inhabited by a thrifty and prudent people. Is it not significant that they find it for their interest to spend nearly one-third of the local taxation of the industrial Canton in the lower and higher education of their youth? This frugal people do so, because they find that such expenditure is productive of the best economies. The Coventry ribbon trade, which has deserted England, has settled itself in the valleys of Switzerland. The Polytechnic Institution has aided in this result, because it turns out 72 persons annually, trained in the science and art requisite to conduct such a manufacture successfully. In this single branch of the ribbon trade there are already 30,000 weavers, besides the collateral workers, such as dyers and superintendents. The ribbon trade of Switzerland is prosperous and increasing, having an annual value of £1,600,000, most of which is exported, while the Macclesfield and Coventry trade, languishing and pining, has her exports represented by £61,000. And so our Coventry weavers shout for protection for native industry, or, in other words, for native ignorance. The difference between the Swiss trade and the Coventry trade is very simple; it is involved in the answer given by Opie the painter to a youth who asked him how he mixed his colours,—"I mix them with my brains, sir!" In the one, high science and art superintend every branch of the industry, and a trained intelligence sits at the loom. In the other, the first is represented by a practical empiricism, the latter by ignorance. As long as this is the case, no reciprocal treaties which man can devise will raise an industry declining from natural causes. Laws of nature are inexorable, and never vary like human laws. Our operatives may find restored prosperity by putting themselves submissively into harmony with them, but never by seeking refuge in the worn-out economical policy of a past age.

Our next illustration is Holland, a country at the mouth of the Rhine, while Switzerland is at its source. It is, in fact, formed by the débris of the Swiss and German lands, carried down toward the sea by that great river. Naturally it is nothing but a gigantic swamp, which has been drained and converted into a fertile country by the untiring industry of its inhabitants. Over this swamp the North Sea used to lash in fury, but was gradually pushed back by dykes. There is a constant warfare between man and the ocean in this strange country. During one of these conflicts of the thirteenth century the North Sea was victorious, and, breaking through the ramparts built to exclude her, robbed Holland of a province larger than Yorkshire, and formed the gulf known as the Zuyder Zee. In the sixteenth century, another invasion of the ocean was again successful, and the Haarlem Sea was the result of the victory. But the Dutch people are lustful of conquest, and carry on constant war, not through blood and rapine, but by industry and science. Within a few years Haarlem Sea has been won back from the ocean, and 45,000 acres have been reclaimed for the people. In fourteen years from now, in all probability, the Zuyder Zee will be thrown back into its parent ocean, and a province capable of supporting 250,000 inhabitants will be added to the country. These are great achievements, and show that Holland is peopled by an intelligent and industrious race. Yet that country had few natural advantages in its dismal flats and dreary swamps. At one time, indeed, a favourable maritime position enabled her merchants to be the carriers for a large part of Europe. But this national monopoly has long ceased to exist, since navigation has been improved, and the wealth of the country is now largely derived from productive industries. For their prosecution Holland has fewer advantages than Ireland. With the exception of a small coal field around Limburg, there is none of this important fuel in Holland. Yet, despite her natural poverty in the raw materials of industry, Holland sends to this country alone exports of food to the annual value of five millions of pounds, and manufactured products worth six millions more. Recollect that we are not speaking of a great State, but only of a small kingdom, having one-tenth the area of the United Kingdom, and one-eighth of its population. The secret of her prosperity is the high state of education among the people, though, from want of a compulsory law, there is still a residue of ignorance. In the primary schools of Holland, a wide foundation is laid for practical purposes in the attention given to science. Beyond this primary instruction, there is a complete scheme of technical education, not only for workmen, but also for the foremen and managers of works. The law compels every town of 10,000 inhabitants to erect technical schools. In these, working men receive systematic instruction in

mechanics, natural philosophy, chemistry, natural history, technology, agriculture, geography, history, the native language, political economy, free-hand and mechanical drawing, and calisthenics. Above these are the higher technical schools, of which there are 32 in Holland,—12 I believe being supported by Government, and 20 by municipalities. In them are 2500 pupils, who pass through a course of five years, about one-third of it being devoted to the study of the exact sciences, one-third to the political, mercantile, and historical sciences, and one-third to their own and at least two foreign languages. When you go into a shop in Holland, you feel quite secure that the shopkeeper will either speak English or French, and generally both. Such liberal salaries are given to teachers that they are readily obtained. Neglecting a few country parishes in which poverty prevails, the minimum of their salaries is £100, and the maximum £350. Need I say one word more in explanation of the causes which make Holland an industrious and prosperous nation, in spite of its small area, and poverty in industrial resources?

Lastly, I select Scotland as an illustration, not for what education will do for her in the future, but for what it did for her in the past. Scotland was still a country of savages when Ireland had the elements of civilisation and the promise of increasing prosperity. I need not remind you how long the Scotch wars retarded the development of industry. So deplorable were they, that the very treasures of our coast were taken away by other nations; for the Dutch worked our fisheries to the extent of two millions of pounds per annum for two centuries before we had leisure or enterprise enough to do it for ourselves. How long it took to cradle our industry may be known from the astonishing fact, that there was an actual slavery or serfdom among the colliers and salters till nearly the end of last century. Though the Union gave a great impulse to trade in Scotland, by a relief of the navigation laws, yet it required another century to improve the roads and means of communication sufficiently for the purposes of commerce. About a century since, £200,000 sufficed as a circulating medium for all the wants of commerce, agriculture, and manufactures; now we require 4½ millions of notes, and 2½ millions of coin. The reason for the rapid rise in the industrial prosperity of the country was, that there had been a long preparation for it in the education of the people. As soon as the natural obstacles to commerce were removed, the people were ready to do their part with energy, and to take advantage of the richness of our natural resources. A national system of education and an easy access to the four universities had given to them advantages far exceeding those available to the people of England

At one time, in the sixteenth century, the English universities were chiefly attended by yeomen, and the poor had ready access. "In times past, when any rich man died in London, they were wont to help the poor scholars of the universities with exhibitions. When I was a scholar in Cambridge myself, I heard a very good report of London, and I knew many that had relief of the rich men of London, but now charity is waxen cold; none helpeth the scholar, nor yet the poor. Oh, London! London! repent, repent, for I think God is more displeas'd with London, than ever He was with the city of Nebo."—Latimer's *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 64.

or Ireland. I need say little more, as I dwelt upon this subject in my last lecture, and entreated you to consider whether Scotland is now in the position to retain this proud pre-eminence. Her parochial system of education does not apply to towns, and her schemes of secondary education are imperfect. Possessed of wealthy endowments for educational purposes, they are worked so as to be positively injurious to the progress of the people. While England is in a state of the greatest activity for the reform and extension of primary education, and holds meetings of great unions and leagues in every town, Scotland is asleep and is dreaming of her past glories. While England is about to reform all her educational endowments, by throwing them into one grand scheme of secondary education for the whole body of the people, with the agency of responsible commissioners nominated by the Crown, Scotland has allowed her endowments to remain under irresponsible corporations, who seem to have no inclination to give up their patronage and class privileges for the benefit of the nation. How much longer Scotland intends to sleep on I do not know, but the world at large sees clearly enough that the *lions passants* of England on their four feet are now making much more way than the *lion rampant* of Scotland on its two hind legs. It was not by dwelling on the past that John Knox laid the basis of prosperity for his country. Past glories ought to be honoured; but future glories require to be achieved.

Lastly, I bring Ireland into contrast with the three countries which I have described in their relations to education. She has had troubles, even more severe than those of the Netherlands under Philip II., or of Switzerland and Scotland in the Wars of Independence. But worse than these wars of conquest and rebellion has been the ruthless stamping out of her industries, as they began to appear above the surface of the soil. In the whole history of protection, nothing is so deplorable as the ills which it has brought on Ireland. Only a single industry, that of flax, has been strong enough to resist the prohibitory laws of England against exportation. Even the internal industries of the country were paralysed by the protective spirit, which, in the form of bounties, robbed the people of their self-reliance. The channels of industry being closed, the people flowed over the land, which, under excessive competition, rose to rack rents, and the tenants scourged it in order to obtain a return. And so, even the national industry of agriculture has gone to the bad, for the soil of Ireland, impoverished by bad cultivation, has lost the ability within the last ten years of feeding nearly two millions of

the population. But sup-posing that this had not been so, agriculture possesses only a small power of expansion when compared with manufactures. I have shown you, by the examples of Switzerland and Holland, that poverty in natural resources is no bar to industrial development, if the population possess an educated intelligence sufficient to compensate for their local disadvantages. There is nothing inherent in the soil, in the Celtic origin of the people, or in the religion of Ireland, that should prevent it becoming an important manufacturing country, for all of these conditions are represented in other prosperous nations. The chief difficulty for its development consists in the fact that England has impressed a character upon the people by centuries of misrule, and that time is requisite for the change of character; because a State, responsible for the upbringing of a people, cannot escape the judgment which says, that the sins of the father shall be visited on the children, even to the third and fourth generation. Ireland, though possessing but little coal, is near to the coal-fields of Scotland and Wales, nearer, in fact, than many parts of England, and far nearer to such fuel than Switzerland. She possesses fine rivers and unequalled ports. Her climate is specially favourable to the spinning of cotton. Her wool, hides, and tallow point to manufacturing woollen fabrics, leather, candles, and soap. Yet only one-half of the people are engaged in trade and manufactures that ought to be so occupied, according to the experience of England and Scotland. No measure of improvement which stops at the notion that agriculture is sufficient for the people, can make Ireland prosperous. The quickest remedy for the ills which afflict her will be the secondary education of the people in practical subjects. It is only through such education that you can diminish the craving hunger for land, and raise a desire for other forms of industrial occupations. It is true that the empire has already expended much money in giving what England calls primary education to the people of Ireland. Well, if that were enough, Ireland should have ceased to be England's difficulty, for there is a wider diffusion of the three R's in the former than in the latter country. And what has it all come to? That the Irish have been enabled to read the seditious newspapers of their country, and, like Caliban in the *Tempest*, to turn upon us and say—

*"You taught me language; and my profit on't  
Is I know how to curse:"*

Such miserable instruction as we give to working people under the name of education, can produce no better result in a disaffected population. For them there is no hope of a higher education in the practical sciences of life, such as is given in other countries. In Scotland, out of 3500 students at the universities, probably 500 are sons of the wage-making class. But in all the Queen's Colleges of Ireland, since their foundation, the vice-president of one of them writes to me that he recollects only one instance of the sort, though there are many sons of farmers holding twenty or thirty acres. If we except the half-dozen royal scholars to Trinity College, Dublin, who are now graciously allowed to wear velvet caps, there is no aid to the poor from this quarter. So the education of Ireland, in its present condition, has but small ameliorative power on the working classes; for it possesses none of those powerful means of pushing forward the meritorious poor which were long the characteristics of Scotch education. Where instances occur of nations abounding in paupers and criminal classes being made prosperous and happy in less than a generation, through the powerful influences of education, that has never been confined to a smattering of the three R's. Such an instance is Baden, which, by eight years of industrial education, lessened the numbers of prisoners from 1426 to 691; to such an extent, indeed, that prisons had to be closed from want of occupants. But then the technical education which led to this result was not only high but special; and, through its agency, new industries were introduced into the country, and declining industries were revived. If we think direct schools for teaching not merely the principles but the actual practice of special industries are generally impolitic for a State to encourage, let us honour and recognise the exceptions to our rule; for, in the case of Baden, they have made a poor population prosperous and happy. Like results, by the same means, have been attained in West Flanders, and the nuisance of mendicancy, with which that province was affected, is wholly abated, just as it was at the end of last century in Bavaria, under the administration of the American schoolmaster, Count Rumford. So is it in Silesia, in which the poor population has been vastly benefited by the industries thus introduced through the agency of special technical schools. Without declaring myself in favour of actual industrial schools of this kind, I would much desire to see secondary or improvement schools for teaching practical science and art made available to the artisan class in Ireland. It may be that the artisans thus trained will not be absorbed by Irish industry as quickly as they are produced, but they would be readily drafted to other countries, just as the Swiss are at present, for their higher schools educate more scholars than are required by Switzerland. The absorption of the surplus of educated Irish artisans would be beneficial to Great Britain and the colonies, and would have a most powerful reflex action on Ireland. Agriculture would then cease to be the only industry kept before the eyes of a great part of the population of Ireland; while new thoughts, new ambitions, and new occupations would raise the population of

Ireland, as certainly, if not so rapidly, as similar causes have raised Scotland within the last century.

Having now, I trust, established that a high education of the people in a country gives to them the conditions of industrial success, I would direct your attention to the difficulties which present themselves to the adoption of a system of technical instruction in England. Every effort made to promote it is met, both in Parliament and out of it, by the statement that it is in vain to ask the tax-payer to augment taxes for such a purpose, as he already pays more for education than any tax-payer in the world, notwithstanding that the results are confessedly miserable. Compare, said a great statesman to me on a recent occasion, our educational expenditure with that of France, Germany, or any other great State, and you will find it both absolutely and relatively greater. Let us then make the comparison with France, for, next to England, she stands lowest as regards the primary education of her people. Well, the first thing that meets our eye is that the educational expenditure of England is £1,390,000, while that of France is only £776,000. So stand the figures on the budgets of the two countries, and, if they were susceptible of no explanation, it would be a deep cause of humiliation to us, for France, though not in the primary, yet, in the secondary education of the people, is far ahead of England. But the figures assume a very different aspect if we add the municipal taxation for education in France to the amount of imperial taxation.

So that in reality France taxes herself for education nearly twice as much as England does. Doubtless in our case, voluntary subscriptions supplement Government expenditure, but these have nothing to do with the present grumbles of the tax-payers. The reason why England receives so much from the imperial funds, and yet has only about half the educational resources of France is, that our country has fallen into a terrible educational error. Other countries consider that primary instruction is the duty of localities, and ought to be supported by local rates, the duty of Government being limited to superintendence and inspection of the schools, or to supplementing the salaries of teachers. This will be seen clearly in the French budget, which applies only £260,000 to subjects of primary instruction, the remaining £500,000 being devoted to higher education. You observe that nearly twice as much is spent on the latter, while in England the very reverse system is pursued,—two-thirds of the expenditure being on the lower, and only one-third on the upper branches of education. Do you begin to see that England, with all her apparently high educational expenditure, is in reality spending, both absolutely and relatively, much less than France, Austria, and Prussia, and far less proportionally than Holland, Switzerland, and many other nations? Yet this error of loading the Exchequer with burdens which ought to have fallen on localities, has made a heavy educational difficulty for the future. England has taught the localities to look to the Treasury for payment of their primary education, and they are not now willing to accept the natural burdens which have been imposed upon them in all other countries. Foreign States have rightly understood that the functions of Government are chiefly to promote the well-being of the people, by giving to them such higher educational development as will enable them to compensate for disadvantages in local position, or lack of raw material, or sterility of soil. England, on the other hand, until recently, has been content, as an empire, to discharge the duties of a hamlet; and when science and art looks for aid to develop themselves as in other countries, the Chancellor of the Exchequer shakes his head, and the Premier cheers the Vice-President of the Council, when he deprecates the increase of taxation. I aver that our educational expenditure, instead of being the largest, is least among the great States. Nevertheless, if the localities assumed their natural burdens, as in other countries, our present amount of imperial expenditure would probably suffice for the higher education of the people. It will be a long time before the localities will wean themselves from looking to the imperial funds for aid in primary instruction; so if we desire to see a higher education of the people, we must either seek the means in increased taxation, or, preferably, in the conversion of unproductive into productive expenditure. It cannot be for ever that Europe will spend 140 millions, or 32 per cent, of her total expenditure, on standing armaments. It cannot be for long that England will give, out of every £1000 of her expenditure, £400 for the army and navy, and only £19 for the education of the people. The small kingdom of Wurtemberg, in addition to the local taxation, spends £47 out of £1000 in the promotion of education, chiefly of a higher kind; and even Saxony, notwithstanding her losses in the recent campaign, spends £37. Against these sums our proportional of £19 is not much to boast of.

L'état ne dépensera jamais trop pour former dans le pays une population intelligente, possédant, à tous les degrés, des notions saines de technologie; ce sera pour lui le vrai moyen de s'assurer à l'avenir, dans la plupart des industries, une précieuse préminence.—*General Morin*.

I have now touched on the main parts of the subject upon which you asked me to discourse, and it may be convenient to summarize our conclusions. These are:—

- That the limitation of the Revised Code to the three R's vulgarizes education, and renders it comparatively useless for the purposes of the working classes.
- That common sense, as well as the experience of other nations, indicates that an elementary knowledge of the principles of science and art involved in the occupations of the people should be introduced to primary schools, in order to make them a fitting preparation for secondary schools.

- That indirect compulsory education of a primary character should be secured, by making it a condition for the employment of the poor, just as a higher education is required for entrance into the occupations and professions of the rich.
- That improved administration would largely increase teaching power, and, while producing economies in time and money, would give a higher educational outcome from the schools.
- That when elementary education is made the only key for entering workshops and factories, the schools attached to them may be rendered secondary and applicable to the employments of the people.
- That a higher education, in relation to the industries of the country, is an essential condition for the continued prosperity of the people; for intelligence and skill, as factors in productive industry, are constantly becoming of greater value than the possession of native raw material or local advantages.

I do not know how far I have carried you with me in these conclusions; but I trust that I have given good grounds for some of them, so far as our time permitted. The whole ideas of education are travelling back to the position that John Knox left them in three centuries since. At one time it was an almost accepted rule, that there should be a liberal education for a gentleman, and a limited one for a peasant. John Knox taught us that there should be one education for a Man, who ought to be able to equip himself for any vocation in life that his talents justified him to assume. And this comprehensive conception of education was, at the same time, the glory and the power of Scotland. England has not yet fully realized this, and would like to reduce your primary schools to the narrow limits of the three R's. And Scotland is allowing herself to drift to this narrow view by her present indifference. Scotchmen hitherto have entered life covered with the armour of knowledge, and able to fight their way through difficulties. Instead of your old thick armour-plates of knowledge, the Privy Council wish to cover your children with the thin veneers of the notable three R's. Which of them will crack first in the conflict of life?

In conclusion, let me ask you seriously whether you think that this country can continue in a career of prosperity, when she is the only leading State in Europe that is neglecting the higher education of the working classes, and of those men above them whose duty it is to superintend their labour? True education consists in fitting a man for a complete life. That is no education at all which gives him knowledge useless for the activities and duties of his existence. I have said that science and art must be studied for their own sake by those who try to advance their boundaries; and are only available to producers who know how to apply the discoveries of philosophers. Science is like the fertilizing rain, which invigorates crops growing on land fitted for its reception, though it runs to waste, without percolating the soil, if that be hard and unfilled. So, just in proportion as different States prepare their populations by culture, will they increase in strength or dwindle in weakness. The future histories of the world will not be those of blood and rapine. They will recount the achievements of those nations which have ameliorated the conditions of the human race by the discoveries and applications of science. It is for the United Kingdom to determine whether she desires her history to be that of a country which was raised to the highest place among States by the genius of mighty men, though she lost that position by a blind reliance on the practical empiricism of her people; or whether her future history is to be that of an enlightened nation which, seeing that a general diffusion of science and art is giving to other countries advantages in industrial competition, added this intellectual power to the practical aptitude of her population. It is a truth incapable of being gainsaid, that science must be joined to practice in the advancing competition of the world, in order that a nation may retain the strength and energy of manhood; for States, like individuals, fall into decrepitude and decay. In saying farewell, allow me to give a friendly warning to our typical John Bull in the words of Martial:

Et non decernis *Taure*, quid esse velis,  
*Peleos* et *Priami* transit, vel *Nestoris* aetas,  
 Et serum fuerat, jam tibi desinere.—  
 Eja, age, rumpe moras, quo te spectabimus usque?  
 Dum quid sis dubitas, potes esse nihil.—*Mart.*

"Old Priam's age or Nestor's may be out,  
 And thou, O *Taurus*, still go on in doubt;  
 Come then; how long such wavering shall we see?  
 Thou may'st doubt on; but then thou 'It nothing be."

Opening of Otago University.

Addresses

By Hon. Major Richardson, The Chancellor;

G. S. Sale, M.A.,  
Professor of Classics and English Language and Literature;  
John Shand, M.A.,  
Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy;  
D. M'Gregor, M.A., M.B.,  
Professor of Mental and Moral Science.  
Dunedin: Printed at the "Daily Times" Office, Princes Street. MDCCCLXXI.

## Prefatory Note.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO was opened on the 5th July, under the most auspicious circumstances. His Honor the Superintendent, in his note of apology for his unavoidable absence, expressed the universal feeling of our people respecting the event. His words are—"The inauguration of this afternoon marks what is in many respects as yet the most important epoch in the history of the Province, if not of the Colony. I should have been glad had the University come forth at once with all the prestige of being recognised as a Colonial instead of a Provincial Institution. Such undoubtedly was the intention of the Colonial Legislature in passing the Act of last Session, which intention I hope still to see carried into effect. Be this as it may, however, I feel assured that the University of Otago, if not *de jure* will be *de facto* the University of New Zealand."

The Council has pleasure in stating that the Chancellor and the Professors, at the request of the students and general public, agreed to put their Addresses at its disposal for publication.

## The Chancellor's Inaugural Address.

MR VICE-CHANCELLOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL—

When I consider the circumstances under which we meet on this occasion, and when I consider the duty which, in virtue of my office, I have to perform, I should feel very anxious for the result, were I not supported by the assurance that the kindness which led you to elect me as Chancellor of the University will not be wanting to me in my present trying position—one so widely different from the stirring scenes and active employments incidental to the soldier's life.

Few can regret more deeply than I do the loss which we have sustained in the death of our late Chancellor, the Rev. Dr. Burns. As one of the chief founders and pioneers of this Settlement he took a deep interest in the establishment of this University, regarding it as the completion of our system of Education; and had he been spared, he would have brought to the performance of the duty which I have undertaken that solid learning, that mature wisdom, and that earnest zeal which so eminently characterised him. But it has been otherwise ordered. One by one the founders of our new home are removed from among us, and many a fervent wish has been entertained by myself and others that both the late Captain Cargill and his fellow-worker, our late Chancellor, had been permitted to see the coping laid on the building in the erection of which they both took so prominent and distinguished a part.

Living, as we do, in an age which may be, and is, rightly de-scribed as a period of great and fundamental change, when Universities, reaching back their history by centuries, are engaged in examining the foundations on which they rest, and are wisely strengthening their hold on enlightened popular affection by judicious and timely reformations, it is well that we should pause on the very threshold of our existence as a University, and examine the machinery and working of our educational system, of which the establishment of this University may be regarded as the designed and fitting completion. We have, indeed, no history to recall; we are, as it were, in the infancy of our existence, and are unlike those venerable English Universities which trace back their descent some ten centuries and more, or that Scottish University which sprang into existence when the magic influence of printing indefinitely multiplied the facilities for becoming acquainted with the works of the literary giants of Greece and Rome, and spread broadcast those seeds of intellect which a rapidly advancing civilisation nourished and developed. They, like some distinguished regiments which bear on their colours the names of those heroic achievements which their soldiers fondly remember, and earnestly aspire to emulate; they can point to a glorious galaxy of men eminent for their intellect and worth, as part of themselves; ours the humbler lot to follow their example, and strive our best to train those who will hereafter people this almost untrodden wilderness to uphold and advance the cause of religion and truth, and to foster and follow science wherever she may direct their steps.

It is now rather more than 23 years since the John Wickliffe arrived at Port Chalmers, closely followed, within an interval of three weeks, by the Philip Laing. These vessels bore to the shores of the Middle Island of



New Zealand the first emigrants sent out by the Association formed for promoting the settlement of Otago. These colonists came forth from their native land to found a settlement at the Antipodes, under a scheme which, almost for the first time in any British enterprise, embraced a constant provision out of the proceeds of the sale of land, and by reserves, for immigration, public works, religion, and education. It contemplated, and in part formed, an endowment for "a Church and a Christian ministry," and "for schools and teachers;" and it designed instituting a College or University so soon as the increase of population should justify such a step. These educational and religious institutions were formed to be in connection with the Free Church of Scotland, and "were solely designed to give a certain and firm, instead of a precarious and feeble, existence to such institutions in the settlement from the beginning," leaving all other denominations at liberty, if they thought fit, to provide other institutions. This plan of settlement, which was intended to extend over 400,000 acres, was only partly successful, and in 1853 the whole of the island south of the Province of Canterbury was formed into a province, and was chiefly administered by a local Legislature and an Executive Government. The educational system, which had been in operation, was in consequence remodelled, and gradually assumed the character which it now presents. Whatever may be the form which colonisation adopts, it is invariably found that to be eminently successful, it must abolish all exclusiveness and all distinctions of race and creed; and if it desires to invite and secure without restriction the enterprising pioneers of civilisation, it must throw open its lands to those who, with capital or willing hearts, are prepared to go in to occupy and cultivate them, necessarily connected with such a system of settlement, and essential to its thorough development and success, is the adoption of a system of education which recognises the Bible as a necessary and the most influential agent in moral culture, and insists upon its pages being daily read in its schools. There must be some ground common to all who profess Christianity whereon they may endeavour to carry into practice the grand principles which ran through the advent song of the Christian faith, and which the angel heralds told to a listening earth when they announced a reign, of which "peace on earth and goodwill to man" was the distinguishing characteristic. In obedience to this law, and in conformity with this spirit, the educational system of Otago assumed a progressively liberal form.

It would answer no good purpose were I to detail the stages by which this conclusion was arrived at. It will be quite sufficient to give a rapid and condensed sketch of some of the principal *features of the system* as it now exists. The administration of the Education Ordinance of 1864 is confided to a Board of Education, consisting of the Superintendent of the Province, the members of his Executive Council, and the Speaker of the Provincial Council. It has the power, under certain conditions, to define Educational Districts, and to superintend and control School Committees within specified limits; to direct the expenditure of all sums appropriated by the Provincial Council; to fix the minimum rate of fees to be paid by pupils; and to appoint a Secretary and Inspector of Schools, whose duty it is, at least once annually, to inspect or superintend the inspection of every school. District School Committees are appointed at a meeting of owners and occupiers of land and householders, and they have power to appoint teachers, to fix the amount of salary, and to charge fees, not being less than the minimum, with power to remit them, and generally to have charge of all local educational matters. The Government provide school-houses and sites, and afterwards assist towards the enlargement of the school-houses when needed, and also give sums varying from £70 to £100 towards the payment of each teacher's salary, which is fixed at a minimum of £100, and is to be raised to the full amount by fees and subscriptions, and by a rate, if considered to be necessary by the Committee, which rate is obtained by assessment, according to the net annual value of houses, lands, and hereditaments in the district. Libraries are provided at the joint expense of the Government and the district. It is further directed that "in every School the Holy Scriptures shall be read daily, and such reading shall be either at the opening or close of the school, as may be fixed by the teacher, and no child whose parent or guardian shall object to such instruction shall be bound to attend at such times." The Amendment Ordinance of 1865 repealed the assessment clause of 1864, and directed that all necessary expenses connected with School Districts, which the Committees are to defray, should be provided from school fees, donations, and subscriptions. The results, so far as the attendance at the schools and the lessons taught are concerned, may be ascertained from the last Annual Report of the earnest and indefatigable Secretary of Education, Mr. Hislop. The population of Otago, before the re-union of Southland, which took place on the 6th October last, and of which period I speak, was about 60,578. The number of Elementary Schools, most of which have libraries attached to them, and of which three are Free Schools, was 96, employing 149 teachers. The total number of attendants during the past year was 6919; the average daily attendance was 4680; and the attendance at the close of the year was 5631, of which number more than one-half were boys. There were 3581 children between the ages of 5 and 10; 1602 between the ages of 10 and 12; and about 1092 between the ages of 12 and 15; while there were 456 under 5 years of age, and only 188 above 15 years of age. The cost of this education to the Province may be stated at £17,791 for inspection and teaching, while £6450 was expended on School buildings, making a total of £24,242, all of which, with the exception of £2302, was obtained from the Provincial Revenue. Taking then the sum of £24,242, which represents the

Government expenditure on Public Education, and adding to it the sum of £7637, supplemented by the Districts in the shape of fees, I find the average cost per head, relatively to population, to be about ten shillings. This, allowing for differing circumstances, will bear no unfavourable comparison with a similar expenditure by other States and Colonies; indeed, we might affirm that it would bear very favourable comparison even with the most liberal and advanced.

Time would fail me, and I should intrude too much on your patience, were I to do more than cursorily allude to the long established *High School*, which continues to work satisfactorily under the administration of Mr Hawthorne, and to the four Grammar Schools, as yet in their infancy, in the country districts. But more than a passing allusion is due to the establishment of the *Girls' Provincial School*. This school was opened at the close of last year, and was placed under the supervision and direction of Mrs Bum, formerly Lady Superintendent of the Geelong Ladies' College. The friends of education do heartily rejoice at the establishment of this earnestly and long hoped-for Institution, where the girls of the Province may receive a thoroughly useful and liberal education. Almost at a bound, this Institution has secured to itself the approval of the public; and I feel assured that the blessing which will accompany its successful development, under a firm and judicious administration, will be such as its most ardent advocates could not have ventured to anticipate—blessings not confined to those who are now, or may hereafter be, students, but to others to be by them transmitted through many a family circle, enlivening, enlightening, and enriching the happy households as they group around many a domestic hearth. Doubtless, in due time, a still higher education will be conferred through the instrumentality of Colleges;

Since this Address was delivered, the University has decided by an unanimous vote to open its classes to women, and to admit them to certificates equivalent to degrees.—J. R.

and then woman, having at length attained to her rightful position, and still moving in the sphere she is so well qualified to adorn, will add to the charms of a delicate sensibility and natural grace those other charms which only a refined and cultivated intellect can confer.

It would be foreign to the character of this Address were I to enter more fully into the consideration of questions which are intimately connected with our system of elementary education; yet I may be allowed to say, that so fully do I recognise the expediency of *religious education* running side by side with that which is usually, but wrongly, termed secular education, that I should be glad if suitable arrangements could be made whereby the Ministers of Religion should be able, as a matter of right, and not as a mere act of grace, to visit and instruct the children of their own denominations at the school-house on appointed days, either before or after the usual school hours; or even were half-an-hour abstracted from secular learning to compass so desirable an object; and I believe that the Government would not only be doing rightly, but also acting wisely in a temporal point of view, were it to add a room to each school-house for the purpose, where-ever such addition might be necessary. In this latter case, the time for religious tuition might be so selected—as, for instance, during the writing lessons, as not to disturb the usual classes; and particular days might be appointed for the several denominations. I would not, however, be understood to recommend that this instruction should take the place of the daily reading of the Bible, but should be added to it.

Highly as I esteem the office of a national schoolmaster, I cannot bring myself to think that he is suitably engaged when communicating and explaining the distinctive creeds and doctrines which are held by various denominations of Christians. His duty is of a different character, and his status as a mental educator should be held in high estimation. I am not disposed to admit that the instruction which he communicates can be termed secular in any depreciatory sense, for, at the time when "the choicest intellectual gifts are cultivated, the exercise of patient attention, industry, and good behaviour, are demanded." It has been well said by Sir Roundell Palmer, that "the line between religious and secular knowledge is purely conventional. All knowledge, all instruction in whatever is honest and of good report, is essentially religious. The clergyman and the school-master are inevitably working together, whether they are working in concert or not." Yet, I would say that their offices are quite distinct, and that the faintest suspicion of the schoolmaster interfering with, or reflecting on the tenets of any denomination, should be rigorously banished from our schools, and that such interference by any teacher should be met by the severest reprehension.

Let it not be supposed, because we have established Primary and Secondary Schools, and a University is springing into existence under auspicious circumstances, that we have done all that we need do. One of the most important aids to educational success is the appointment of able, independent, and well-paid Inspectors of Schools, who should fully and faithfully report to the University, or an independent Board, the state of education in each school which is dependent on the public, whether the assistance be rendered in a great measure by the Government directly, or through rates raised expressly for educational purposes.

Should *Academic Inspection* be desired—and it is beyond all question that it would be very valuable—the various Professors attached to the University and the High School would afford abundant materials for efficient examination. It is advisable that these inspections should be made at uncertain times, principally by written

answers made to written questions, and in the presence of the examiners or of others to whom the questions should be sent under seal; and further, that the results of such examinations should be made public.

While taking these precautions for securing an accurate report of *results*, the means necessary to secure effective tuition should not be neglected. This is one of the most important points to be attended to in any educational system, and can only be obtained through the instrumentality of trained instructors. In Prussia there is a teacher to every 66 pupils, and to every 400 of the population, and these are specially trained and duly certificated. In Upper Canada there are 4365 certificated teachers, and in many countries of Europe the schoolmasters are registered under Parliamentary sanction, and thus duly accredited. Considering the vast influence which is insensibly exercised on the minds of youth at a time when impressions are usually deep and abiding, too much stress cannot be placed on this vital point. The University will, until training colleges can be established, offer every facility for study and examination; but it should not be overlooked that aptness to teach is as essential a qualification in a teacher as the possession of knowledge. The amount of the teacher's salary should, in no little measure, depend upon the results of his tuition, as ascertained by inspection, for it is evident that a mere attendance at school is not a proper gauge of success. But while adopting this salutary stimulus to exertion in both master and pupil, due allowance should be made for the difficulties which surround a school situated in a sparsely populated district, in order that the income of the teacher should not fall below a fixed and respectable minimum; for, if we degrade the office by offering a remuneration for the teacher's services, scarcely exceeding that which the mechanic can earn, we not only diminish, if we do not destroy, his influence, but we deter the intelligence of the age from seeking to enrol itself in the honourable office of an educator of youth.

It is fitting that I should take advantage of the present occasion to state the result of the *conferences* which have taken place between the New Zealand University Council and the Council of the Otago University. I need scarcely remind you that previously to the 12th of September, 1870, when the General Assembly of New Zealand passed an Act to establish a University for the Colony of New Zealand, the Province of Otago had passed an Ordinance, which was duly confirmed by the Governor, for constituting a University at Dunedin. The Colonial University Act gave the entire management of the University to a Council to be appointed; it arranged for the affiliation of Colleges and Educational Establishments; it empowered the Council to confer degrees after examination, and to admit, without examination, graduates of other Universities. It authorised the Colonial Treasurer to pay annually the sum of £3000 from out of the Consolidated Revenue for maintaining the said University, and for providing stipends for professors, officers, and servants, the establishment of lectures in affiliated Colleges, and for fellowships, scholarships, prizes, and exhibitions, and for other purposes. The Act also made a further provision for the dissolution of the University of Otago, and the transfer of its endowments for the purposes of the Act on conditions in consonance with its provisions, to be mutually agreed upon, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It further declared, that should the University of Otago, within six months after the passing of the Act, enter into such an agreement, then the University of New Zealand should be established at Dunedin, and in default of such agreement, at any other place; but it provided that no exclusive privileges were intended to be conferred as would prevent the establishment of a New Zealand University at any other place, or prevent the General Assembly "from applying any endowments made" by the Act, "or which may have been or may hereafter be made for the support of a University by authority of the General Assembly, or any part of any such endowments, to the establishment and maintenance of any other New Zealand University." The time within which the dissolution of the Otago University could have taken place having passed without any communication from the New Zealand University—owing probably to circumstances which it is not necessary to recall—the Otago Council proceeded to carry out the trust confided to it. Shortly after, the New Zealand University Council was appointed by the Governor to meet at Dunedin. On the arrival of some of its members they met and elected a Chairman, who telegraphed to me that the Council were desirous of conferring with me on the subject of a transfer of endowments. Considering the communication of great importance, I left for town on the morning of the second day after. I then learned that some informal conferences had been held between some of the members of both Councils, and I was invited by the New Zealand University Council to state my views on the subject of union. I read to them at a meeting a series of resolutions, which I intended to submit to our Council, and which, at a subsequent meeting, after amendments made, were adopted. These resolutions were to the effect that a union of the two Universities, on principles which would secure the location of the University at Dunedin in accordance with the Act, was desirable, provided there was secured what was deemed to be an equitable representation of the Province in the Council, and an efficient local administration of the University; and they provided, amongst other things, that in case of a union being effected, all existing engagements should be observed; that if other Universities should be established, the Otago University should retain its present endowments, and participate, in the ratio of population, in the £3000 annually granted out of the Consolidated Revenue by the Act, and also in any future grants: and further, that the Province of Otago having given 100,000 acres of land for University purposes,

which amount might also have been given by other Provinces, in an equal, greater, or lesser degree, should be exempted from the operation of the New Zealand University Endowment Act of 1868, by which land to the amount of 10,000 acres might be taken from each of the Provinces. Many of the absent members of the New Zealand University having arrived, a full conference was held between the two Councils, and by request these resolutions were read to, and left with, the New Zealand University Council. In reply to these resolutions, a communication was received virtually accepting the spirit of many of them. It stated, however, that there should be only one University, but omitted to state an important point that it should be at Dunedin. It proposed that there should be affiliated Colleges, and that the University of Otago should be one of these, having full control over its own endowments, and over future grants to it out of the Consolidated Revenue; but it omitted to state that, while it should participate in any future grants from the Consolidated Revenue, it should participate also in the ratio of population to grants already made. The Otago Council replied that the question of the constitution of the Council on amalgamation had been overlooked, and that certain definite resolutions had not been sufficiently remarked on in the resolutions forwarded by the New Zealand University Council. A merely formal reply was received to these, to the effect that it was premature to fix on any place for the location of the University permanently, and, indeed, unnecessary, because at present nothing more was contemplated than the founding of lectures in affiliated Institutions, and University Scholarships; that any alteration in the constitution of the Council was unnecessary and impracticable; but it accorded to the Otago University, so far as scholarships were concerned, the privileges of an affiliated Institution.

This may be considered a sufficient summary of the leading points which arose during the conferences. The whole of the papers will be submitted to the Superintendent, and it may here be sufficient to observe that the province has, upon every principle of justice, a right not only to a fair participation in the £1000 allocated for scholarships, which right has been admitted, but to an equal participation in the £1500 appropriated for the establishment or subsidising in affiliated Institutions of Professorships or Lectureships. I believe that full justice will be meted out to this University; nevertheless it is our duty to see that we do not sustain any loss by abstaining from pressing on the proper authorities the claims of the province, which provides at least one-fourth of the Consolidated Revenue of the colony.

The University commences its career with *a staff of four Professors*, viz., of Classics and English Language and Literature; of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy; of Chemistry and Mineralogy; and of Mental and Moral Philosophy: the last mentioned having been selected and provided for by the Presbyterian Synod of Otago and Southland, which contemplates the endowment of other Chairs as the education fund at its disposal may admit. In connection with the University there have already been established one permanently endowed scholarship of the annual value of nearly £40, and three scholarships ranging in value from £15 to £30 per annum for three years. There appears every reason to hope that the example thus set will be followed by those who desire to give encouragement to learning. It cannot fail to be remarked that the University has given considerable prominence to teaching the sciences, thus adopting a system of education more in accordance with modern practice, but it should not thereby be inferred that the University does not rightly appreciate the great benefits arising from a study of the Classics. The study of Latin has justly been represented as tending to accuracy of thought and perspicuity of language, and therefore, with Greek, takes a prominent part in every system of education. United with the study of mathematical science, which encourages the growth of habits of close and exact reasoning, and running side by side with mental and moral philosophy and the natural sciences, we have for the present, in our undeveloped state, a reasonably equipped Institution for intellectual education. It is not expedient that any one of these studies should, as elsewhere, overshadow the others, almost to their utter extinction. Even now, or but a short time since, nearly the whole educational force of Eton was applied to the communication of classical knowledge; for it is stated that "out of 35 masters 24 were classical, 8 mathematical, and 3 only taught the modern languages, physical science, natural history, English language and literature, drawing, and music;" and it is represented that this was the usual proportion in all public schools with the exception of Rugby. It would scarcely be possible to place too great a value on the benefits which flow from a thorough classical education, commenced at a suitable period, communicated in proper proportions, and by earnest, able, and judicious masters. Much that is beautiful would be evoked by one who was an enthusiast in this literature, and the pupils, catching the infection, would become inspired with a noble ardour to master the languages in which, for many centuries, the learned of every civilised country communicated their thoughts to mankind. It has been well observed, that when the ancient classics are taught to mature and vigorous minds, "the progress, now slow, painful, and irregular, would be vastly more rapid, pleasant, and sure." "Cramming of the memory, now declared to be indispensable with the very young, would at a later age be superseded by intelligible explanation and intelligent perception of principles; the authors read would be better comprehended, better appreciated, more enjoyed; the knowledge of words, combinations, idioms, would grow swiftly, insensibly, day by day; the judgment and taste, first exercised on the writings of their own countrymen, would be brought early to bear on those of Rome and Greece; the beauties of Homer and Horace, and Virgil and

Sophocles, and Livy and Thucydides, would not now be wasted on dull and unwilling ears, but would be really felt; and all the good effects, intellectual, æsthetic, and moral, would be really accomplished by a skilful teacher with a heart in his bosom, and not merely a mass of learned lumber in his head."

However reasonably perfect may be the machinery which the University presents for communicating a collegiate education of no mean character, I feel that all its advantages would be ineffectual without the *hearty co-operation* of all parties in any way connected with it. There is a great work to be done—a work requiring all our earnestness and all our patience. We may indeed be beset with difficulties, but these once fairly faced will vanish. It is with us the day of small things; but let us hope for greater. Let us bear in mind the words which were uttered by Miss Nightingale, when on a bed of long-continued sickness and languishing suffering, to an anxious enquirer who sought at her hands the best way of doing some indicated good work: "I would only say work—work in silence at first, in silence for years, and it will not be time lost." Others have indeed trodden the path we now tread, and the way seemed to them to be long, and dark, and wearisome, but the day dawned at last.

Since this Address was delivered the number of Students attending Classes amounts to 73.

Did we need an illustration, we have not far to go to seek it. In the earliest years of the existence of the Melbourne University, only two students presented themselves for matriculation annually for two or three years, but this year 91 have successfully passed the necessary examinations. It was fashionable at one time to laugh at the University as a costly toy, and treat it as a premature, if not a presumptuous experiment; but now the fashion has changed, and it can point to admission on its lists being regarded as an honour. The average number of students who annually present themselves for examination is half that of either Cambridge or Oxford; and since its commencement more than 136 degrees have been conferred, and 164 graduates of other Universities have taken their degrees.

If I should not be deemed presumptuous, I desire to express my conviction that we shall find in our *Professors* all that we can desire. In carefully reading over the documents which accompanied their applications, I was struck, not so much with their scholastic attainments, though these are such as may well make us proud and confident, but with the aptitude of the candidates who have been selected, to communicate their knowledge to others, and with their power to excite and sustain the attention of their classes. If it is a source of gratification to be elected to supply the place of a retiring Professor in some of our home Universities and Collegiate Establishments, I can well imagine the pleasure with which our Professors received the intimation of their election when they dwelt on the enviable distinction to which they were called of giving a name and a character to a young Institution like this, and of fixing the impress of their own minds on those of the rising generation—moulding as it were the literature of the province, and training scholars who, in time to come, would imitate and transmit the ability, judgment, and enthusiasm of their teachers. I have every hope, too, that the great advantages which the liberality of the Superintendent and Provincial Council has so judiciously exercised in creating and endowing this University, will not be lost on the youth of this and the neighbouring Provinces. Such solid advantages can scarcely be too highly appreciated. The youth just leaving our Elementary Schools, whatever his condition in life, may look forward to a short stay at the High School or one of the Grammar Schools, and then, or at once, to availing himself of the advantages which the University presents; and not only they, but is it an idle hope to indulge in, that many a one engaged in professional, commercial, or mechanical pursuits may desire to redeem the past, and may rejoice to find that there are, at their very door, ample means of instruction which perhaps were denied them when starting in the race of life? And yet one word of counsel would I respectfully offer to and urge upon the attention of parents. We are not in this colony so sorely pinched and pressed as to necessitate our demanding the services of our children at an age when the budding intellect begins to awaken to the realisation of the pleasures and benefit of knowledge, and when it is most susceptible of improvement; and yet there is something saddening in the thought that there are only 188 scholars above the age of 15 in our Primary and Secondary Schools out of the 6919 youths who have attended them during the past year. Exhibitions and Scholarships have been liberally provided by Government, by Churches, and by individuals, which may be successfully competed for, and may afford to many a promising youth the means of availing himself of the benefits of the University; and even were it otherwise, we need only look at the articles which our customs revenue enumerates to find out where, if necessary, many a luxury may be denied, and many a desire be repressed. And is not the prize worthy of the struggle? Is it nothing to see the University prizeman taking his seat at the family hearth in the homely cottage, and hear him speaking from experience of the solid enjoyment which a University confers, and view him a living example of how the inequalities of life may be adjusted, and how the cottar's son may aspire to and obtain a place among the higher officers of the State, or be known as not undistinguished among those whose genius, learning, and integrity have richly earned for them a place in the judgment, affections, and respect of their fellow men?

There is yet one point to which I may be allowed to make a special reference, and earnestly to press on the attention of the constituted authorities. I allude to the expediency, I would rather say the necessity, of every boy

above mere infancy going through a course of elementary *drill* as a part of his education, not by intruding upon his hours of recreation, but by making it a part of the day's work. I earnestly entreat that this may not be deemed the prejudice—or say, the crotchet—of an old soldier. The conviction is not one of to-day, but has been a cherished one for years past. Much as I would desire to say to-day on the imperative duty of every citizen being not only willing but capable of defending his country—and the flower of the soldiery of the once-proud France biting the dust in humiliation before the citizen soldiery of Germany reads a lesson while it excites the sympathy of every Briton, which he should not be slow to learn; much as I would say on this point I stay my hand, and only direct attention to the undoubted fact, that by improving the physical condition of a boy, you improve his mental capacities—so intimately connected is mind with body—and not only that, but the habits of attention, obedience, promptitude, and confidence are stimulated, and act and re-act with increasing vigour in every position of life, both present and future. I fear to say more, but I earnestly desire, and ask that what I have said may be fairly considered, when I am convinced it will be extensively adopted.

I have yet one subject on which I desire to say a few words of kindly suggestion, and those I would utter with special regard to the youths who will sooner or later hasten to avail themselves of the advantages which this University offers. I have been led to think much on the subject from the tendency to which I shall immediately refer, having not only attracted considerable attention in the home country, but also from the adoption of the same sentiments in distant lands. The importance of the subject will amply justify me in submitting my thoughts to the patient and unbiased consideration of those who may be exposed to the dangers which environ them.

There is beyond all doubt a very general impression, and one which is gaining ground in the minds of thoughtful men, that the tendency of the age is towards *materialism*, and that this tendency is intimately connected with the advance of science, as cause is with effect. While admitting the fact of a prevailing tendency to materialistic views, I may be allowed to affirm that nothing can be further from the truth than the assertion that it owes its origin and influence to science. This materialistic philosophy is the offspring of a well organised and energetic body of men who ascribe to science what is merely the production of their own imaginations. They venture to say in the language of one of the most eminent of their class, when offering their cold comforts for our acceptance, "Science has shown that we are under the dominion of general laws, and that there is no special Providence. Nature acts with fearful uniformity, stern as fate, absolute as tyranny, merciless as death; too vast to praise, too inexplicable to worship, too inexorable to propitiate; it has no ear for prayer, no heart for sympathy, no arm to save." This dishonour done to science, and this travestie on its teachings, might have been left to be destroyed by its own demerits, were it not that the voice of this materialism penetrates by thousands and tens of thousands in the form of a cheap literature into every corner of our native land, and in the darkest and dreariest nooks where even the advanced guard of the Christian ministry and educators have scarcely reached, permeating the minds of those who, excluded from the comforts, and often from the very necessaries of life, and debarred by their very isolation from the antidote which true science affords, fall a ready prey to the spoiler, being allured by the fascination in which the offering is decked. To meet these successfully, it is necessary that advantage should be taken of every opportunity of presenting science in her truest, and therefore, her most attractive form; and circulating her utterances with equal liberality and zeal, and more than equal tenderness. What vast store-houses of the noblest knowledge are there laid up in all the various branches of natural science. While the minister of the gospel dwells constantly on the pages of inspiration, and studies with unabated earnestness those languages and those commentators which elucidate and illustrate their meaning, why is it that the scarcely less wondrous pages of the book of nature remain, as it were, veiled from mortal ken? Simply because the missionaries of science will not stoop to expound its utterances in language intelligible to the uneducated, and with a zeal corresponding to the necessities of the case. The footprints of the Creator tell their tale to every one who hath an eye to read and a heart to welcome. The studded canopy of heaven teems with evidences of power and wisdom, and in the bosom of the earth are no less clearer indications; while all around, decked in the most bewitching garb of animate and inanimate nature, sing their songs of praise and wonder.

Let science unlock these treasures, unfold these glories, and she will prove herself to be—as in truth she is—the help-meet of revelation. If there is one thing, as years rapidly accumulate over my head and the finger on the dial plate points to the evening of life, which makes me envy the rising generation, it is the abundant and ready facilities which are afforded for the acquisition of scientific knowledge. A science too, which, like her sister revelation, is no longer exclusive and narrow in the admission of disciples, but opens the door widely to all alike, and moves the gentler sex to scale the Alpine heights, roam over the grassy downs, and thread the ferny woodlands, reaping a rich harvest of nature's choicest gifts to instruct and rejoice those who may be privileged to listen to its fascinating teachings. But it is well that we should remember that the contest between religion and science is not a contest between those who have attained a high position in the intellectual world, and those who earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to our fathers; for the masters of science are almost

universally known by the modesty and hesitation with which they advance and maintain their theories; but the contest is rather with those who flock to their standard, misinterpreting their teachings, and dogmatically enforcing as accepted and indisputable facts, that which their masters have left for further investigation to mature or to modify. It has been well said that the gap between the longest series of inductions and a law is too vast to be bridged over by any human intellect, and therefore it is that true science advances with slow and tentative steps, pausing now and again for fresh facts and clearer illumination, and never venturing, in the infancy of scientific investigation, to do more than present to other minds its experiments, and the consequences which appear to flow from them. Did we need to illustrate this position, Professor Tyndall's "Earlier Thoughts," just reprinted by him in the maturity of his intellect, affords us an example. After affirming the certainty with which the mind can pass along the line of thought which connects physical phenomena with one another, he says:—"But when we endeavour to pass, by a similar process, from the phenomena of physics to those of thought, we meet a problem which transcends any conceivable expansion of the powers which we possess. We may think over the subject again and again, but it eludes all intellectual presentation. We stand face to face with the Incomprehensible. The territory of Physics is wide, but it has its limits, from which we look with vacant gaze into the region beyond."

No less valuable is the testimony borne by Professor Stokes, the new President of the British Association, and one of the most eminent mathematicians of the day. He says, speaking of those who held thought to be only a function of matter, "Science can be expected to do little to aid us here since the instrument of research is itself the object of investigation. It can but enlighten us as to the depth of our ignorance, and lead us to look to a *higher aid* for that which most nearly concerns our well being."

As there is a theology which is not religion, so there is a philosophy which is a mere pretence, being immature in its nature, though seductive from the charms with which learning, eloquence, and taste have invested it. Philosophy steps out of her way when she intrudes on the domain of religion, and theology deviates from her appointed path when she impedes the advance of science, or attempts to limit or arrest the range of human thought. An all-wise God has deemed fit to make known His will to men, and to some extent His nature and perfection, by a special revelation which is recorded in the Bible, and by laws and principles recorded in the book of nature. These two books are open to every living being, and speak a language common to men of every race and clime. They are, as Kepler beautifully expresses it, "the finger and tongue of God." The one cannot contradict the other; for both are emanations from the same perfect source. As the eyes of a man convey but a single picture to the mind, so these two books convey to him, who rightly studies them, but one idea of the Supreme Being. The one is spoken of in the language of an Apostle as rescuing mankind by proclaiming Him whom they ignorantly worshipped; while the other, by its philosophic teaching, points with "trembling finger and shaded eyes" to a Being infinite in power, in wisdom, and in goodness. The truly scientific man knows too well the uncertain and incomplete nature of his facts to venture on dogmatism. Like Newton, he would say, "I know not what I may appear to the world, but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, while the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me." Did we need any evidence of the necessity of cautious induction from supposed ascertained facts, Astronomy would tell us that the misty light which envelopes the middle star in the sword of the Constellation of Orion was at one time regarded as an accumulation of nebulous fluid, the raw material of future worlds. Astronomers rested satisfied with the belief, and drew their inferences accordingly, until Lord Rosse's telescope dissipated the illusion, and proclaimed the nebula to be clusters of stars. And here again science would have rested, had not the spectrum analysis reasserted with additional evidence the fact that the nebula of Orion is after all but an enormous gaseous system. More perfect instruments and more intense and patient investigation may yet affect this result, and therefore the true astronomer hesitates to decry the revealed record with reference to creation. Other kindred sciences speak, in the imperfection and immaturity of their facts, the same word in reference to the necessity of cautious induction. Neither should the theologian be hasty in imputing materialistic tendencies to the scientific observer of nature. The best and most learned commentators of Scripture have thought it not improper to reject what was once universally accepted interpretations of recorded facts in connection with scientific subjects. There is not, there cannot be, any reason to justify these fellow-workers in the service of a common Master in engaging in a bitter literary warfare one against the other. Better, far better, for the theologian to permit unimpeded, if he cannot aid, the onward march of science, and for the man of science to withhold his hand from covertly undermining or more openly attacking the authority of the cherished records of a nation's faith. Many and various are the instruments which God employs in working out his wondrous purposes; and it is not for us to scan too minutely or to judge too hastily the means he has been pleased in his Providence to adopt.

In recalling to mind the progress of civilisation, it is right that we should remember that when learning had well nigh fled the land, and a darkness which might be felt was rapidly embracing within its fold the civilisation of Europe, the expiring embers were fondly watched by the Church of those days, and to many eminent

members of it is humanity deeply indebted for those signal services which rescued the records of ancient literature from destruction, and rekindled the torch of knowledge. The light thus shed abroad, intensified through the instrumentality of lay teaching, vitalised the dormant and almost extinguished mental energies of man; and the rescued literature of Greece and Rome, and still more, the book of God's revelation, indefinitely multiplied by the discovery of paper in the 14th century, and of printing in the 15th, cast a light far and near which no human power can quench, and which, aided by the illuminations of science, will brighten and mature until eventually all errors will be chased from their dominion over the human mind. With regard to one of the most inspiring of the circle of sciences we might picture to ourselves the deeply affecting influence which pervades the soul of the astronomer as he fixes his intelligent gaze on the exceeding glorious and wondrous beauties of the heavenly luminaries; and we may easily conceive how the illuminations of science would dispel from his mind any, even the slightest, suspicion that these brilliant constellations, marching onwards in their destined and ascertained courses, move but in accordance with some self-originating, some self-existing law.

If the Syrian Job, standing some forty centuries back on the plains of Chaldea, listening with trembling yet earnest intentness to the enumeration by the Almighty of the wonderful exhibitions of his power in the heavens above and the world around, was asked in the language of tender expostulation, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?" If so challenged, he could only reply, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye seeth thee, wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes;" can we with any semblance of justifying pretence affirm that the teachings of science are but the infusions of infidelity? If David, some thirty centuries back, in the twilight hour of science, was forced to exclaim that "The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth forth his handiwork," and, in his impassioned psalm on the manifestation of Deity, there was drawn from him the humbling confession, "When I consider Thy Heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him?" If such was the result, at such a period, of meditation on the majesty of the Deity as manifested in the glorious order and movements of the heavenly bodies, what must be the effect on the mind of the man of science, who brings to his investigations the most accurate and powerful instruments, and applies them with the accumulated knowledge of centuries? To him Alcyone, the brightest star of the Pleiades, is, as has been represented, the hinge around which the whole solar system turns—the centre of gravity of that vast system. The attractive energy of this cluster being so powerful, though at a distance of thirty-four millions of times greater than the distance between the sun and our earth, that Alcyone, herself circling round some attractive centre embosomed in the depth of Heaven, draws our system irresistibly around it at the rate of 422,000 miles a day. And this is no mere conjecture, but the result of long, deep, and careful investigation, and demonstrable on the strictest mathematical principles. If such stupendous results are obtainable by man, whoso dawning intelligence is still but as the faint glimmering of a feeble light, is it reasonable, nay, is it possible, to suppose that this system had its origin from any other source than from an all-wise and all-powerful Creator? No; science gives, and can give, no doubtful sound. Profound as may be our admiration of those masters of modern science, some few of whom seemingly foster materialistic views, we are forced to agree with Whewell, that "the strain of music from the lyre of science flows on, rich and sweet, but never reaches its close; no cadence is heard with which the intellectual ear can be satisfied." Reverentially as we may be disposed to bow before the marvellous and deep researches of those masters, we are reminded that there were, in the olden time, citizens of no mean city in the Empire of science, and we are content to believe with the great physiologist—that "the organs of animals gave evidence of a purpose;" with Cuvier, "that this conviction of a purpose can alone enable us to understand every part of every living thing and with Newton, a giant even among the giants of to-day, "that every true step made in philosophy brings us nearer to the First Cause, and is, on that account, to be highly valued;" and that "this beautiful system could have its origin no other way than by the purpose and command of an intelligent and powerful Being who governs all things, not as the soul of the world, but as the Lord of the universe, who is not only God, but Lord and Governor."

And yet more, does not this suspicion of science, this fear of its teachings, do an injustice to our faith? Does it not argue that we are apprehensive of the result, if the torch of science be brought to cast its light on the pages of inspiration? The grounds on which the reception of scientific induction rest, and those on which the word of God claims to be received, are equally imperative, and we have no reason to fear the weight of adverse criticism or evidence; for, considering only one of the series of irresistible arguments, is it possible to conceive that a religion spreading with the lightning rapidity which Christianity did was the offspring of fraud? Were its authors and promulgators among the great, the noble, the intellectual? The very reverse was the case, they were of humble origin, untutored, and illiterate. Did the new religion chime in with the pleasures and vices of Society? It stood aloof from all religions on account of their falsity, and took its stand on behalf of a high-toned virtue and morality. Was the power of the sword evoked in its propagation? It rested on no arm of flesh, but simply and prayerfully explained its principles, depending on their inherent vitalizing power, and on an unseen



hand. Did its advocates shrink when persecution arrayed its forces to sweep it from the earth? They stood undaunted in every hour, in every clime, amid every form of the most bitter and relentless malignity; and on the cross, and at the stake, in the courts of Cæsar, and in the solitary hut in the wilderness, they were found faithful unto death.

If such a religion, so promulgated, illustrated, and enforced, be but a delusion, then we must pronounce the world a blank, the future—if such there be—a dark unfathomable abyss, and we have only to gather around us the tattered shreds of some chilly form of materialism, and extract from them what warmth, and hope, and comfort we may, as in cheerless despair we wander, stumbling and blindly, towards that last leap in the dark which lands us in annihilation.

## Professor Sale's Introductory Lecture.

MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

It will naturally be expected that in beginning a course of Lectures on the Greek and Latin Classics, and on the English Language and Literature, I should in the first place say a few words upon the value of those studies, their proper place in a system of education, and the mode in which I propose to treat them. It would indeed be unnatural if I were to refrain from doing so. If I had formed no opinions on the subject I should hardly have been a candidate for the Chair which I have the honour to fill; and having formed opinions, now, if ever, is the time to express them. I do not allude simply to the event-fulness of the occasion, to the interest which naturally centres round this our first meeting as Tutor and Students, to the anxiety which I feel, and which all of us feel, that the beginning which we make this day may be made in a right direction, that the studies which we here pursue may have the effect of making us better citizens and better men. Others more able than myself have already spoken on this subject, and I would not lessen the effect of what they have said. My object to-day is more practical. It is simply to measure the real value of classical studies as a means of education, to give to my class students some plain directions such as my own experience tells me may be useful, to make some suggestions which they may themselves work out, to point out some errors against which it would be well that they should guard.

First then with regard to the value of classical studies.—I am not going to combat the often told and almost worn-out objections which have been urged against them. The founders of this University have decided already, and no doubt upon sufficient grounds, that classical studies shall occupy an important place in our system of education; and probably there are few in this place who would object to their decision. At the same time there is no doubt that those studies may be, and in England for a long time have been, pursued too exclusively. A great change, however, is taking place in this respect. The Classics are no longer placed on the high and solitary pedestal which they used to occupy. It has come to be admitted that however valuable the study of language and literature may be, it is not, and cannot be comparable in value with the study of nature: that the most precious faculty we possess, that of observation, which is healthy and vigorous in every young child, becomes dwarfed and stunted, and eventually dwindles away and dies, if his thoughts are forcibly directed throughout his education to books only; and that the process, instead of being in any sense of the word *education*, becomes in reality the most foolish and fatal mental perversion.

You will perhaps think it strange that I, of all men, should so strongly deprecate the exclusive study of the Classics. I can only say that I have bitterly felt the truth of what I am urging; and to all young students who may come to me for help in their classical studies, I say most earnestly—Along with those studies have one other pursuit at least which shall preserve your eyes and your ears from being deadened; it matters not whether that pursuit be Chemistry, or Botany, or any of the branches of Physical Science; only make sure that you have something which will constantly take you away from books and words, and bring you face to face with facts and things.

I have said that a great change is taking place in England. Within my own memory it was quite possible for a student to obtain the highest distinctions which the English Universities could confer, without knowing anything of the literature, laws, or constitution of his native country, without knowing one single word of any modern European language, without knowing one single fact in natural science, without having any acquaintance, worthy of the name, even with the literature of the two languages with which his whole life had been occupied. His sole claim to the distinctions which were conferred upon him might be, and sometimes was, simply a thorough knowledge of the words and grammatical structure of Greek and Latin, together with a fair command of the English language. He need not even know the contents of the books in which the language had been studied. For instead of his grammatical knowledge being used as a key to give access to the treasures of the language, the language might be looked upon as valuable solely for the difficulty of unlocking it, and the treasures within might be neglected altogether—the language might be studied for the sake of the grammar, and

not the grammar for the sake of the language.

I would not be misunderstood in what I am now saying. I do not wish to imply that the scholar who has acquired a masterly use of the Greek, Latin, and English languages has acquired anything contemptible; nor am I ignorant of the great powers of mind, and the close application of which it is the result. "It would take," says Mr. Clark, "many pages to write out at length the inductive syllogisms which have to be proposed and solved in determining the true meaning of a difficult sentence in Thucydides or Tacitus. The facility and rapidity with which an accomplished student does this ought really to enhance in our eyes the value of his previous training—not lead us to depreciate it, or to underrate the difficulties which he is thus enabled to master. Intuitive perception of truth is not a lucky guess, but a masterly condensation of long observation and painful reasoning." I cordially echo these words; and those who have watched the career of many a distinguished lawyer in England will admit that, so far as the training of the reasoning faculties and the growth of habits of intensity and concentration of thought are concerned, the accomplished Greek and Latin scholar has received a better training than he could possibly have obtained by any other means. But still I hold that even this result is dearly bought if it is at the expense, as it sometimes is, of his natural powers of observation; and more dearly still if it has left him ignorant of his own country, and careless of the great events that are happening around him.

What then is the real value of Greek and Latin as a means of education, and what should be the object which the student should set before himself in studying those languages. I think a general answer to this question may be fairly given in a few words: The Greek language is worth studying chiefly for its literature; the Latin language not only for its literature, but more especially for its vocabulary and for its almost perfect grammatical structure. Now if this account of the value of Greek and Latin be generally true—and I think most scholars would allow it to be so—it follows that so far as practical utility is concerned, using the phrase in its lowest sense, neither Greek nor Latin is of very great value to a man whose life is likely to be spent in the ordinary trades or callings of a colony. For it is plain that the success of the merchant, the farmer, the miner, the handicraftsman, do not depend in the slightest degree on his appreciation of the beauties of ancient literature, nor even upon a knowledge of grammar. He may certainly derive some advantage from the study of the ancient languages in obtaining a readier and more accurate insight into the meaning of the numerous words, constantly becoming more numerous, which are incorporated from them into English. But so far as his business is concerned, such an insight can be obtained sufficiently for his purpose from an ordinary English dictionary. There are indeed the learned professions, admission to which is impossible without a certain knowledge of Greek and Latin. To the theologian, the surgeon, the lawyer, the schoolmaster, some acquaintance with the ancient languages is a necessity; and to them, even in the lowest and most commercial sense of the word, classical studies may be said to be valuable. Nor do I wish to say one word which might seem to check the ambition of those who will, I hope, resort to this University for assistance in enabling them to enter those honourable professions.

When, however, I speak of the value of Greek and Latin as a means of education, I am speaking not of a special but a general value, and of an education not for a special purpose but such as every man would desire to have, no matter what his trade or profession, provided it were within his reach. I speak, in short, of what our grandfathers called a "polite" and what we call a "liberal" education; one which will enlarge the powers, cultivate the taste, refine the manners of him who obtains it; an education which in England is open to a few; in Scotland, I believe to many; but which here ought to be open to all.

Viewing the question then in this light, it may, I think, be said generally that the Greek language is valuable chiefly for its literature. It is true that a knowledge of the words themselves is not without importance. There are sciences, Botany for instance, the phraseology of which is taken largely from the Greek. But still in all such cases a right understanding of the meaning of the scientific terms depends not so much on a knowledge of the Greek words from which they are derived as on an actual acquaintance with the thing or quality of which they are the symbols. Take for instance such a word as *cotyledon* in Botany, or *artery* in Anatomy. It is the actual dissection of the seed of the plant, and the actual examination of the body which alone can give a right understanding of the meaning of the words. And in such cases all that a knowledge of Greek can do for us is to satisfy our curiosity as to their etymology, and perhaps also to make it easier for us to learn and remember them. This, however, would be but a poor compensation for the long labour and study necessary to make a student even moderately acquainted with the Greek language; and therefore I think I am justified in saying that the chief value of the study of Greek is, that it introduces us to the unrivalled literature of Greece. To shew what the value of that literature is it would be easy to quote high authorities. I will content myself with giving the words of one who, from the direction of his own studies, would be very unlikely to set an excessive value on an acquaintance with Greek literature. Mr. Marsh in his lectures on the English language has the following passage:—"I cannot speak of even Greek as being of any such value in reference to English grammar or etymology, as to make its acquisition a well-spent labour, unless it is pursued for other purposes than those of

domestic philology. But, that I may not be misunderstood, let me repeat, that so far from dissuading from the study of Greek as a branch of general education, I do but echo the universal opinion of all persons competent to pronounce on the subject, in expressing my own conviction that the language and literature of ancient Greece constitute the most efficient instrument of mental training ever enjoyed by man; and that a familiarity with that wonderful speech, its poetry, its philosophy, its eloquence, and the history it embalms, is incomparably the most valuable of intellectual possessions." These words, coming from the mouth of a highly educated American, a man of the world, one holding high diplomatic position, one moreover whose literary labours have been chiefly spent on the English language and literature, seem to me to have a force and weight far greater than they would have possessed had they been the words of a scholar trained in an English University, and accustomed from boyhood to look upon a correct knowledge of Greek as one of the highest human accomplishments.

If, however, the study of Greek is to be pursued for the sake chiefly of the literature, it follows that anything short of such an acquaintance with the language as will enable us to read that literature easily and with pleasure to ourselves, will be but lost labour. And this is, I think, true. There is nothing more elevating both to the moral and intellectual nature than to become familiar with great works of genius; and the remains of Greek literature are among the greatest: they are the grand originals of which more modern works have for the most part been copies. But for a student to acquire such a mastery of the Greek language as will enable him to read with pleasure the great works of Greek literature, several years of unremitting labour are necessary; and unless this labour can be given, I would not advise any one, simply for the sake of the process itself, to commence the study of Greek. To quote the words of Professor Seeley:—"What avail all the merits and beauties of the Classics to those who never attain to appreciate them? If they never arrive, what was the use of their setting out? That a country is prosperous and pleasant is a reason for going to it, but it is not a reason for going half way to it. If you cannot get all the way to America, you had better surely go somewhere else." Those, however, who can face the labour of the journey may feel sure of a sufficient reward; and the labour, great as it is, is constantly lightened by the prospects which open upon us at every turn of the road.

With the study of Latin the case is very different. It is not only that the literature is valuable, but every Latin word stored in the memory is valuable also. The Romance languages, as they are called, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, are derived so entirely from the Latin that we are even told by those acquainted with them that the greater part of the labour of acquiring them is removed by a previous knowledge of Latin. I need not speak of the vast number of Latin words in our own language: a number which has been estimated by Archbishop Trench at thirty per cent, of the whole number of words in use, and which is every year increasing. Surely with these facts before us it must be admitted that every word of Latin learnt is a gain to him who learns it, and that no time is lost which is spent in obtaining even a superficial knowledge of that language. But a knowledge of Latin is valuable not only nor even chiefly for the sake of the words. Its highest value lies in this, that it has been pronounced by competent authorities to be far beyond any other language, ancient or modern, perfect in its grammatical structure. "The Latin language," says Mr. Marsh, "is a universal key to all language, a general type of comparison whereby to try all other modes of human speech." And again: "The Latin grammar has become a general standard wherewith to compare that of all other languages, the medium through which all the nations of Christendom have become acquainted with the structure and the philosophy of their own: and technical grammar, the mechanical combinations of language, can be nowhere else so advantageously studied." The Latins were indeed, as Professor Munro calls them, "a nation of grammarians." The science of grammar was elaborated by them as it never has been by any other nation. For centuries the keenest intellects among them were unceasingly employed in bringing the language to perfection; and the result is, that for directness and logical precision, and consequently as a field for the study of the science of grammar, the Latin language is unequalled. "That singleness of purpose," says Professor Thomson, "by which the Roman achieved the mastery of the world, is as clearly indicated in the unswerving correctness of his grammatical usages, as in the unswerving directness of his military roads."

Of the value of the Latin literature I need not speak at great length. In literature as in art, the Romans followed directly in the footsteps of the Greeks: and much of their literature, beautiful as it is, shines only with a borrowed light. In one branch only they were originators. But their excellence in that one branch made them the rulers of the world, and has been, and will be to the end of time, the model for all succeeding nations. I allude of course to their skill as law-makers. "Legal science," says Mr. Maine, "is a Roman creation." It would be an impertinence in one who has not received a legal education to attempt to enlarge on the advantages to be derived by the English law student from a study of Roman law. The greatness of those advantages has been established by the decision of those who alone are competent to pronounce upon the question: and it is enough to say that the Inns of Court and the Incorporated Law Society require that a candidate shall possess a sufficient knowledge of Roman law, in the original Latin, before he can be admitted to either branch of the legal profession: and in the examination of law students this subject is every year becoming of higher importance.

Moreover, it is not only to the law student that this branch of Latin literature is valuable. Mr. Maine says, "I know nothing more wonderful than the variety of sciences to which Roman law, Roman contract law more particularly, has contributed modes of thought, courses of reasoning, and a technical language. Of the subjects which have whetted the intellectual appetite of the moderns, there is scarcely one, except Physics, which has not been filtered through Roman jurisprudence. The science of pure Metaphysics had indeed rather a Greek than a Roman parentage, but Politics, Moral Philosophy, and even Theology, found in Roman law not only a vehicle of expression, but a nidus in which some of their profoundest enquiries were nourished into maturity." And further on he speaks of Roman law as "the most plentiful source of the stream of modern knowledge, the one intellectual result of the Roman civilisation,"

Now there may be some parts of ancient literature which may be understood not perhaps adequately, but sufficiently for the purposes of an ordinary liberal education, through English translations. But this cannot be said of Roman law. It is incapable of translation. We have embodied words and phrases from it in our own language; and it is impossible, without a knowledge of Latin, and without seeing the words themselves *in situ*, to use a geological expression, to have even a remote perception of their meaning. If then the passages I have quoted be not exaggerations—and lawyers are not usually prone to exaggerate—there is abundant reason why every Englishman should become acquainted with Roman literature, even if Lucretius, and Catullus, and Cicero, and Virgil had never existed.

I have referred to the studies of Greek and Latin, and have pointed out a few only of the most striking peculiarities of each which make them valuable as a means of education. There are other features common to both studies which, though they ought not to be forgotten, yet do not require that I should speak of them at great length. I have already alluded incidentally to one of these. I have said that the study of the Greek and Latin languages makes a man a close and powerful reasoner. I will add that the kind of reasoning on which the mind of the student is exercised is similar to that which he will have to employ in all the concerns of life. And in this respect the study of the Classics possesses an inestimable advantage over that of Mathematics, and even over that of many of the natural sciences. The chemist, for instance, makes an experiment with certain results. He knows that if the same experiment be repeated under precisely similar conditions, the same results must inevitably follow. He never has to use his judgment in weighing probabilities. His life is spent among certainties. The mathematician, starting either from some given fact or from some admitted axiom, proceeds by necessary deductions, each step being the inevitable consequence of the preceding one; and when he arrives at his ultimate result he finds that throughout the process his judgment has never once been called into play; he has not in fact even reasoned; the work has been done, so to speak, mechanically; and in the ordinary concerns of life the instrument which he has employed (for I cannot call it a faculty) will never on any single occasion stand him in stead. I speak especially of pure analytical Mathematics, and of the method ordinarily employed by the mathematical student in that part of his studies. I am well aware that nearly all great discoveries have been made by a very different process. The great physical laws, although their certainty may afterwards be established by deductions made on the assumption of their truth, must yet have been originally discovered by observation and induction. These great discoveries, however, have nothing to do with the ordinary training of the mathematical student. The eminent men to whom we owe them have been something more than mere mathematicians.

On the other hand let us analyse the process employed by the classical student. First of all, in discovering the meaning of words, and in arriving at grammatical principles, he is, or ought to be, constantly occupied in collecting, comparing, and classifying examples; and in every separate example he has to decide between conflicting probabilities. Even in the case of the youngest student, whose faith has to be pinned to his lexicon and grammar, even he has, in a less degree, to employ the same process. For his lexicon gives him many meanings for each word, and out of these he has to select the most suitable; and his grammar, though it gives him a number of rules, yet does not inform him which rule he must apply in the particular case, one perhaps which may be susceptible of several interpretations. At every step the classical student must use his memory, taste, and judgment; and his decision, when he arrives at it, is made on precisely similar grounds to those upon which he will have to decide in all the affairs of life—on the grounds, namely, of probability—of moral and not mathematical certainty.

I have already referred to the habit of concentration which the classical student acquires. There is a common defect in the mind which the Greeks denoted by the epithet *kouphonous*, an epithet which Sophocles applies to birds; and probably from this circumstance Bacon describes the same defect by the epithet "bird-witted." It is that habit of wandering from a subject to which children especially are liable. His Honor Mr. Justice Chapman, in his excellent remarks upon the value of classical studies, insisted particularly on their efficacy in curing this defect, and I need not repeat what he then said. I will only remark that although, I believe, some other studies, Mathematics for instance, may be equally efficacious with Classics, yet the study of English provides no sufficient remedy, but on the contrary, if not narrowly watched, is apt to aggravate the

disease. And it would be well if those who, not very wisely, maintain the sufficiency of English as an instrument of education, would lay this matter to heart. It is most common indeed for a person, when this wandering habit of mind has taken hold of him, to hear, read, and even repeat long passages of English, not one word of which has really affected his mind. He has heard the sounds, but they have struck his ear much as they might have struck the ear of a sleeper, who hears indeed, but is not awakened. Of all habits this is the most pernicious, and unfortunately our parents and teachers take great pains to implant it in our minds. In our very earliest years we are taught to repeat sentences and phrases, of the meaning of which we have not even the most remote conception. The consequence is, that the child contracts the habit of saying or hearing one thing and thinking of another. If there be any benefits derived from teaching a young child catechisms and formularies, I am convinced they are infinitely outweighed by this serious and almost universal mischief.

Now when we come to a difficult language like Greek or Latin we cannot, if we would, repeat the words in that dreamy half-conscious manner in which we may accustom ourselves to repeat English. In English we know the meaning of the separate words, and the sounds being familiar may easily pass by us unheeded. But in reading Greek or Latin our attention is arrested at every moment. If we pass over a syllable we must go back for it, or else we are lost altogether. It seems to be chiefly for this reason that classical studies encourage the growth of habits of concentration.

It is often asserted that an Englishman cannot really understand or appreciate the literature of his own country unless he is acquainted with the masterpieces of Greek and Latin. This subject is a very wide one, and I can do no more than just refer to it in the limits of this lecture. That the vast majority of English writers have drawn largely from classical sources cannot be denied; and it is I think true, that to be able to appreciate them perfectly we must place ourselves in their position—we must drink at the spring at which they drank—we must go to the same temple at which they received inspiration. But it has been also argued with considerable force that Shakespere, the greatest name of all, though he certainly must have been well acquainted with a good deal of the contents of ancient literature, was yet only acquainted with it at second hand: that for understanding him, at any rate, we need do no more; and that for understanding more Latinised writers, English translations of the Classics are, though not perfect, still for ordinary readers amply sufficient. I acknowledge the force of this argument, and I confess that if it be only for the purpose of appreciating our English literature, it is not worth while in my opinion to spend many years in the acquisition of Greek and Latin.

There is one more point to which I must allude, and that is the invaluable effect of the study of the ancient languages in giving us mastery in writing and speaking our own. I shall have to refer to this subject again when I come to speak of the study of English. I will only say now that it seems to me impossible to imagine any better or more efficacious means of learning to write and speak English than that of translating from another language; and further, that in translating from Greek and Latin we have this immense advantage, that while the modes of thought of the classical writers often correspond closely with our own, yet the idioms of the language are completely different, so that we have the two essential requisites for such an exercise—a complete understanding of an author's meaning, and the necessity of entirely altering the form in which he has clothed it.

But it is time that I should say a few words concerning the method which I propose to follow in studying the ancient Classics. There are two extremes to be avoided. There is the one to which I have already alluded—that of mistaking the means for the end, of attending too closely to the niceties of grammatical structure, to the neglect of the real scope and meaning of the author. And there is the opposite and much more dangerous one of reading in a careless and superficial manner, raising up a showy building with no foundation, deluding ourselves with the idea that we are becoming imbued with the spirit of the ancients, and forgetting that in the study of language and literature, as in painting, breadth and freedom of handling, unless it be the result of long-continued, laborious, and minute industry, is nothing better than slovenliness.

How then are we to combine the two things—an intelligent appreciation of an author, and a thorough acquaintance with his language and its grammatical structure? Let us take an illustration. How do we get a thorough knowledge of the geography of a country? Is it by following up every gully—by exploring every piece of swamp, or bush? Or is it by mounting to a height and getting a general survey of the whole? I answer—by both. The details will be perplexing without the general view; and the general view will be vague and worthless without the details. So with the study of Latin and Greek authors. Let us not be afraid of the minute and often tedious labour of mastering verbal difficulties. Let us not grudge the necessary toil of translation and re-translation. There is no other way of obtaining facility in the use or understanding of a language; and secondly, let us read an author *generously*. Not piece-meal as we have been of necessity compelled to do at school, but in masses. And when we have patiently and carefully studied every sentence, let us endeavour, by a rapid review of the whole work, to get a connected and comprehensive idea of the author's meaning. Again, in translating from English into Greek or Latin, you will find the converse method invaluable. First get your general view, and then fill in your details. After writing numerous exercises in the style, suppose of Cicero; take one of these—examine every word that you have used, even the most familiar of them

minutely—take your lexicon and find out how Cicero has used the same word in analogous sentences. The operation is tedious, but it is effectual; and a few hours spent in this way once in every five or six weeks will be amply repaid.

You will observe that I have said nothing concerning the practice, almost universal in schools, of committing to memory rules of grammar. The omission was intentional. I believe such an exercise to be in the great majority of cases not only worthless but mischievous. Use grammars by all means, but use them rationally, and treat them as books of reference. I look back with astonishment at the prodigious waste of time which was caused in my own younger days by committing to memory pages and pages of indigestible rules of grammar—rules which, though they could be repeated when called for, were never really applied in practice; for the simple reason that all boys, and, I believe, nearly all men, invariably reason from particulars to particulars, and never from generals to particulars. Learning by heart, it is true, is one of the most useful exercises in studying any language: but it is passages from good authors which should be committed to memory—passages of which the meaning and grammar already are well understood, not the rules of grammar, which when taken neat are, to my stomach at least, both nauseous and indigestible. There may be others of more cormorant-like digestion who can assimilate grammar pure and simple; but I find at any rate that my own experience corresponds with that of Professor Thomson and Professor Seeley, both of them high authorities in any question connected with classical studies.

But I will go further. Even in the very rare cases, if there be any, in which the rules of grammar are remembered and applied, and make—so to speak—a short cut for the student in learning to write Greek or Latin correctly, even there the process, instead of being beneficial, is, I believe, most hurtful. For it is not rules but principles of grammar which we want to get at. And these principles can only be seen by an intelligent comparison of actual passages taken from classical authors, in fact by a process of careful and systematic induction. I will give one single example of what I mean. The usual school Latin grammars give a short rule to the effect, that when the relative pronoun is used to denote "cause," it has to be followed by the subjunctive mood. Now if this rule were universally true, which I do not think it is, it would be far better learnt by seeing one or two actual examples in the course of reading, than by loading the memory with the trash in which grammatical rules are usually written. Now, instead of learning the rule, suppose a student met with a case where the relative pronoun, in a causal sense, was followed by the subjunctive. An intelligent tutor would first remind him that an idea may be represented in two ways, either as a thing actually existing, or as a thing conceived in the mind—that the Romans had a language capable of making it perfectly clear which of the two notions was intended, and that the subjunctive proved that it was the latter that was intended, and not the former; and he might quote from his own memory, or from any scientific grammar, instances in which the same principle was involved, including many in which the relative pronoun might be used in other senses besides that of a cause. Is there not here all the difference between an intelligent perception of a principle and a blind submission to a rule neither understood, nor in this case, as I believe, even true? In the one case, it seems to me, a student is led to reason and think for himself; in the other, even if the rule were true, he would simply be using the lowest and most parrot-like kind of memory, and at the same time would be learning the very worst lesson which it is possible for a reasonable being to learn—that, namely, of submitting blindly to authority when the reason is neither satisfied nor even touched.

I have detained you rather too long on this subject, but, if I do not overrate its importance, it is one the right understanding of which makes all the difference between a man of thought and a man of words, between a scholar and a pedant.

It is for this very reason that the most thoughtful men of our time are coming to the conclusion that the study of Latin should be deferred until the age, say of 14 or 15, by which time a boy has his reasoning faculties developed sufficiently to enable him to grasp the principles of grammar, and can study it as a science, not as a mere collection of arbitrary rules. If the subject is begun at too early an age, it must of necessity be treated unscientifically. "In the contest between the children and the grammar," says Professor Seeley, "the children have the better. They have more influence upon it than it has upon them. Instead of the children becoming grammatical the grammar becomes childish."

There is a passage in Locke which, though not referring especially to the study of grammar, but to reading in general, is yet so apt to what I have been saying that I shall not apologise for quoting it; and if the quotation should have the effect of inducing any one to read and think carefully over the short but valuable essay in which it is contained, it will not have been thrown away. "The mind," he says, "is backward in itself to be at the pains to trace every argument to its original, and to see upon what basis it stands, and how firmly; but yet it is this that gives so much the advantage to one man more than another in reading. The mind should by severe rules be tied down to this at first uneasy task; use and exercise will give it facility. So that those who are accustomed to it, readily, as it were with one cast of the eye, take a view of the argument, and presently in most cases see where it bottoms. Those who have got this faculty, one may say, have got the true key of books, and the clue to

lead them through the mizmaze of variety of opinions and authors to truth and certainty. This young beginners should be entered in, and showed the use of, that they might profit by their reading. Those who are strangers to it will be apt to think it too great a clog in the way of men's studies, and they will suspect they shall make but small progress if in the books they read they must stand to examine and unravel every argument, and follow it step by step up to its original. I answer, *this is a good objection, and ought to weigh with those whose reading is designed for much talk and little knowledge, and I have nothing to say to it.* But I am here inquiring into the conduct of the understanding in its progress towards knowledge; and to those who aim at that I may say, that he who fair and softly goes steadily forward in a course that points aright, will sooner be at his journey's end than he that runs after every one he meets, though he gallop all day full speed."

We come now to the study of the English language and literature; and this is, I confess, the most difficult subject with which I have to deal. For, strange as it may seem, it is comparatively a new subject. There is not at the present time in either of the old English Universities a Professor of the English Language and Literature. It is true there are English Professorships at the Scotch Universities: but in the short visit which I was able to pay to Edinburgh and Glasgow I could gain but a very imperfect idea of the method followed there; and from the examination papers which I have seen, that method seems to be one which I should be both unable and unwilling to adopt. For, so far as I can judge, it is one which is exactly adapted to foster and encourage that very vice which it should be the especial object of a University to eradicate—I mean shallowness and superficiality.

I am compelled, therefore, to strike out a line for myself. In the first place it is in this subject, above all others, most important that we should be on our guard against the danger of mistaking mere talk for knowledge. In the study of the words of the English language, and still more in the study of English literature, the student is constantly exposed to the temptation of adopting other men's opinions and fancying them to be his own. Almost every one has a tendency to do this, and this tendency is greatly encouraged by the periodical literature of the day. Even such a book as "Trench on the study of words," interesting though it is, to my mind is a most dangerous book for a student. For the conclusions at which the author has arrived, although they represent the results of long and careful labour spent by the author himself, are easily caught up and appropriated by a reader, and he may be tempted to talk of the sense in which Wyclif, for instance, has used a certain word, when all the time Wyclif's writings may be entirely unknown to him, except through Archbishop Trench's book. If this is to be the result of reading such treatises, it would be far better that they should not be read at all, or that, having been read, they should speedily be forgotten.

But this tendency to display and the affectation of knowledge is much greater and more dangerous in the case of the literature than in the case of the language. How many persons are there who saunter pleasantly through the pages of the "Academy," for instance, or the "Athenæum," dipping into reviews of books, taking up opinions about their styles and merits, learning—for the time only—just enough to supply them with a fund of literary small-talk, but never gathering the smallest grain of real knowledge, nor acquiring the slightest interest in the works which form the subject of their conversation. And the mischief which thus results from the reading of periodicals is, I think, certain to follow from attending lectures, as they are ordinarily conceived, on English literature.

The popular idea of a lecture on this subject is, I imagine, something of this kind. The lecturer is supposed to take up some such subject as "The dramatists of the reign of Queen Elizabeth." He will first give a rapid and interesting sketch of the rise and progress of dramatic representations in England. Having done this he will take the reign of Elizabeth; he will review the events of that reign; he will give a string of names of soldiers, statesmen, divines, philosophers, and poets—pausing here and there to speak more particularly of the achievements of one more celebrated than the rest. He will perhaps give a short sketch of the condition of literature at the commencement of the reign. He will then come to his real subject: he will describe wittily and pleasantly the styles of Greene, Peele, and Marlowe. (I take these names from a text-book on English Literature; I have not myself read a single play written by any one of them). He will now come to Shakspeare. He will tell us (at second hand) all that antiquarians have been able to discover of his biography. He will give a list of his plays, describing the plots of the most celebrated, and informing us (again at second hand) from what sources those plots were derived. He will quote Schlegel, and Coleridge, and Hallam—perhaps even Goethe, or at least Carlyle's translation. It is to be hoped (for there will surely be a few grains of wheat scattered among this intolerable amount of chaff) that he will read for our benefit some at least of the more striking scenes from a few of the plays. Having despatched Shakspeare he will proceed to the less important authors. He will have a few words to say about Ben Jonson, about Beaumont and Fletcher, about Massinger and Ford. He will no doubt institute comparisons between those authors and Shakspeare, and finally perhaps he will hazard a few opinions of his own, or quote those of others, as to the general effect which all these writers have produced on the language, literature, and morals of the English nation.

I think this is not an unfair description of the generally-received notion of what a lecture, or course of

lectures on English literature, should be. It would no doubt be a pleasant though an unprofitable amusement to attend such a course. Nay, it might even be profitable to those who attend, not for the purpose of getting knowledge, but for the purpose of enabling themselves to talk as if they had got it. But to all who went with the honest intention of learning, it would be the most utter waste of time. And if, in addition to this, the student were expected to pass an examination in the subject—if he were expected, that is, to have remembered and adopted the views propounded in the lecture room—it would not be merely a waste of time, it would be a most serious and lasting mischief. It would be a mischief if the views of the lecturer were erroneous, for they might remain in the student's mind uncorrected. It would be a still greater mischief if they were true and original, for the student would be more likely to rest satisfied with them, and less likely to undertake the labour of reading the authors for himself. And whether the views of the lecturer were true or false, it would have the effect of encouraging the vice of which I have already spoken—the vice of affecting a knowledge which we do not actually possess: or it might engender the still more dangerous and hardly less contemptible habit of resigning ourselves to other men's opinions, surrendering, and ultimately losing altogether our own power of independent judgment.

Again, it is, I believe, customary in almost all English classes for the students to be put frequently to the task of writing original essays, or even original poetry, on given subjects. Now if the subject be one with which the student is really familiar, one which he has thought out for himself, and on which he has got something of his own to say, then the writing of an original essay is no doubt an exceedingly useful and valuable exercise. It gives shape, consistency, and clearness to his thoughts. But how many of such subjects are there? Is it not almost a certainty that in the majority of cases he will really have nothing to say, and that he will then either be driven to read, from existing authors, disconnected fragments bearing on his subject, or he will be compelled to make the best of his own barren ideas, to whip up his small modicum of cream into a showy and frothy syllabus. Such an exercise as this would be little if at all better than that affectation of knowledge to which I have just alluded. If we have nothing to say on a subject, by all means let us remain silent; and if we have, our labour should be employed in condensing it as much as possible, not in diluting it—in expressing it not in many words, but in few.

What then is the province of the lecturer? and how is the student to derive more benefit from attending lectures than from private reading? I answer: First, there are, I have no doubt, some students who would *not* benefit by attending lectures. These who have had their interest in the great works of English literature already awakened, who already feel a delight in reading our great masters, and who can understand what they read—such students as these need no lecturer to help them. The only possible benefit they could derive from a lecturer would be that of comparing notes with him, of ascertaining whether their interpretation of the meaning and their sense of the beauties of an author agreed with his. But it would be a clear waste of time for such students to attend regular classes; and I hope none such will attend.

The province of the lecturer I conceive to be something of this sort: First of all to awaken an interest in the mind of his students; to read passages from the author whose works are to be the subject of their study; and to give them, if he can, a keen appetite for more. For the same purpose of awakening their interest, *and for no other*, he may quote from writers on such subjects short passages to show the estimation in which the author is held, and the position in English literature to which he is entitled. Having done this, he has done all that he can do as a lecturer; he must now be a fellow-student, and as a fellow-student he must read through the works of his author carefully and systematically along with his class. He must notice the history and meaning of words, especially of such as are used in a different sense from that in which we commonly use them; where the meaning of a passage is difficult or doubtful, he must suggest what seems to him the most likely interpretation; where the grammatical construction is involved, he must analyse it. And when he has in this way gone through a sufficient portion of his author, let him return to the beginning, and endeavour, by reading it through consecutively, to get a clear and comprehensive view of the whole. This is the only way that I know of, or can imagine, by which we can acquire a real knowledge of English literature. It will probably be objected, that if we adopt this method our progress will be but slow, and the results will hardly be commensurate with our expectations. To this I can only answer with Locke—"This is a good objection, and I have nothing to say to it."

Again, in studying English as a language, and in practising ourselves in the use of it, by far the best and most effectual exercise that I know of is, that of translating from other languages into English. Those of my students who study Greek or Latin as well as English must look to translation especially as the means of improving them in the use of the latter. For those who study English alone, some substitute must be provided. Several may be devised. Two of the most useful would be those of condensing, and reproducing from memory uncondensed, passages from any English author. I remember that in the working men's college at Cambridge one of the exercises was that of paraphrasing an author. And Professor Seeley apparently approves of this practice. He says "the exertion of clothing a thought in a completely new set of words increases both clearness of thought and mastery over words." I would not venture to contradict so high an authority, but I am sure that in



many cases at any rate the effect of paraphrasing an author will be simply to obscure his meaning; and if we clearly understand that meaning, and if the author has, as he probably has, carefully chosen the best words to express it, the advantage of finding a less perfect expression would not seem to be very great. After all, the one infallible way to improve our own English is—constantly to read, study, and imbue ourselves with the best models; and this not that we may become mere copyists of their styles, but chiefly that we may enlarge our vocabulary, and perfect ourselves in those grammatical usages which are observed by all good writers. As to the advantage of increasing our vocabulary, it is enough to mention that Mr. Marsh estimates the whole number of English words actually in use at one hundred thousand. "Out of our immense magazine of words," he adds, "and their combinations, every man selects his own implements and weapons;" and he goes on to say that persons of fair intelligence do not make use of more than three or four thousand out of the hundred thousand words we possess; that even Shakespere only uses fifteen thousand, and Milton not more than eight thousand.

I have, I hope, indicated with sufficient clearness the course which I propose to take in dealing with my three subjects. I will conclude by adding a few words of caution. From the unexpected number of those who have entered their names as students, I am afraid there may possibly be some who expect that by attending University lectures they will be able to acquire knowledge easily and without much exertion. They may imagine that there is some superior virtue residing in an Institution called by the high-sounding name of a University, or in a tutor glorified into a Professor. If there be any who have deluded themselves in this way, by all means let them shake off their delusion. As for the Professors they will have to be in many cases what I have called them—fellow-students. Indeed they *must* be learning themselves if their work is to be effective. They must be like running water, receiving as well as giving, if they are to supply anything wholesome and pleasant to their students. As soon as they cease learning themselves, they will become like stagnant pools—flat, vapid, and unwholesome. And let it never be forgotten that the main part—I had almost said the whole—of the work that is done must be done by the student himself in private. When he comes to the lecture-room he can *test* what he has learnt by himself, but it is at home in his own study that the labour must be gone through. And after all, the function of a University is not to *teach*—a phrase hateful in itself, and which ought to have no existence outside of the walls of a nursery—but to *educate*; that is, to draw out what is already within, to induce a student to work, and to think for himself; to bring out and call into vigorous exercise the faculties which he possesses, not to attempt to pour in draughts of ready-made information, an attempt most mischievous when made, and in which, fortunately for us, success is impossible.

## Professor Shand's Introductory Lecture.

MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

ON so interesting an occasion as the opening of a University in New Zealand, I may be permitted to congratulate the Council and the Public on the auspicious commencement of their important enterprise. It is a proper object of ambition for a rising colony like New Zealand, separated, as it is, by many leagues of ocean from older States, to possess within itself the means of recruiting the learned professions, and of giving to its own youth that higher training and culture which is so necessary to the intellectual development of the individual, and so essential to the refinement and progress of the whole community. For some years to come, no doubt, the College, which has now been happily opened, will be limited in its resources, and modest in its aspirations. It will have to pass through trials which it will require the exercise of much skill and patience to meet. It may even encounter dangers which it will demand both courage and energy to overcome. But this is only the law that regulates the growth of all human institutions. No University has ever yet started, like Minerva, into life full-grown and completely equipped. All have had their small beginnings, and have required the fostering care of successive generations to bring about their ultimate development. I need not repeat what the Hon. Major Richardson, our Chancellor, told you in his Inaugural Address about the early history of the now flourishing and efficient Universities of the sister Australian Colonies. But the rule of infinitesimally small beginnings is not confined to Colonial Universities. The ancient Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, now the glory and the pride of England, which have exercised, and which still do exercise, so powerful an influence on her thought and intellectual progress, were so modest and unpretending in their origin that no one even ventures to assign the exact date when they came into being. It would be presumptuous to anticipate that our young Institution will ever rival the renown of these famous seats of English learning; but one may venture, perhaps, to augur that it has before it, if not a great, at least a respectable and useful future, and that, in the present age and in a growing colony, its progress will be unusually rapid.

The disadvantages under which we labour as a new Institution are too obvious to require even a passing reference. The older Universities of the mother country have very much to guide and stimulate them that to us will necessarily be wanting. But in one respect, at least, it may be to our advantage that we have no past and no

history. We are, as yet, unwedded to obsolete educational theories; we are not committed to antiquated text-books; we are unfettered by bygone traditions; we are embarrassed by no vested interests. We have the opportunity of starting fairly abreast of the age in which we live; marking, out our course of study in accordance with the spirit of modern ideas, and adapting our instruction to the requirements of our own circumstances and our own times.

The public mind in Britain has lately been a good deal occupied with the discussion of the question, whether the Natural Sciences ought to be admitted to a prominent place in the ordinary instruction of our Public Schools. Hitherto our educational authorities have been content, for the most part, to plod on in their old routine, untroubled by the thought that changes so vast in the material and intellectual conditions of society, as those which the nineteenth century has brought about, demand corresponding changes in the training that is to fit our youth for the battle-field of life. Science has grown up in our midst into a mighty and beneficent influence, ameliorating the physical condition of mankind, and scattering blessings with lavish hand among all classes of the community—but those who direct our educational destinies can see in this new power nothing that deserves recognition, or needs encouragement; it has opened up and interpreted to us the book of Nature—but our instructors can find nothing written therein which they deem worthy of our learning. I am aware that it has been urged in apology for such a state of things, that the study of the Sciences does not afford sufficient scope for mental discipline. But this I take to be one of those transparent fallacies, which some-times succeed for a series of years in maintaining a precarious struggle for existence by dint of incessant reiteration. I know of no faculty of the human mind which is not capable of being liberally exercised by a comprehensive course of scientific studies. Viewed merely as an intellectual gymnasium, I believe that the Sciences, judiciously taught, would prove as superior to any other study, as they are pre-eminent and indeed unapproachable in the interest and utility of their results. And surely the advantage cannot be overrated of early imbuing the minds of our youth with scientific tastes and scientific ideas, which would provide them in after life with an unfailing mental resource and an inexhaustible fund of intellectual enjoyment.

There is another, and, in my opinion, a still more important aspect presented by this important question. I have spoken of the advantage of a scientific training to the individual; I have still a word or two to say on the benefits which the community would derive from the more general cultivation of science. There can be no question of the debt that Britain owes to science. It is the basis not merely of her power and her material greatness, but it finds the very means of subsistence for a large portion of her redundant population. If gratitude cannot induce her to protect and cherish her benefactor, should she not have some care for her own future destinies? I do not doubt that individual Englishmen will be found in the future, as they have always been found in the past, pressing forward among the foremost in the ranks of scientific explorers. The irrepressible bent of genius will ever assert itself, not merely without encouragement, but in spite of obstacles. But is it quite safe for Britain, when other nations are beginning earnestly to bestir themselves, to trust her future prosperity to the isolated efforts of amateur workers? Would it not be wise for her, through the instrumentality of her Universities, of her Colleges, and of her ordinary Schools, as well as by means of Technical Schools widely planted and efficiently supported, to spread scientific information broadcast among the masses, and to develop, with a view to utilise the scientific capabilities of her ingenious people? If the workmen at her forges, the engineers on her locomotives, the spinners in her mills, were familiar with the facts and principles of chemistry, of steam, and of mechanics—all intent on the means of improving the machinery and processes which they direct—if there were thousands of workers, in place of units, in a field which is wide enough for the co-operation of all, who can tell at what rate of acceleration the material prosperity of Britain would advance? There are signs that these considerations are beginning to sink deeply into the public mind, and that the time is slowly but irresistibly approaching when the pressure from without will compel a complete revolution in our English system of school instruction.

I have spoken of this question with exclusive reference to the mother country, where I have taken for a good many years a humble share in the active work of education. How far my remarks apply to New Zealand, in whose education, both scientific and general, I shall henceforth take a warm interest, I cannot as yet pretend to have formed an opinion. You have not had time to perfect your educational system, and you are, perhaps, to be held excused if you have not yet made sufficient provision for the scientific education of your youth; but if you are not resolved to make efforts in this direction as opportunities arise and as your means increase, you will be even more unwise than our educational authorities in England have been—more unwise in the degree that your material resources are less developed. Your railways have still to be constructed, your mineral wealth has still to be explored and brought up from the depths of the earth, you have still to bridge your rivers and excavate your docks. The cables have yet to be laid that are destined in the future to unite your islands with the distant continents. Your power-looms, your spinning-jennies, your steam-hammers, your rolling-mills, have yet to be set in motion. Your navy has still to be built that will distribute your manufactures over the world, and bring back in exchange the wealth and the luxuries of foreign lands. As you wish these visions to be realised, as

you desire the speedy development of your undoubtedly vast resources, cultivate science, for in it you will not fail to find a true friend and most steadfast ally.

It augurs well for the liberality and wisdom with which this University will be directed, that its Council, even with the slender means now at their disposal, have devoted two Chairs to the teaching of science, and have allotted half the time of the students to scientific studies. Science, however, has extended so much, and has ramified into so many distinct divisions, that it will be hardly possibly for either Professor, even in a three or four years' course, to take up all the branches which it lies within his province to treat. When sufficient funds are available for the purpose it will be right to divide the subjects of study attached to each Chair. Thus, Mathematics may with much advantage be separated from Natural Philosophy; and Chemistry from Natural History and Geology. More desirable still, however, in my opinion, than either subdivision would be the founding of a Chair of Practical Science. Such a Professorship, embracing the highly important departments of engineering, mining, and manufactures, would not only constitute an attractive feature in the programme of our University, but might be expected to exercise no small influence in developing the material resources of the Colony.

The duties of the Chair, to which I have had the honour of being appointed, will be somewhat trying and onerous. I have not only had assigned to me the various branches of pure Mathematics—constituting in themselves a sphere sufficiently arduous and comprehensive for the energies of one individual: but it will be my duty also to give a course of instruction in the distinct but cognate sciences which are usually grouped together under the title of Natural Philosophy, and which present a field even more varied and extensive. In another respect, too, I shall be placed in common with my colleagues, in a position of difficulty and disadvantage. Strangers in the Province, imperfectly informed alike of the actual attainments and educational wants of those who are to become our pupils, with very few existing data and no previous experience to guide us, we are about to undertake an important share in the work of establishing the University which has just been opened. We enter on our labours, however, with full confidence that the circumstances in which we are placed will be liberally considered, that our shortcomings—unavoidable at the outset—will be leniently judged, and that you will receive our earnest efforts to perform our respective duties to the best of our ability, less in the spirit of criticism than in that of kindness and encouragement.

I need hardly remind you that there are two methods of investigation recognised in Philosophy: the Deductive and the Inductive methods. Some of the sciences comprehended in my province make use of the deductive method; others employ the inductive; while some avail themselves freely of both. The purely mathematical sciences follow exclusively the deductive method, and in this respect they differ from the other exact sciences—the physico-mathematical. These latter, it is true, are also deductive in form, but they are founded upon principles which involve the properties of Matter, such as inertia, gravity, and density; and which must therefore have been obtained *inductively* from the results of observation and experience. The elementary principles of Mathematics, on the other hand, flow necessarily and obviously from purely abstract conceptions, such as space, quantity, number: they in no way depend upon experience, and it is even inconceivable that they should be otherwise than they are. We have here to do with necessary truth, and the results are as certain and as necessary as the principles on which they are based. It is in this field—dealing with necessary truth—that the deductive method shows itself to best advantage. It is here that it has piled, upon the simplest foundations, its hugest, its most wonderful and most imperishable superstructure.

And yet it is true that no fact can be evolved by deduction from elementary principles which is not implicitly contained in the principles themselves. The explanation of this apparent paradox is furnished by the consideration, that the method of deduction, which would be useless to a perfect intelligence, owes its value as a means of discovering truth to the limitations of the human intellect. Were our intelligence perfect we should have no use for such a science, for example, as Geometry. Geometrical truths would be perceived not as depending upon and flowing from one another, but as equally primary and co-ordinate. No fact in Geometry is anterior or posterior to another. None is cause, and none effect. All are co-existent, and to a sufficient intelligence all would appear equally simple and axiomatic; and in many cases they would seem but different expressions of the same obvious truth. The human faculties, however, are far removed from this state of ideal perfection, and it is necessary to present mathematical truths in a deductive and logical form, evolving conception after conception, and fact after fact, from others which are not in themselves anterior or pre-existent, but which have previously been evolved and grasped by the mind. It is equally necessary, in the analytical branches of Mathematics, to represent conceptions more or less complex, and often embodying the results of long antecedent trains of thought, by mere symbols or forms of notation. These conceptions, defined with the most minute precision, and concisely denoted by appropriate symbols, become available as a sort of intellectual counters, by the help of which a tyro can perform calculations, which, without such mental aids, would overtax the powers of a Euler or a Lagrange. Dealing thus with necessary truth, and exclusively deductive in form, the mathematical sciences are the most perfect embodiment that we possess of purely logical thought; and the study

of Mathematics, from the clearness and precision of its conceptions, and the certainty of its conclusions, becomes an admirable training in the forms and processes of pure logic. This logical training, combined with the abstruseness and difficulty presented by mathematical studies, cannot fail to react beneficially upon the intellect in an educational point of view—invigorating the reasoning powers, giving balance to the imagination, inducing the habit of concentrated application, and imparting a healthy tone and strength to the general faculties of the mind.

But even if mathematical studies were less valuable as a means of mental discipline than they unquestionably are, it would be impossible, by reason of their general utility, to exclude them from the curriculum of a liberal education. Mathematical knowledge is required not merely by the engineer, the architect, the surveyor, the mariner, to whom it is indispensably necessary in the daily exercise of their professions; but it is useful to every man in every station of life. In most other studies a little knowledge is, if not positively dangerous, as the poet affirms, at all events exceedingly useless. But the smallest modicum of mathematical knowledge is *pro tanto* valuable. If a man knows only a few mathematical facts, he will meet with occasions in the course of his life for the use of all of them; and he will find himself amply repaid for the trouble of having acquired them. If he knows more, his resources have been proportionately increased; and if he has been fortunate enough to obtain an extended mathematical culture, his intellectual horizon has been indefinitely widened, and he finds himself in possession of the key which can unlock for him all the treasures of science. For Mathematics, philosophically viewed, has two aspects: it is at once an instrument of scientific investigation, and a language, untranslatable into the vulgar tongues, for the expression of scientific truth. It is in this language that the laws are written which govern the physical Universe; and these laws can only be accurately apprehended by those to whom the language is familiar. Every science which does not content itself with simply registering facts and describing phenomena, but which aspires to trace the operation of the forces by which these facts and phenomena are caused and determined, must express itself in mathematical language, and have recourse for its development to mathematical processes. The more a science has become matured, the farther it has advanced from the stage of mere empiricism; the greater the credit which its progress has reflected on the human intellect, the more will that science be found to have availed itself of the aid of Mathematics, and the more dependent it will have become on mathematical methods for the further pursuit of its investigations. Without a competent knowledge of Mathematics a man may indeed enter the outer precincts of the temple of science. He will find there much to instruct and much to delight him. But into the inner court where Nature's most sacred mysteries are exposed to the view of her favoured votaries, he is not permitted to penetrate. As of old, over the entrance to the famous Academy at Athens, he finds inscribed on the portal of that shrine: *No one unskilled in Mathematics may enter here.*

Natural Philosophy, which is the other branch belonging to my department, consists of two principal groups or divisions. The first division embraces the group of sciences which treat of Motion and of the Forces, especially Gravity, which produce or modify motion in bodies; and is at once an indispensable introduction to the Physical Sciences, which form the second division, and a connecting link between them and pure Mathematics. As bodies exist in nature in three physical states or conditions—as solids, liquids, and gases—the group naturally subdivides itself into three corresponding branches; and as the effect of forces acting upon any body may be to produce motion in the body, or, by balancing each other, to maintain a state of rest, we see the group still further subdivided. We thus obtain the sciences which are known as Statics, Dynamics, Hydrostatics, Hydronamics, and Pneumatics. I have called these a group of sciences, but as my remarks have indicated, they are rather branches of one and the same science, which may be called the science of visible motion, considered both abstractly and in relation to Matter in its three physical conditions. The fundamental laws of motion being simple and completely understood, it is possible in these sciences to employ, as in Mathematics, the deductive method of investigation. For this reason, though separated from pure Mathematics by the narrow but well defined line of demarcation which I have already traced, they have assumed the form of mathematical or exact sciences, characterised by the same precision in their conceptions, and the same certainty in their conclusions, and they have consequently received the appellation of the Mixed or Applied branches of Mathematics.

The sciences which form the other group comprehended under the general title of Natural Philosophy are those generally known by the name of Physics. It is not unusual to designate all the scientific branches of knowledge, excepting Mathematics and the Mental Sciences—all the branches, that is, that have to do with external nature—by the name of Natural Science. Most frequently, however, this term is restricted to denote those branches only which are not reckoned among the Physical Sciences. The terms Natural and Physical, derived respectively from the Latin and Greek words for Nature, are really synonymous in meaning, and a good deal of confusion has arisen from the practice of using them sometimes in their wider and sometimes in their restricted signification. It is necessary, therefore, to find a boundary, and, if possible, a principle—for the existing boundary is not irremovable, and will inevitably be disturbed by the advance of science—which will clearly define the limits of Physics, and divide my department from that of my colleague in the Chair of Natural

Science.

Physics, then, claims as especially its own domain the sciences of Astronomy, Heat, Light, Electricity, Magnetism, and Sound; but it also proposes to itself the cultivation of friendly and mutually helpful relations with all the other branches of Natural Science. Thus the atomic weights and the specific heat of bodies, as well as the relations between heat, electricity, and chemical action, are of equal interest to the physicist and to the chemist. Geology appeals to Physics for an explanation of the changes which have taken place in the crust of the earth under the operation of the forces of nature, and supplies the materials which are requisite for their elucidation. Were the laws of molecular action once ascertained, the physicist, entering the province of Mineralogy, would attempt to explain the structure of crystals, and to discover generally the internal constitution of bodies. He would even fain pry into the nature and the working of the vital forces—to call by that name those mysterious agencies, whether they be specific forces, or only modifications of the known forces of inorganic nature, which in organised beings preside over the wondrous phenomena of life.

It was easy to see the bond of union between Astronomy, which has sometimes been called Celestial Dynamics, and which concerns itself chiefly with the motions of the heavenly bodies and the force of gravitation by which these motions are modified, and the first division of Natural Philosophy, which I have called the science of Motion; but the other branches of Physics were no doubt originally grouped together rather by a happy intuition than because the hidden link which joins them was very distinctly perceived. The recent progress of science, however, has cleared away this obscurity, and has made it manifest that what we call Heat, Light, Electricity, and Sound, are only forms of the Energy of Nature, which consists in nothing else than different modes of motion. Light and sound have, indeed, long been recognised to be peculiar motions or vibrations of the media in which they travel. The phenomena of heat on the other hand were supposed, until lately, to be caused by a kind of imponderable fluid called caloric; but the caloric hypothesis is now almost universally abandoned in favour of the dynamical theory, which regards heat as a mode of motion affecting the molecules or particles of a body. The existence of a heat fluid having been definitely disproved, it has become impossible, especially after the experiments of Faraday, to retain any longer the fluid hypothesis in the case of electricity; and there can, I think, be little doubt that electrical action is also a species of molecular motion, whose precise character, however, has not yet been even plausibly imagined.

It will now be readily perceived that Natural Philosophy is nothing else than the science of Energy; and that it divides itself into the branches which I have enumerated, according to the particular form in which the energy displays itself. At one time the whole mass of a body may be separate in visible motion, as in the sciences of Dynamics and Astronomy; at another the energy, by no means less in amount, but invisible and impalpable in form, may consist, as in heat and electricity, in oscillations or vibrations of the ultimate particles or molecules of the substance. It has long been known that these different forces, or, as we may now term them, forms of energy, are closely related, and capable in certain circumstances of mutually producing one another. Thus a current of electricity, itself the product of chemical affinities, is capable of giving rise to heat, and light, and mechanical action. Heat may be caused, as in the steam-engine, to produce mechanical action; and, as in the thermo-electric pile, to give rise to a current of electricity. Mechanical energy again may be made to produce heat and light, as when a piece of iron becomes red hot by hammering on an anvil; or, as in the electrical machine, it may be the exciting cause of the electricity that is separated on the conductor. So long as the fluid theory of heat maintained its footing it was impossible to recognise in these actions an actual transformation of one kind of force into another kind which was supposed to be different in its very essence; but as soon as the dynamical theory of heat is admitted, the step becomes an easy one. In fact, it has of late years been demonstrated, not only that these different forms of energy are mutually convertible, but that they are so in definite proportions or equivalents for each. A certain amount of heat becomes converted into mechanical force: let that mechanical force expend itself in friction or percussion, and precisely the same quantity of heat will be reproduced. The quantity of heat necessary to raise the temperature of a pound of water by one degree, Fahrenheit, will, if converted into mechanical work, raise a pound weight to the height of 772 feet against the force of gravity; and the percussion caused by the fall of a pound weight through 772 feet will produce exactly sufficient heat to raise the temperature of a pound of water one degree, Fahrenheit. Thus 772 foot-pounds is what is termed the mechanical equivalent of heat.

It is the same with respect to the other forces. In effecting their mutual transformations, there is no energy lost, and none created. The same indestructible energy disappears in one shape only to re-appear in another of its various forms. It may lay aside for a time its active character and become latent, as when work is done in opposition to some natural or artificial force; but the energy is not annihilated, it is only laid up in store for future use. It has ceased for a time to be dynamical energy, but it still exists potentially, ready at any moment to reassume its active form. Thus a stone may be rolled up to the top of a mountain, and, while it remains on the summit, the work expended in raising it to that height against the earth's gravitation might be supposed to have vanished for ever from existence; but the stone, in virtue of its new position of advantage with respect to the

force of gravity, possesses now a store of potential energy—it is capable of falling; and if it be allowed to roll down again, it will reproduce, in the form first of visible motion, and ultimately of heat, all the energy which was expended in raising it. When a liquid is evaporated a quantity of active energy in the form of heat becomes latent, or temporarily disappears; but the molecules of the vapour now occupy a position of advantage with respect to the atomic or cohesive forces—they are capable of falling together under the influence of these forces, as a stone falls to the earth in obedience to the force of gravity; and when they do so, in the act of condensation, a quantity of heat, exactly equal to the former absorption of it, will reappear. So, when water is decomposed by a current of electricity, a large expenditure of electric force is requisite to tear its component atoms asunder, and to enable them to assume the gaseous state. But, on the other hand, a store of potential energy has been accumulated in the mixed gases—the atoms of hydrogen and of oxygen have been placed in a position of advantage with respect to the force of chemical affinity—and when they are made to recombine, the fall of the atoms towards one another will develop a quantity of heat which will be the precise equivalent of the electrical force which has disappeared.

Thus, force, so fleeting in its form, is in respect of its essence as indestructible as matter itself. Like matter, it is incapable of being created, and it cannot be annihilated. It may alternate, as in the swing of a pendulum, between the dynamical and potential conditions, but the total amount of energy in these two forms which exists in the Universe remains for ever the same. This is the truly philosophical doctrine of the Conservation of Energy—the grandest scientific conception that in the present age the mind of man has been able to frame.

Like all other great ideas it is not the offspring of any single brain. Dim glimpses of one or another aspect of the grand truth had been obtained by the penetrating eye of genius; it had been laid bare, now on this side now on that, by successive explorers in the fields of science, while other workers and other thinkers, by suggestive experiments, and by pregnant words, had prepared the way for its reception long before it was clearly perceived by any particular mind, or formulated distinctly by any particular pen. In Mechanics the principle of the conservation of force, as applied to machines and to *living forces*, had been familiar to mathematicians since the time of Newton and Leibnitz; but the principle was restricted in its application to visible mechanical forces. Rumford and Davy perceived clearly the dynamical nature of heat; and it is in their writings that we find the first suggestions—I should rather say demonstrations—of the convertibility of visible mechanical force into the invisible molecular energy of heat. Young advanced a distinct step in the same direction when he established on a scientific basis the undulatory theory of light; and Faraday supplied the extremely suggestive principle of the mutual equivalence of chemical action and electrical force. At length, between twenty and thirty years ago the doctrine was almost simultaneously evolved in all its comprehensiveness and grandeur by several philosophical and far-reaching minds. Mayer in Germany, and Grove in England, did most valuable service in elaborating the theory and clearing away the difficulties by which it was surrounded; but I imagine that if any single name be associated by posterity with this great truth, it will be that of Joule of Manchester, whose laborious experiments and accurate numerical determinations have forced conviction on the most sceptical, and *proved* the doctrine which the others, it may be, anticipated him in promulgating. Other eminent men, Thomson, Rankine, Helmholtz, Clausius, and many more, have subsequently been workers in the same field; and though, in the present imperfect state of science, much necessarily remains to be elucidated by future explorers, the great principle of the convertibility and equivalence of the physical forces—the grand law of the conservation of energy—is now established on a firm basis, and has received almost universal recognition.

It is this subtle, this unstable, but indestructible energy, that it is the province of Natural Philosophy to follow through all its transformations, to investigate the laws which regulate its operation in each of its various manifestations, and to ascertain the conditions which determine or accompany its disappearance in one form, and reappearance in another. It is this that has given to the physicist the right of wandering beyond the limits of his own proper domain, wherever there is a manifestation of force to be studied, or a physical law to be interpreted. As it is the duty of the chemist to study the transformations of matter, to account rigorously for every atom, and to trace it throughout all its combinations; so it must be the endeavour of the physicist to study the transformations of energy, to account for every vestige of force, and pursue it through all its Protean forms—to bind the Proteus, if he can, and compel him to reveal his secrets.

I have said that the Mathematical Sciences, both pure and mixed, are deductive in form; the various branches of Physics on the other hand are classed among the experimental or inductive sciences. This does not imply, however, that the method of deduction is altogether excluded. The inductive and deductive methods in philosophy are not antagonistic; they are, on the contrary, correlative and supplementary. The inductive method must be industriously and patiently pursued till the law connecting the appearances has once been recognised. When that has been done, when the law has been reached and has received its mathematical expression, the process must be reserved. The deductive method then comes into operation, predicts and explains all the phenomena, and even discovers new facts. Experiment, as a means of investigating truth has then been

superseded; it is relegated to the subordinate function of illustrating and verifying the conclusions of theory. Several of the branches of Physics which I have mentioned have already, as regards their most important principles, reached the deductive stage, and are so far entitled to rank among the exact sciences. Such are Astronomy, Light, and Sound. I need hardly remind you, for example, with what remarkable accuracy celestial phenomena are now predicted by astronomers; that, so far as these phenomena are dependent on the law of gravitation, calculation has taken the place of observation; and how the deductive method in the hands of Adams and Le Verrier achieved its crowning glory when, by the discovery of Neptune, it added a new planet to the solar system.

But though Astronomy has now become so largely a deductive science it continued for many centuries in the observational or inductive stage before it reached so high a pitch of perfection. It is not wonderful, then, that those branches of Physics, such as Electricity, Magnetism, and Heat, the earnest study of which may be said to have commenced only within comparatively recent years, should still find themselves in an inferior stage of progress. In the case of these sciences the philosophical method to be pursued is induction, the work of the philosopher experiment. This is not merely the best, it is the only method which we possess of discovering new laws; and though some laws of nature are already well known to us, many more remain to be discovered. I have already indicated that we know very little of the molecular actions which constitute the phenomena of heat and electricity, which determine chemical affinities, which regulate vital processes, and which cause the mutual transformations of the different forms of force. If the extent of our knowledge of these and kindred matters of the highest importance is ever to exceed its present limits, it can only be by the method of patient experiment and unwearying observation. The physicist must continue to question nature by every available means, to perfect his instruments and devise new ones, to multiply his experiments, to pile up facts upon facts, and to accumulate an ever-increasing store of numerical determinations. Sooner or later a new Kepler will arise to reduce to order the chaotic mass of empirical observations, and a new Newton will reveal the laws of the molecular forces, and lend to the motions of the atoms the same simplicity and harmony that characterise the majestic movements of the planetary worlds.

I have said that one duty of the physicist is to perfect the apparatus which serves as his means of observation, and I cannot adduce a more striking instance of the magnificent results which improved instrumental appliances are capable of furnishing than is supplied by the discoveries already effected by the spectroscope—the latest as well as the most powerful instrument that science has invented and called to her aid. This new instrument has only been for a few years in the hands of scientific observers. It may be that its best form has yet to be devised; and, certainly, its powers have not yet been fully ascertained. Already, however, it has analysed the atmospheres of the sun and of the stars, it has solved the vexed questions of the solar spots and prominences, and it has revealed the constitution of the far distant Nebulæ. It has even grappled not unsuccessfully with problems previously unthought of—opening up in solar meteorology an altogether new field of study, and discharging for the photosphere of the sun the same familiar functions which the anemometer, the barometer, and the thermometer perform for the atmosphere of our earth. In still another unlooked for direction it has been found competent to measure the respective velocities with which particular stars are approaching or receding from our system; and thus, by the use of the spectroscope, observations will be accumulated, which may enable the astronomers of a future generation to unravel the mighty maze which is presented by the attractions and the motions of the stellar Universe.

Distance imposes but little limitation on the power of the spectroscope. Light, as you are aware, travels with such immense velocity that it is capable of flashing from pole to pole of the earth in the twenty-second part of a second of time. And yet the rays which have revealed the presence of hydrogen, of nitrogen, or of iron in many of the more remote stars and nebulæ have travelled for centuries at this prodigious rate before reaching the prisms of the physicist. And as no distance, however immeasurably vast, can baffle the power of this wonderful instrument, so nothing seems to exist so inconceivably minute as to defy its scrutiny. It has made known to us the physical condition of the distant stellar worlds; it seems competent, also, to make us acquainted with the ultimate atoms and molecules of which matter is composed. For the diversely-coloured luminous bands, which form the distinctive spectra of the different chemical elements, have opened for us a loophole into the internal constitution of bodies, through which we may mark the play of the elementary molecules, and note the pull of the atomic forces. What tone is to the ear, that is colour to the eye; and as surely as the tones of a musical instrument indicate the length and tension of its chords, so surely do those bright spectral bands reveal the rate of the molecular vibrations, and betray the tensions of the atomic attractions. And great as are the services which the spectroscope may be expected to perform in the department of celestial physics, I have little doubt that in this apparently more humble sphere it is destined to render still greater services to science and to mankind. For it is not merely interesting and elevating, it is of the last importance for ourselves and for posterity, that we should become acquainted with the laws by which the various atomic forces are controlled. The molecular energies of matter are almost our sole ultimate source of power, whether we obtain this power

immediately from the strength of the human arm, from the shock of a water-torrent, or from the expansive force of vapour in the cylinders of the steam-engine. It was by the patient investigation of the laws of nature, and by conforming to those laws after they had been discovered, that civilised man attained the mastery which he now exercises over the natural forces. On the same conditions his dominion over the material world may in the future be indefinitely extended, until the time at length arrive when all the giant powers of nature will have yielded themselves the willing and obedient slaves of the intellect of man.

## Professor M'Gregor's Introductory Lecture.

MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

OF the departments of Science to be studied in our University the Mental Sciences have been committed to me. It naturally falls to me, therefore, in my opening lecture, to survey the extent and redd the marches of my subject. To do this is especially necessary in the circumstances in which we at present find ourselves, assembled as we are to open a class for the study of a science whose scope and method are now becoming very different from what they used to be. Looking at the present state of science, it cannot fail to strike us that those sciences are most advanced whose subject-matter is least complicated. Quantity and number, the subject-matter of Mathematics, hold true of all things in all time, and are clear and uncomplicated as our ideas of space and time on which they rest. Masses of matter in motion, the subject-matter of Astronomy, stands next in point of simplicity. Hence Mathematics and Astronomy are pre-eminently the exact sciences, simply because they are least dependent on any others, and are not, before they advance, compelled to tarry for their lagging sisters. Far otherwise is the case, for instance, with Medicine, whose phenomena, before they can be reduced to law, or any attempt made at such-reduction, must be studied by the light of principles made known by the previous labours of chemists and physicists, and applied to the study of the human body and the functions of its organs. After thus learning all that is known to anatomists and physiologists of the structure and functions of the body in health, Pathology must be studied to find what changes are wrought by disease; and Therapeutics, to find the means of prevention and cure. Here also comes into play an urgent desire for knowledge as a means of avoiding misery, which, though a great motive for study, is at the same time a disturbing force of enormous potency, and hinders, by the excitement and eagerness that it engenders, the attainment of the object it desires. If the difficulties of Medicine be so great, and its dependence on other sciences so complete, what wonder that, when to the enormous complexities of man's bodily frame are superadded the still greater complexities of his mental constitution, the difficulties should be the greatest within the whole range of human study and progress, most slow and laborious. Add to all this that mans eagerness to understand his own nature, origin, and destiny, is little if at all less absorbing than his desire for the cure and alleviation of his bodily ailments, and becomes immeasurably greater as he grows in understanding and intelligence. There is yet another obstacle here to progress greater than any other: that is, the blinding power of the feelings which, in all ages, have, biassed men where their loves, their hatreds, their selfish interests, or their religious sentiments, are involved. Liking inclines us to believe all the good we can of its object, and is a motive power for belief able to surmount almost any degree of opposing proof. The lawyer is loath to move in reforming a process that pays well, and even priests of the most High have been found to justify the enslaving of their fellow-men.

No practice is too odious, no error too gross, to be vindicated and made praiseworthy by those who are well paid for doing so. Our fears also do much to hinder our reception of the truth. For instance, with regard to a future state, man's actions may, and often do, make it his interest to disbelieve in it, and he straightway contrives to do so. Our bodily health also, as influencing our mental elasticity, is not without its influence. Where we know nothing, elated we place Hope; depressed we place Terror. From this root arising, superstition now keeps many, and for ages kept all, in the bondage of ignorance. In the view of this increasing complexity and concomitant implication of our feelings and strong emotions, all helping to obscure the truth, what wonder is it that mathematicians and astronomers agree, while philosophers and doctors differ? It is nothing strange then, seeing man's strongest feelings are involved, and his future destiny staked on the conclusion he comes to regarding his own nature and his duties, that the history of this subject should be such as it is—that for ages the noblest intellects of our race, ignorant of the knowledge which we have inherited, and thus having no matter to their thought, but only words which they mistook for things, should have enunciated system after system of metaphysical thought; each of which, in its turn, professed to solve the problems of man's nature, and to have grasped at length the secret of the universe. For many ages this intensely natural but fatally unscientific impulse drove men to seek truth by all methods but that by which alone she is to be found; namely, the patient and laborious observation of nature, in order to discover her laws. The philosophers, in their impatience to possess a key wherewith to unlock the arcana of nature, struggled incessantly, but ever in vain, to find entrance by forbidden and impossible ways. In the absence of scientific inductions whereon to build, they built on the sand,



and with the returning tide their structures perished.

In the "haunt obscure of old philosophy," as if in the gloomy depths of some labyrinthine cavern, the thoughtful of all ages continued to grope blindly their way ever and anon amid the tortuous sinuosities of their path, finding themselves on the beaten track trodden by thousands of weary seekers before them, none of whom could find an exit to the light, or solve the mystery of existence. In brief, this oldest and noblest of the sciences became a bye-word and a reproach, a synonym for profoundly subtle, trifling, and endless perplexity. Her literature, the more one reads it, reduces to chaotic bewilderment all our ideas and beliefs. It is like sailing over a tempestuous ocean without chart or compass, the sun clouded over by day, and the night without a star. Yet sight the land that lies beyond we must, or prove that it exists not. Our life depends on it, and we cannot choose, but venture.

Is there then no hope of a compass or a pilot? Are we hopelessly tied down to this spec of earth that we inhabit, there to play out our little part and perish? If there is no life beyond the present, no promised land, no haven of rest; to what purpose, I ask, is it that we are endowed with aspirations and faculties, whose width of sweep serves only to make us miserable, by making the greatest objects of human ambition seem unspeakably contemptible? Why are our faculties so hugely disproportioned to our condition that the inevitable result of their exercise is to make us discontented with our lot? and why are our desires greater even than these faculties can satisfy? Instead of being benevolent, the Creator that made us thus with such powers and such unresting eagerness of desire for we know not what, must have designed to make us miserable, and chafe our lives out against the bars of our prison all the more violently the nobler we are. Not so; we do not perish when our body rots. This want of adaptation to our present surroundings is designed to make us feel that this is not our rest, There is a means of bridging this vast abyss that limits and encloses the faculties of man; not, however, constructed by any science of ours; nor does science any longer pretend to such a power. How far, then, can science legitimately go, and at what point must she give place to religion? This has been the world's great battle-field, the debateable laud of history, where age after age have mingled in interminable strife the cultivators of science and the apologists of religion.

Let us, for the sake of conciseness, transfer our gaze from the wide stage of history, and consider for a moment the epitome of the same great drama that is played out on the narrow stage of an individual life.

In the golden days of youth, before reason demands a scrutiny of all our opinions and beliefs, in order to lay bare their foundations before admitting their validity, our mental attitude is one of spontaneous activity and unquestioning enjoyment. We are blindly trustful in others, and hopeful ever—as we feel now we shall feel always; we judge of others by ourselves, and the present wholly absorbs us. Sooner or later, however, in the life of every man who awakens to the consciousness of his powers and consequent responsibilities there comes a change. Reason, till now dormant, awakens and asserts its prerogative to doubt till proof is given. Before, he believed too much; he makes up for it now by believing too little. His most cherished convictions are weighed in the balance and sometimes found wanting. Bit by bit his foothold fails him, and he drifts into universal incertitude. This is the critical period in the life of youth: winds are high, all sail set, ballast often wanting, and the steersman unwary,—what wonder then that many make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience?

As in the unreflecting time of youth, so in the unscientific ages of the world—religion was freighted so heavily with ignorance and superstition that she could not have continued to float till now had she not been forced by science, increasingly as knowledge advanced, to heave overboard this lumber which many good men persisted in believing to be an essential part of her cargo. Religion having been thus deeply laden in the past, is necessarily somewhat laden still with what will hereafter be found to be but traditions of men. Always as this heaving overboard becomes no longer avoidable, religious men live in daily dread of what this encroaching science may be at next, and consign to be carried forth to its burial. Each side lives in constant dread of the other, notwithstanding that both equally with single eye are loyal to truth as they see it. Indeed they fight because they are loyal, for each thinks that truth is imperilled by the other.

There remains, however, the indubitable fact, that while science advances by pushing back the boundary line of religion, yet in the very act of advance her own outermost barrier is rising more clearly into view. She begins practically to admit that her scope is limited, that after she has done her utmost she cannot penetrate beyond mere uniformities of succession, which all converge the more clearly as they near their centre into an inscrutable all-pervading Power, from which primordial source emanates the energy that is manifested to us in the unresting flux of nature's phenomena. We find then that the sphere of science has steadily widened by pushing back the frontiers of nescience. The sphere of religion being to man's unaided faculties shrouded in mystery was wrongly, though inevitably, imagined to be co-extensive with the ever lessening nescience of the time. Science thus was robbed of the room given her to grow in. She has grown, and must continue to grow, at the expense of nescience. She *seems* to grow at the expense of religion, because we at any rate, if nature does not, abhor a vacuum, and accordingly fill up the hiatus between the true boundary of religion and the extremest outposts of our actual science by stretching our religion to cover our nescience. It is only, however, so long as

we confine our regard to mere superficial extent, so to speak, that there is even seeming antagonism and encroachment by the one on the sphere of the other. Science seems to compel religion into ever narrowing limits by forming into classes, bringing under laws, making natural, phenomena that were formerly isolated, unexplained, super-natural. This is essentially a superficial procedure. Despairing of explanation so long as explanation meant unfolding the nature and origin of things as well as the laws they obey, science, in order to make progress possible, evacuates the word of the former half of its meaning, confines it to the bringing of any fact under a law, and there leaves it. She refuses to entertain a search for causes, and restricts her mission to the discovery of laws.

It is obvious then that science even the profoundest is essentially superficial, for the all-sufficient reason that such is all the science that is possible to us. She takes from religion with the one hand, only to give her more amply and enduringly with the other. Things mysterious, *i.e.*, things isolated, are such no longer; but at the same time things simple are becoming the most mysterious of all. Knowledge advances with equal strides towards the natural and supernatural alike, both being found to be inextricably involved when you get to the bottom of any phenomenon.

Is it true that the causes of this truceless war that has raged between religion and science are to be found wholly on the side of the former? Far otherwise is the fact; for we find that just as religion has often been more irreligious than science, science also has been less scientific than religion. After every decided step in advance, she has had, in periodic paroxysms, fits of unendurable self-sufficiency and conceit, necessitating abundant depletion at the hand of Theology, on which, during such temporary aberrations, she would persist in making the most vehement assaults. Large classes of hitherto unexplained facts are brought under the sweep of some principle of commanding generality. Knowledge is power, and so, in the natural exultation that the grasp of such a principle causes, giving as it does ever increasing mastery over the gigantic powers of nature, we cannot wonder that its discoverers, and still more their disciples, get intoxicated with the consciousness of might. They are impatient to use it as a weapon to demolish the prejudices of the unscientific, all-forgetful that not every man can bend the bow of Ulysses. At present the strife is raging, and for a long time to come will rage around the facts of organization, life, and thought. Meanwhile, the becoming attitude for us is one of keen-eyed yet candid watchfulness. Let our motto be "*Magna est Veritas et prevalebit*," for it is the true interest of every honest inquirer that, cost what it may, the truth must be known, and, as soon as known, believed. At the same time, be it never forgotten that there lies a profounder meaning than most of us imagine in the trite saying that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." It has an intoxicating effect, especially on such as have not had to bear the burden and heat of the day, but, seated at their ease, gorge without assimilating the results of the thousand toilsome tentatives, abortive experiments, and blind gropings of the discoverer. This knowledge of results, merely without any acquaintance with their genesis, of opinions without the history of their growth and the errors that hindered it, is one of the greatest evils in modern education. This defect is specially pernicious when those moral principles are at stake by which a man has been accustomed to guide his life and rule his conduct. Any new dictum of science, compelling re-examination and modification here, ought to have its claims most rigorously scrutinised. And this, amongst others, is a reason why. The sincerest most single-eyed seeker of truth, so subtle is error, may almost unconsciously welcome a doctrine he otherwise would not, because it promises to loosen the hold of moral restrictions which had already begun to be irksome. If this be so, who can calculate the evil done by a doctrine wholly or partially an error, which counterfeits truth, obtains the sanction of science, and weakens the power of public morality by previously sapping the regulative convictions of individual men.

Granted that soon the counterfeit will be detected, and the fallacy exposed, can its blighting effects be neutralised or even momentarily arrested? The down-hill road is easy, and the velocity increases with the distance.

Moreover it holds true, gainsay it who lists, that purity of life is the *sine qua non* of faithful moral perception. The student whose increasing knowledge gives increasing liberty, which imperceptibly degenerates into license, is a self-deceiver, though he may not know it; and he will do well to pause till his vision be purified, and distorting media removed, by casting out the impurities that exhaled them.

The increasing frequency and momentum of the collisions between religion and science is really the beginning of the end. They are due to the fact that the explorers are moving along radii rapidly converging to their common centre, which being reached, or even brought distantly above the horizon, the combatants in this perennial strife will gladly beat their swords into ploughshares and study war no more.

I have thus briefly, and with such clearness as was possible in such narrow compass, touched upon the relations of religion and science, in order to place before you the more intelligibly, what is now a-days meant by Philosophy. In the universe of knowledge science and religion are complementary. With the first rise of intelligence and the consciousness, however dim, of the cosmos emerging from the darkness, religion asserted her sway. Slowly and laboriously through the ages man's perception of the universal order kept growing in

clearness, and his religion in intelligence, till at length, after the Greeks had fruitlessly by a prematurely deductive Philosophy toiled to reduce the many to the one, science vindicated for herself a position independent of Theology. The various sciences, for the purpose of methodical exploration, divided the universe among them. Each had allotted to her some definite department of nature, and concentrated her energies on discovering the laws of her own phenomena, taking no concern with aught beyond save to appropriate and turn to account the discoveries of the rest. Each science is compelled to admit the existence of some Power, and that this Power is and can be known to her only in terms of force; she therefore relegates all further questions to Philosophy. So long as even the most general and profound discoveries are looked at simply as the most fundamental, each of its own science; so long as there is no attempt at a coordination of these principles, and their reduction to one system is ignored, philosophy has no existence as yet, but only science. To quote Spencer: "The truths of Philosophy thus bear the same relation to the highest scientific truths that each of these bears to lower scientific truths. As each widest generalization of science comprehends and consolidates the narrower generalizations of its own divisions, so the generalizations of philosophy comprehend and consolidate the widest generalizations of science. It is therefore a knowledge the extreme opposite in kind to that which experience first accumulates. It is the final product of the process which begins with a mere colligation of crude observations, goes on establishing propositions that are broader and more separated from particular cases, and ends in universal propositions. Or to bring the definition to its simplest and clearest form: knowledge of the lowest kind is ununified knowledge; science is partially unified knowledge; philosophy is completely unified knowledge."

According to this view, while science furnishes the data of Philosophy, philosophy determines the limits of Science, and both equally in so far as they differ from mere speculation are confined to the sphere of the Relative. We are so accustomed to regard the nature and limits of the different sciences as being wholly determined by their objects, that at first we fail to see that the real limiting determining power is the science which teaches us the reach of our faculties—or, in other words, the length of our tether. Astronomy does not consist in the distances, attractions, and motions of the heavenly bodies, but in the knowledge of these acquired by the mental evolution of their laws. From the overwhelming confusion of phenomena, mind evokes the cosmos, as the genius of the sculptor induces over the shapeless marble the shapely lineaments of the statue. Science is not the existence of phenomena obeying laws, but these phenomena observed by mind and classified according to its laws. To the science of mind all the rest are related as to a common centre and substratum grouped concentrically around her in the order of their simplicity, they may be said to form a circle whose circumferential line is occupied by philosophy, inasmuch as it is she that determines the relations of science as a whole to the infinite beyond. The sciences contribute severally their widest generalizations; she aims at the widest of all the Central Unity; at grasping by the faculties of man the Great First Cause, in whom we live, and move, and have our being.

Formerly, this was thought to form a part of the legitimate business of Philosophy, till, from the failure of their efforts, men learned to narrow the sphere of their search. They vainly attempted a science of Transcendental Metaphysics; they aimed at cognizing the Absolute, forgetful that a God who can be compassed by reason is no longer a God, whom his rational creatures can worship. This conception of Metaphysics (a name commonly restricted to the higher regions of Philosophy) which, to this hour, prevails in Germany, is clearly incompetent. We must restrict her area to the limits set in the very name by its great originator Aristotle, *ta met a ta physica*, i.e., what comes *after* or *above* Physics.

To this over-ambitious philosophy we may aptly reply in the words of Scripture:—"Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" Nay, verily, Philosophy is not the means, is not the bridge by which man can span the abyss that intervenes between the universe we see and its invisible Maker and Upholder. He is the self-appointed Goal towards which have agonized unceasingly in every age the excellent of the earth, the noblest of human kind. Some drawn or driven—Which? By the intellectual; others by the moral necessities of their nature. Be this as it may, both equally bring man to the point where, having done his utmost and despairing, he sees most clearly his littleness by the light of his own most transcendent discoveries.

Like an eagle weary of his mighty wings, from the increasing tenuity of the circumambient air, man can soar no higher. At this altitude his grasp of principles, even the clearest, gets weaker; as he rises, they lose their distinctness of outline, are no longer mutually exclusive, and he lands at length in complete imbecility of thought, which here sets its own laws at defiance, and, therefore, is thought no longer.

Contradictions here are equally irresistible, and equally true, simply because man, trying to transcend his own consciousness, gets beyond the limits of true predication. He has no matter to his thought, but only words which he mistakes for things. Consciousness of objects no longer accompanies him in his flight—not because there is no existence there, but because he no longer obeys the conditions of cognizing it.

Here we are face to face with the truth that all knowledge is relative—the profoundest law in the science of mind, and therefore in all sciences whatever. This is the doctrine so ably vindicated by Hamilton against the

French and German absolutists, and so clearly expounded by Mansell in his "Lectures on the limits of Religious Thought." It was the tacit recognition of this law by the physical sciences, at an early stage of their history, that enabled them to make such rapid progress and attain to their present imposing position. It was the non-recognition of the same law by philosophers that rendered their science so barren of abiding results. From a false alarm at its apparent consequences, this law, which science was incessantly urging on the consideration of theologians and students of philosophy, was regarded as a yoke not to be tolerated—the very insignia of bondage. It shewed too clearly the folly of system-making, and the inveterate habit of anticipating nature so easy and seductive to the overvaulting yet indolent intellect of man. The change was, and is, all the harder from the dispiriting contrast that is offered by the grand and elaborate dogmatic structures where philosophy had formerly her abode, to the miserable provisional tenement which she is summoned to content herself with till, by her own genuine and legitimate labour, she is able to plan and build a mansion that shall be eternal. The change is imperative, and no longer avoidable. She must restrict her pretensions to what her data allow, else, by the nemesis of violated law, she must be cast forth as useless—a branch, indeed, of the tree of knowledge, but now only fit for the burning. Shall we, then, despair of her future? Indeed, there is no choice left us in this matter. For every son of man whose desires go beyond the bread that perisheth, and whose brains are competent to think at all, must, consciously or not, be a metaphysician. I hold it a settled point that this science has in it a vitality that is indestructible, in spite of the bewildering prospect which its past and even its present affords. It is founded on an impulse which cannot be kept under, because it originates in an intellectual craving which cannot be repressed. To quote the words of an eminent metaphysician—"To suppose that the light of metaphysics, fitful, or lurid, or bewildering as it may too often be, can ever be extinguished, is to suppose that man has ceased to have a thinking mind. As long as man thinks, this light must burn. The deep river of speculation, with all its devious windings, with all its perilous shoals, whirlpools, and cataracts, will flow on for ever; and he must be a rustic—a barbarian, indeed—who would loiter on its banks in the vain expectation of beholding the mighty flood at length run dry. Let people decry the science as they may, of this we may be assured, that they know it in their secret hearts to be the most essential and the most ethereal manifestation of mental power which the human intellect can exhibit."

What now remains for me to do in the following out of the too extensive plan of this lecture, is to set forth, however meagerly, the bearings of the great modern generalization of the persistence of Force on that branch of our subject called Psychology, or the science of the facts of consciousness. Nature, viewed as a problem to be solved now-a-days, presents herself under an aspect entirely different from what she used to wear, namely, that of one central force, which, variously modified by various collocations of matter, is the cause of all the change and movement that any-where take place. By some psychologists mental force is regarded with certain limitations as a member of the correlated group into which this central force is modified, and, by consequence, the phenomena of man's mental and moral nature are directly traceable to this source. Let us see how far this is true. If it be not the whole truth our ideas will be all the clearer if we follow them up to see where they bottom, and we shall have clearly defined our frontier: Let us then endeavour to gain a clear understanding of this idea—the keystone in the arch of modern science—with regard to which, as the radiating centre of all force, every physical science must clearly define its position, as must also our science, in so far as it is physical. To the unaided senses all human forces are inappreciable in their minute manifestations, and accordingly were supposed to come to nothing. It is now known that in every case where a force has operated and apparently come to nothing, that there is invariably an effect produced, and that this is due to the force reappearing in a new shape. The question then has come to be—Does the force displayed in every change, from the upheaval of a continent to the movement of a fly on the ceiling, in the very act of being expended, become converted into an equivalent amount of some other force or forces? To this experimental enquiry is giving an affirmative answer with ever increasing distinctness. Motion, being arrested, is actually found under certain circumstances to be changed into heat, chemical force, electricity, magnetism, light, and *provisionally* nervous force or mind. Taking heat as the most familiar, it is found by experiment to be but a mode of motion. When, for instance, a cannon ball, impinging on a rock is suddenly arrested in its flight, what takes place is simply this—the motion that before impact was *molar*, *i.e.*, carried along the ball as one mass, has now become *molecular*, *i.e.*, the atoms composing the ball are set a swinging violently each against the others. In consequence the body expands, the atoms requiring more room to move in, and the feeling of heat is produced. Conversely, heat can be resolved into motion, as is familiarly proved when we see the piston of a steam-engine, with all the concomitant masses of matter, set in motion by the molecular expansion of water into steam. Heat expands the water into vapour to give its particles elbow-room, so to speak; the piston is driven up, and a train of a hundred carriages is hurled along because heat is motion, and nothing more. The same thing may be further illustrated by reflecting that the coal which gave out the heat which generated the steam was dug from the bowels of the earth, where it had lain for geological ages, all that remain of the vegetation that clothed the primeval world. Coal is nothing more than the carbon that was stored up in the tissues of plants, after being disengaged by the

solar rays. The sun is thus seen to be proximately the prime mover of all things. For, owing to its enormous size, it is still radiating with great intensity the heat originally generated by the precipitation towards their centre of the immense masses of nebulous matter that compose his mighty globe. In the same way it can be shewn that heat can be converted into electricity, chemical force, magnetism, and light. In short, each of these into all the rest; and not only so, it will probably soon, with regard to all of them, be a demonstrated fact that a given amount of any one can be changed into an equivalent amount of any other.

This brief statement will, I trust, make it plain how it is that in these latter days all scientific research has come to mean the following up of this all-pervading force into its minutest and remotest ramifications. My concern with this great law is twofold. First, to determine, if my time allowed, its metaphysical bearing—*i.e.*, What, on the admission of its truth, are we thereby compelled to believe regarding the reach of our faculties and our relations as reasonable accountable beings to this mysterious Power. Second, how far nerve force, considered as a member of the correlated group, exhausts the mental phenomena of man.

On the first of these points my remarks must be very brief, if I am to leave any space for the second. I must content myself with sifting to some extent this idea of an indestructible force. Now that we have got it, what does it amount to? Is there a limit to the scientific explanation of nature? Can we go on for ever including the effects of her forces in classes of ever-widening generality? We start with some actual experience of force—say the force of my muscles in grasping this table; or, better still, a shock of electricity. We explain this by showing that electricity is merely a mode of heat, as heat is a mode of motion, and so on, till we come to a class so wide that we cannot merge it in any wider, and our power of explanation is ended. Begin at any point you please, with any kind of human experience, you find that you understand only as you are able to generalize it. You rise from special to general, till you reach a species so wide that you have no genus to bring it under. With its co-ordinate it forms the sum mum genus—the outermost barrier of science—the circumscribing limit of the restless intellect of man. All the separate effects that constitute the sum of things are daily becoming more and more reducible to some of the correlated group. These themselves are reducible to heat, and heat is matter-in-motion. Here, as before, we are face to face with the insoluble. We have reached the loftiest summit in the universe of thought, only to find that what we have gained in extent of view we have lost in nearness and fulness of intuition. Our horizon, it is true, is immensely widened; but, on the other hand, we see but a hazy outline of the largest features of the landscape, while all the rest have faded from our sight, and baffle the keenest eye. Of matter or force, as of any other ultimate idea of science abstracted from the actual concrete facts by which they are suggested, or in which they are embodied, we can make—nay, are logically compelled to make—directly antagonistic assertions. We are in a region where contradictions are equally unavoidable, yet equally unthinkable; and no human intellect is adequate to saying which of them, or whether either is true, or to furnish the verification required. We cannot think of matter except in terms of force, nor of force except in terms of matter. With regard both to the one and the other, all that science can tell us only brings into clearer relief how much remains unknown. Take any force you like, any form of matter, you are driven at last to admit that the only forces we know anything of are the forces that affect our own consciousness, that these are not persistent, but the reverse; that the force that does persist is beyond our consciousness, except as regards its effects alone, and that of its ultimate nature science can tell us nothing. Thus is clearly marked off the sphere of science. Her concern is with the relative, and beyond this she cannot penetrate without losing all claims to credence and all title to respect. Beyond this relative lies a real absolute, now and for ever beyond the province of science to meddle with. If ever, therefore, the man of science forgets this, he meddles with what concerns him not, and about which his science can tell him nothing, except that it exists, and that to its existence it is due that either he or his science has any place in the order of nature's phenomena. Thus by persistence of force we mean really the eternity of some mysterious Power that transcends our widest conception. In the very act of grasping the idea of any actual force resolvable into one central reservoir of energy infinite and therefore incomprehensible in its vastness, we are by the very constitution of our minds compelled to believe in, though we cannot cognise, an Almighty Being, none other than the Almighty God, who is the absolute antecedent of all the consequences we see. This is the absolute, the subject-matter of revelation, just as its relative manifestations are the subject-matter of science. Religion has thus nothing to fear from the most inexorable logic of science. Nor indeed, does science any longer pretend that she has—at any rate, in so far as she has learned to profit by experience. She takes to herself the relative as her portion, refusing to meddle with her sister's domain.

I turn now to the second of the two points mentioned above—namely, How far does nerve force, supposing that it really is a member of the correlated group, exhaust all the facts of consciousness, and enable us to make a complete synthesis of man's nature?

The food of animals consists mainly of the flesh of other animals and vegetable products. Its mineral constituents—*viz.*, water and common salt—may in this connection be overlooked. Animals require that their food be previously elaborated for them in the less complicated organisms of plants before it is fitted for assimilation by their own more intricate digestive apparatus. Clearly, then, in following up this correlation, I

must begin with the food of plants. All vegetable life is dependent for its food on the inorganic materials it finds in the air and in the soil. From these it not only derives food for itself, but elaborates and stores up food for animals and men. Some plants, represented by the pea and the bean, yield the albuminous substance, casein; while the other two great types of animal aliment—viz., saccharine and oleaginous matter—are produced abundantly by multitudes of plants. The cereals alone produce the whole of these in great abundance, and in such fitting proportions, that "bread" is aptly called the staff of life. Thus, the agents at work in the production of this complex result are—the heat and light of the sun, to begin with. These are expended in preparing for the plants their food, *i.e.*, in decomposing the carbonic acid and water, of which their food consists. For these compounds must be broken up before plants can assimilate the carbon and the hydrogen, of which their tissues are mainly composed. Plants, then, exposed to the sun's rays, prepare, as we have seen, the food of animals. But more than this, they exhale the oxygen which animals live by inhaling, and remove by absorbing it, the carbonic acid, which is poison. Plants expire through their lungs the leaves, and cast out as useless, oxygen, which to animals is the breath of life. Similarly, by a beautiful adaptation, what animals expire with every breath as something to be got rid of at any cost, plants inspire at every pore, and then restore it as vital air, or store it up for future use as fuel and as food. The sun's force is expended in producing food for plants. This food goes to build up their tissues. These tissues and the substance they secrete become in their turn the food of animals. Passing over the process of digestion, let us suppose that the nutritive ingredients of the food have found their way into the blood, and are ready to be assimilated, What is the sequence here? The tissues of the body, like everything else in nature, are in a state of unceasing change, and this succession of changes is essential to the continuance of life. The more actively the vital powers are exerted the more rapidly do the organs waste, demanding therefore more frequent and abundant supplies of materials for repair. A constant waste goes on, increased by every exertion even the smallest of body or of mind. New particles are being constantly deposited to replace the old: each of these, after contributing its share of the animal activity, becomes effete, is decomposed and got rid of, only to be followed by an equally fleeting successor. The force stored up in these particles has already been traced to the sun. They are so many minute reservoirs of force, and this force is liberated by burning, or as it is learnedly called, oxidation, precisely in the same way as heat is evolved from coal in an ordinary fire. The blood, supplied with a continuous stream of oxygen through the lungs, brings it into contact with those particles of which the whole body, muscles, bones, nerves, and brain are composed. The oxygen oxidizes, that is, burns them, and from their combustion is evolved all the force that is expended in the activities of the animal frame in keeping up the bodily heat, in muscular exertion, and the phenomena of mind. In short, the stomach is a furnace: our food, whether vegetable or animal, is the fuel; our bodily warmth, our muscular vigour, our nervous force, *i.e.*, our mind, with all its feelings, thoughts, and emotions, are the ways in which the force evolved in this combustion is consumed.

Suppose, then, a man in ordinary health, and sufficiently supplied with food. This food is oxidized or burned, and a definite amount of force capable of endless transformation is the result. This force is the man's capital, let him spend it as he pleases. An easy mind and a good digestion are the great conservers of vitality. Possessing these, a man sufficiently pachydermatous, not troubling himself about lofty ideals, or the other causes thus originated that harass other men, is most likely to live long and, in his own sense of the word, happily. If, however, too eager to lead such an ignoble existence, a man's brain is active whether in doing, or suffering, there is less power forthcoming for the other purposes of the economy. The muscles, lungs, and other organs, are badly supplied, health is deranged, and life itself is shortened. On the other hand, a man using his brains but little, whether in study or in the wear and tear of business, we ordinarily find his frame more athletic, his muscular vigour greater, and his general health unimpaired.

Yet another step we can go in this direction. The mind is scientifically divisible into Feelings, Volitions, and Thoughts; or Feeling, Will, and Intellect. Given the ordinary mental power of an individual man: If his feelings are very sensitive and acute, there is so much the less force in his intellect; and his will, similarly a very obstinate and inflexible will, drains the intellect and the feelings. It is, however, intellectual activity and waste that causes the greatest drain of all; hence the great tendency of excessive activity here to shorten life and make prematurely old.

An evident corollary from all this is, that intellectual eminence of the highest degree in more than one widely divergent department is beyond the power of any single mind, even the greatest.

This line of thought, though full of applications to education and the practical conduct of life, I cannot longer dwell on. Up to this point I have been occupied exclusively in approaching my own proper subject from the physical side, my purpose being to make the alleged sequence intelligible so far as to put you in possession of materials for enabling you to follow intelligently the nature and bearing of those physical discoveries and controversies of the day that are destined to influence so profoundly the future of Psychology. It is not possible, in the course of a single hour, to entertain any of the questions that must at every step have pressed themselves on your attention in following my argument. For instance, What is the nature of Vitality and its relation to the

"Physical bases of Life?" Is it a mere question of collocation of matter, or is it not rather something unique in its nature, nullifying therefore the whole position that mental are merely physical forces transformed? One question, however, because of its present interest, I cannot help touching on before I close, namely, the relation between mind and brain. The materialist on the one hand affirms that brain thinks in the same way as muscle contracts and the liver secretes bile; on the other hand psychologists maintain that between the molecular movements of the grey substance of the brain and thought there is nothing in common save degree and duration in time. The truth is wholly with neither. It is true that our mental phenomena and the accompanying molecular movements in the nerve centres are inseparable in fact, and unthinkable apart. But the *nature* of their connection is as far from being understood as ever. We accept the fact as a conjunction unique in nature, the extremes of human experience—mind and matter welded into one, yet offering the widest contrast in the universe of things. Does any one affirm that it is a case of causation? Then which is cause, and which effect? If you ask the materialist what he means by matter, he cannot define it otherwise than by saying that it is something occupying room in space, *i.e.*, something *extended*. The corresponding definition of mind is, that it is something *unextended* that occupies no room in space. The one you must think of as in some place; the other you cannot think of as in any place. Nay, more: In the very act of thinking of the one you are, so to speak, at the point the farthest possible removed from the other. No one effort of mind can compass them both. The world of mind and the world of matter are still as distinct as ever; and yet it is true that every fact of mind is equally a fact of matter; and the peculiarity of mental science is, that every phenomenon within its borders must be studied under two totally different aspects and by two totally different methods. Physiology and Psychology are thus happily agreed; and, as always happens when ideas hitherto antagonistic unite, each containing its quantum of truth, there is reason to expect a rapidity of progress hitherto unknown.

The Finances of New Zealand,

By Master Humphrey,

Dunedin, N.Z.: Mills, Dick and Co. Printers and Publishers, Stafford Street. 1872.

*Several friends having asked me to republish my letters referring to the finances of New Zealand, I have much pleasure in acceding to the request. The following pages will be found to contain the substance of my observations in a condensed form.*

MASTER HUMPHREY.

## The Finances of New Zealand.

FOR years past our ordinary expenditure has exceeded income, and of late the annual deficit has increased so rapidly that it now amounts to hundreds of thousands of pounds. The causes of this are so apparent, that hardly anyone who is not wilfully blind can fail to recognise them. With a total population not exceeding that of some of the principal towns in England, we have been cursed with the most complicated and costly series of Governments in the whole world. To gain an approximate idea of the extravagance we have been supporting let any unprejudiced man pay a visit to our Provincial Council of Otago; let him run over in his mind the list of officers and salaries that institution implies, with its Superintendent, Executive, Speaker, Clerks, Messengers, Sergeant-at-arms, and the whole paraphernalia. Let him reflect that the same deplorable exhibition of incapacity, and the same outrageous waste, go on in half-a-dozen similar assemblies; let him pass in review the limitless series of jobs that have been perpetrated here; let him look at the Post Office, costing from £35,000 to £40,000, when a building as well suited for that or any other purpose could have been erected for a tenth part of the money; let him look at the Exhibition Buildings costing £20,000 or more, and presenting the ridiculous spectacle of a permanent building put up for a temporary purpose; let him then cast his eye to the South and observe a railway constructed at a cost of £367,168, for the ordinary requirements of which a few donkey-carts might suffice; let him remark the jetty costing £40,000 at which the only ship that ever discharged was the one conveying the timber to make the approaches to it. When he has thus, perhaps, in some measure realised the folly displayed by our own Provincial Governments, let him imagine the same sort of thing going in the other Provincial Councils, whilst over all there has been a General Government outstripping every one of its subordinates in the dignified magnitude of its extravagance. When he has done this, it will cease to be a matter of surprise that our debt, as compared with population, exceeds that of every nation under heaven, and that our current expenditure should exceed income by nearly 50 per cent.

Why the people of this Colony should have allowed so pernicious a system to grow up, why they should acquiesce in a state of things so fraught with destruction, may prove hereafter an interesting question to the student of political philosophy. And it will probably be found that the true cause of this strange apathy is, that instead of additional taxes being imposed to supply the amounts wasted by Government, the annual deficits

have been made good out of borrowed money. When bad or wasteful Government is brought home to the people, as it eventually must be in the shape of grinding taxation, an outcry is raised and measures adopted for enforcing economy. But in our case, instead of extravagance being associated with a vision of the stern tax collector, the systematic borrowing enables Government to present itself for a time in the shape of a beneficent fairy, with work for the unemployed, billets for the obedient, and lucrative contracts for those who may best deserve them. The strongest incentive to exercise a vigilant supervision over its proceedings is removed, and so long as the people can be persuaded that the pleasant system of artificial prosperity can be maintained, it is vain to expect them to interest themselves; for the majority of mankind care little about abstract ideas, and rarely resent bad government until it manifests itself in some tangible present grievance.

It is related of Hudson, the great railway king, that when elected chairman of directors of the Eastern Counties Railway, he issued instructions to the head of the financial department to "make things pleasant." This making things pleasant consisted simply in paying dividends out of capital, and for a time, no doubt, answered its purpose. Indeed the only objection to such a system was that it would not last for ever—otherwise it would have been perfect. But a time inexorably came, when the process, pleasant as it was, could no longer be continued, when the unlucky shareholders deprived of the customary dividend, were forced to recognise the existence of an enormous deficit.

The system adopted by the great railway king, is much the same as our Colonial politicians seem bent on following. Year after year things are made pleasant to the supporters of the Government, to our huge army of officials, to constituencies returning pliant members of Assembly, and the deficit is replaced by borrowing. Public works are started involving the expenditure of thousands, or tens of thousands, not on the ground of their being legitimately wanted, or likely to remunerate, but simply for the advantage to local traders of the expenditure of money in their immediate neighbourhood. The entire community with one voice cries out to the Government "Give, give, give. Spend money amongst us, no matter how, or for what purpose. Distribute billets, silence remonstrance, and buy off opposition as you will. All we ask is—*spend*, but do not tax us."

The results of adopting this system may be readily conceived. It gives possession of power to those who will use it with the least scruple. Instead of the Government being held accountable for enforcing economy or proper administration, it's very tenure of office is made to depend upon the extent of its extravagance. Our practice of supplying deficits in revenue out of borrowed capital, and of incurring further debt for the reckless construction of public works, reverses the proper condition of things, and makes a government that is dragging the country to ruin, seem to the ignorant to be conducting it along the very path to prosperity.

When persons engaged in commercial avocations find themselves in a position of unexpected difficulty, when trade falls off and there is a simultaneous decline in the rate of profit, there are generally two alternatives, and the style of man may be fairly estimated by that which he selects. The one is to countermand orders, cease adding to his liabilities; and, above all, cut down expenses to the lowest possible figure. The other is to put on a bold face, launch out, order freely, and affect the appearance of doing well by disregarding every suggestion of prudence or economy. The results of the latter course are not difficult to foresee; and this is the policy to which in the crisis of our fate the Government has committed us.

The most alarming feature of the case is that the evil tends so rapidly to intensify itself. The bubble can only be kept from bursting by blowing it larger. Accustomed as our population has become to revel in false prosperity, any Government that awakened them to a sense of their true position might be reproached as the cause of misfortunes to which it only drew attention. And so we find that to grasp the nettle boldly, to inquire into, and avow, our real financial situation, requires more courage than any Colonial politician apparently possesses.

As illustrative of this we may refer to the action taken by the Stafford party during their recent but brief tenure of power. In making his ministerial statement Mr Stafford said—"The Government would strenuously endeavor to bring the ordinary expenditure within the ordinary revenue of the Colony, and thus avoid increasing the floating debt"—thereby admitting that expenditure exceeded income, and that great efforts would be requisite to establish an equilibrium. The Stafford party, however, were soon driven from office, and assuming that there was any real intention to carry out the programme laid down by their chief, few can be surprised at their speedy expulsion. But whilst giving them credit for a wish to do something towards reducing our preposterous expenditure, it is deeply to be regretted that a more determined stand was not made two years ago when the Financial Scheme was laid before the Assembly. By that means a fatal impulse was given alike to the reckless expenditure on public works and to the policy of supplementing deficits out of borrowed capital. Looking at the constitution of Assembly, at the pressure put on members by their constituencies, and on the ministry by members, it was a foregone conclusion that the money borrowed would be misapplied, and that no one could long retain the post of power without yielding to demands for which there was no justification. One or two individual members of the Opposition, it is true, spoke out boldly and nobly, and their conduct in doing so, when unsupported by the strength of their party, entitles them to the gratitude of every true friend of New



Zealand.

It was at this meeting of the Assembly that the practice of defraying military and other expenses out of borrowed money was adopted as portion of our avowed policy. In the Financial Statement of that year the Colonial Treasurer remarked,—

"It is useless for us to attempt to disguise from ourselves that when in 1863 we incurred an enormous loan for war purposes—which loan has been from time to time increased by other expenditure of the same nature—we did that which put it utterly beyond the power of the Colony in the present generation to continue to pay interest upon those loans, and yet defray out of its revenue large war expenditure."

"You will not be surprised, therefore, after what I have already stated upon the subject of Defence expenditure, to hear that the Government consider that the Colony is not justified, even if it were able to do so, in regarding the item of Defence Expenditure as one to be defrayed out of the ordinary revenue."

"We therefore propose to do that which we believe a large section of the public men of the Colony regret was not done four years ago—we intend to ask for a Permanent Appropriation for Defence Purposes of £180,000 for the first year, £160,000 for the second year, and £150,000 for the three succeeding years, the money to be borrowed from time to time, if required, and as required."

This recommendation was adopted, and one of the largest items of our permanent expenditure is thus transferred from the accounts of the Consolidated Fund and charged against one maintained out of borrowed money.

In the accounts for the year ending June, 1870, the revenue appears as £1,018,360; but the expenditure, including liabilities of the preceding year amounted to over a million and a-half. The actual figures were, £1,593,182; but from this it may perhaps be fair to deduct something on account of the Reserve Account and Incidental Receipts not included in the £1,018,360 of revenue. Still the deficit was very large, necessitating the issue of £365,000 worth of Treasury Bills, as against £53,650 redeemed, besides a sum as £132,456, entered as accruing from transfers;—that is presumably, transfers from funds arising from borrowed money.

The accounts of the next year disclosed a state of things still worse. The revenue had fallen off whilst expenditure increased; and these alterations for the worse were observable in almost every item. The subjoined table shows the respective amounts of revenue for the two years:—

With the apparent exception of the Telegraph, therefore, we see that every individual item showed a diminution, and the entire discrepancy between the two years amounted to no less than £111,986 14s 9d. As regards the telegraph to which it will be necessary to refer more particularly by and bye, it may be here mentioned that like the Post Office it is a losing department, and that the enhanced receipts of this particular year are more than counterbalanced by increased expenses.

After the £936,188 which is the real amount of revenue for the period we are considering, come a variety of entries by means of which the public income is apparently raised from that sum to £1,201,832, full particulars of which will be found in the detailed statement annexed hereto. I do not expect my readers to understand all these items, but some of them, I think, they will understand very clearly. For instance, they will see that £50,000 worth of Treasury Bills are put down in the same way as if that amount was derived from actual revenue. And then they may remark £53,098 18s 4d entered as transferred from Special Fund. Now this Special Fund is the proceeds of loans, so here are two instances of borrowed money being treated like permanent income.

In regard to the other entries by means of which the receipts are swollen from £936,188 to £1,201,832, it is obvious that being mixed up with the Treasury Bills and transfers from the Special Fund we find them in very suspicious company, but if it is possible for the Government to manufacture so large an amount of money without having recourse either to borrowing or taxation, it is a pity they do not enlarge their machinery and supply the whole revenue by the same means.

## ***EXTRACT FROM PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND, 1870—71.—B. No. 1, PAGE X.***

The study of figures and statistics is proverbially so dry that it is hardly to be wondered the general reader should regard them with aversion; but, in dealing with these subjects, one occasionally meets with an amusing incident, or a mouthful of humbug of such exceptionally good quality as to afford an agreeable relief after the dreary monotony of statistical facts. Such a one is to be found in the preamble of the Appropriation Act, under which the £50,000 worth of Treasury Bills were issued, and £53,098 transferred from the fund of borrowed money to the accounts of the Consolidated Fund. The object of this Bill was to provide for the payment of large amounts of ordinary expenditure out of borrowed capital, and generally make ourselves comfortable at the expense of other people. Considering these circumstances, I think it will be admitted that the subject was led up to in a very elaborate and diplomatic manner, for the preamble ran as follows:—

*"Most Gracious Sovereign—*

*"We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects in the House of Representatives in New Zealand in Parliament assembled, towards making good the supply which we have cheerfully granted to your Majesty in this Session of Parliament, have resolved to grant unto your Majesty the sums hereinafter mentioned, and do therefore most humbly beseech your Majesty that it may be enacted, and be enacted, by the General Assembly of New Zealand in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows."*

Bearing in mind the real object of the Bill, I think we cannot but admire the versatility and grasp of mind that could conceive the idea of so happily blending loyalty and disinterested liberality towards our beloved sovereign with the more practical notion of making things pleasant to ourselves. And I have no doubt that when Hudson adopted a similar course in like circumstances, he coupled his instructions with a few moral remarks of a highly edifying character.

Further down in the list of receipts we have an entry of £66,295 6s 6d for an "Advance from Special Fund, London," and partially balanced by a similar entry on the other side of £46,000 repaid. This still leaves a balance of £20,295 6s 6d to be added to the other amounts of borrowed money tacked on to the actual revenue, and applied to purposes of general expenditure.

Then we come to Deficiency Bill £60,000, balanced by an entry on the other side of the same amount for overdraft repaid Bank of New Zealand. This apparently represents a temporary accommodation converted into a deficit. Next comes Treasury Bills renewed, £200,000, with a corresponding entry on the other side of Treasury Bills redeemed. This would appear to represent an old debt staved off for a time, indicating that when the time came to pay we found it more convenient to take an extension of credit. It seems our creditors did not object, but as these transactions, such as renewing bills and the like are rarely effected without some expense in the way of discount, commission, &c., it would be interesting to see what these amounted to in the present instance.

Passing now the accounts of disbursements we find (with the most trivial exception) that every item shows an increase, some to the extent of fifty or sixty per cent. This is a more serious affair even than the diminished revenue, for whilst that might possibly be attributed to misfortune, the increased expenditure indicates something worse. Passing by one or two accounts in which the increase has not been so great, we come to that of Public Domains and Buildings, for which we paid £2797 in 1870, and £9,300 in 1871, the increase being principally attributable to the erection of a new Government House. This figures for the sum of £4605, though that probably only represents a part of the entire cost. In this department, too, we find the salary of Colonial Architect, £700, and a sum of £43 7s 3d also paid to that gentleman for commission. Whether he gets a commission on *all* works he superintends, besides the £700, is not stated, but might perhaps be inferred from the entry above quoted; and here I wonder whether the Colonial Architect enjoys the same privilege as private architects — that of taking commissions from contractors? Should such be the case, what with his fixed salary of £700 a-year, commissions from the Government and commissions from the contractors, we must admit that the Colonial architect has a really good time of it. Further on, when we come to Miscellaneous Expenditure, we shall find £125 4s, or about £2 10s a week, set down as "paid to labourer engaged by Colonial Architect," though what work may be performed in return does not appear. And under Miscellaneous we also find £1568 expended in the purchase of furniture for the Government House.

Lower down we come to Public Departments costing £45,282 in 1870 as against £53,301 in 1871, an increase of £8,019.

Then there is Law and Justice, for which we paid £54,926 in 1870, and £63,753 in 1871—an increase of £8,827. Taxpayers, however, will hardly be disposed to grumble at this extra charge, bearing in mind that it is partly attributable to expenses incurred in the Barton prosecution—that is, provided they adopt the supposition of the quality of justice dispensed amongst us having been improved by that infusion.

Next on the list stand the Post Office and Telegraph Departments, costing £145,712 in 1870 and £147,765 in 1871. The revenue obtained from these combined sources for the year under consideration was only £65,632, the loss occasioned by them is £82,133 in 1871 as contrasted with £80,355 in 1870. And here it may not be out of place to remark that whilst the accounts of Post Office and Telegraph appear as separate entries in the receipts, they are muddled together in the expenditure, so that one cannot apportion with absolute accuracy the amount of loss occasioned by each.

Next we find the Customs' Department, which figures for £37,835 in 1869-70, and £45,557 for 1870-71. Now this increase is a very remarkable one, because the amount of revenue raised was smaller. In 1870, £813,025 was collected at an expense of £37,835, whilst in 1871 it appears to have cost £45,557 to collect £745,473, so that one year per cent. defrayed the cost of collection, and the next year it jumped up to 6 per cent., or in the ratio of 33 per cent. increase.

Then comes the Miscellaneous Expenditure, which here figures for £93,270 as compared with £63,823 for the previous year, showing an increase of £29,447, or nearly 50 per cent. The entries appearing under the

heading of "Miscellaneous" certainly justify the selection of that name. I cannot attempt to give them in full detail, but have picked out a few, which are as follow:—

When I first made out a comparative table of expenditure for the years 1869-70, and 1870-71, I could not help being struck by the uniform increase of almost every item. But on coming to the account of money paid as interest on loans, it startled me to observe that it showed an apparent diminution, the figures being £411,711 for 1870, and £361,315 for 1871. Now, that I could not but regard as most remarkable. It is sufficiently notorious that our debt is growing larger, and it did appear strange that with an increasing debt, the interest should diminish. I therefore thought it worth while to investigate the matter, and on looking up corresponding entries for each year, I came across the following details:

These figures speak for themselves. It will be observed that in the former year there were four quarterly payments for interest of about £52,000 each; but in the latter we find only three quarterly payments—the one due on the 15th July being excluded, so that the total amount set down for interest was £52,000 less than really had to be paid. In excuse for this omission, it may perhaps be pleaded that the money was not absolutely due till 15th July, 1871, whereas the financial year terminated on 30th June. But if we admitted this reasoning, we should expect to find the account commencing with the payment on 15th July, 1870, because that would then fall within the financial year. We know very well there are four quarters in every year, and that if money is to be paid by quarterly instalments, there must be four of them.

In estimating, therefore, the amount of interest really chargeable to the year under consideration, we must add £52,000 to the sum put down in the published account. When this is done, the seeming saving is converted into a loss, and the interest account for 1871, like the rest, turns out to exceed that of 1870.

To complete our review of disbursements we have still to consider the items of Native and Military Expenditure.

The former shows an increase of £13,282, being only £21,496 in 1870, as contrasted with £34,778 in 1871; but, as this enhanced expenditure might possibly have been occasioned by the adoption of the so-called "Sugar and Blanket Policy," I was willing to suspend my judgment as to whether it was excusable until I had ascertained the amount of Military Expenditure, which, as a matter of course, we should expect to see reduced in a corresponding proportion.

On referring to the account of disbursements from the Consolidated Fund, I found that, in 1869-70, we spent on defence £244,615, whilst in the succeeding year only £83,993 was put down under that head, giving an apparent saving of £160,622.

It can hardly be necessary to dilate upon the favourable comparison ostensibly shown by these figures. Notwithstanding every other department showing an increased expenditure, the saving here indicated would more than counterbalance them all, and although the deficit for 1871 would still exceed that of 1870, yet seeing that part of it was occasioned by falling off in revenue (which might be attributed to misfortune), it would only be fair cordially to recognise the fact of a considerable saving in expenditure. In this seeming reduction, therefore, I thought we had legitimate ground for congratulation. It was the single bright spot in the dreary prospect of our affairs, the one green oasis in the desert of deficits. But when I reflected on the matter, and remembered that every other item of expense had increased—some of them enormously—when I recalled to mind the very significant omission of £52,000 from one account, my mind rather mis-gave me, and I resolved to investigate a little further before accepting the apparent saving as an actual fact. It happened that something caused me just then to look into what is called the Special Fund Account. This fund is maintained exclusively by loans. Nothing goes into it from the general revenue. It is supplied entirely by borrowing. The expenditure from it during the same period was of the most heterogeneous character, but we are at present concerned with one item alone. It is that of Military Expenditure, which is set down here as £171,134, in addition to the £83,993 charged against the Consolidated Fund. The entire Military Expenditure, therefore, instead of being £83,993, as anyone would infer from looking at the tabular statement of disbursements from the Consolidated Fund, is in reality £255,127, or £10,512 more than it amounted to in the year before.

"When these entries have been rectified, we find, with one insignificant exception, that the table of disbursements is very brother to that of receipts—that as every source of revenue diminished, so every individual item of expenditure increased during the year under consideration.

I subjoin a comparative statement of the expenditure for the two years, indicating by a\* the insertions necessary to correct the account.

Having thus reviewed the accounts of the Consolidated Fund, we have now to consider those of the Special Fund. The entries we find on the receipt side are those of sums raised by sale of Debentures, Hypothecation of debentures, Proceeds of Treasury Bills, Loans, &c. The amount of money so raised for the year under consideration was £602,587. There is £20,000 put down for Treasury Bills renewed. £15,000 as raised by Sale of Debentures, and then again another sum of £14,600 raised by Sale of Debentures. There is £214,900 put down for Debentures issued in Conversion and Consolidation of Loans" and £273,500 as raised by

## "Hypothecation of Debentures."

The entries in this account are somewhat confusing for we find the same amount figuring on both sides. Thus, in addition to the above, we have £204,000 set down as "raised to defray amount advanced under Temporary Loan Act" and we have it again appearing on the credit side as applied in "part" repayment. Such items, however, we will pass over, merely remarking that they appear to indicate that the accumulating floating debt when it had assumed sufficient dimensions had to be consolidated or converted into a portion of the permanent indebtedness of the colony.

There is however one item of peculiar interest appearing on both sides of the account. Among the receipts we have £1,709 as Proceeds of Confiscated Lands, and on the other side, to set against this, we have £6,122 put down as paid for "Management and Survey of Confiscated Lands," or rather more than three times what the lands realised. Going to make up this sum we have £2,839 for salaries, £688 for extra clerical assistance, £1074 for surveys, £566 for purchase and compensation, £238 for office rent, and £131 for the inevitable travelling expenses.

Then we have a solid lump of £118,572 applied to purposes of a miscellaneous character as particularised below:—

As regards the £19,898 paid to Mr Busby, why was it paid? What did the Colony get in exchange for it? It is possible that this is in settlement of some antiquated land claim, but even if good value were got for the money in the shape of broad acres, it does not follow that they should be paid for with borrowed money. When a Province sells its Land it deals with the proceeds as permanent income like that arising from rents or pastoral assessments, and if such receipts are credited to the current revenue it would be natural to expect payments for the purchase of land to be similarly debited against ordinary expenditure.

Then in regard to the £27,873 put down among the disbursements as "Balance due by the Province of Auckland," we can only suppose that it represents a bad debt owing by Auckland to the General Government, and instead of being defrayed out of income was met out of capital. A similar remark may perhaps apply to Taranaki and Wellington, but in the latter instance it would seem that at the very time it was necessary to write off £1180 as a bad debt, we made our bankrupt debtor a fresh advance of £15,000. Finally we have £48,823 to represent a part of what we have had to pay for the misdeeds of Southland.

Here then is £118,572 devoted to miscellaneous purposes out of borrowed money, besides the £171,134 applied to military expenditure. If, therefore, we wish to obtain an approximate idea of the real deficit for the year under consideration, it will be requisite to commence with £122,000, which is the deficiency admitted by the Colonial Treasurer, and add on to it the £52,000 for interest omitted, the £171,134 of military expenditure, and the £118,572 applied to miscellaneous purposes, thus:—

The next items claiming attention are £255,392 for Provincial Loans taken over by the General Governments, £810 for interest accrued on them, and £2,760 for charges and expenses attending their conversion. Then there is £6,000 handed over to Wellington to extinguish a loan raised under the "Harbour Reserves Amendment Act" and £250 to redeem debentures of the everlasting Wanganui Bridge.

Then we came to the expenses of negotiating the Loan of 1870, which stand as follows:—

Commission to England:—

£500 of the above is charged to the Consolidated Fund, £2895 to Immigration and Public Works; but with the exception of £500 every penny is defrayed out of the loan itself.

The reader will observe that a good many of the items appearing in the disbursements of the Special Fund, we have not included in the £463,706, representing the probable deficit for the year. The omission, however, is of little consequence, for when the annual deficiency gets well into six figures a few thousand pounds more or less are not of much consequence. I mean that whatever course of action might be proper with a deficit of £500,000, would be equally advisable with a deficit of only £450,000. If it behoves us to bestir ourselves in the one case it does in the other, and if we make up our minds to look on with lazy acquiescence whatever may be our plight, we might as well spare ourselves the trouble of inquiring into the exact circumstances of our position.

The complete accounts for the succeeding year—that ending 30th June, 1872—have not yet been published, for, as a rule, it occupies fourteen or fifteen months from the termination of each financial year before the full particulars are made public. The reader will no doubt remember that, in speaking of the transactions of this year, one of our Colonial Treasurers fixed the deficit at only £33,345, whilst the other declared there was a surplus of £10,500. Until the detailed accounts make their appearance, it is of course impossible to determine by what process our enormous, real deficit has in appearance been explained away; but it is obvious that neither of these gentlemen can have considered military expenditure, provided for by loan, as affecting the deficiency. Here is one item of £186,813 paid out of borrowed money—

But this sum, large as it is, will not adequately represent the real deficit. We may not be able at present to estimate it with perfect accuracy, but we can get a very good general idea. Attached to the Financial Statements

of each year are a series of tables, and the first of these is devoted to showing the amount of our indebtedness as it grows progressively larger. On the 30th June, 1871, its nett amount was £8,304,020, and by the following year it had risen to £9,406,492, giving an increase of £1,102,472. Now, in the recent Financial Statement, all that was claimed by the Colonial Treasurer as having been spent on Public Works and Immigration £711,611, and even of that £93,118 was made up of items partaking of the nature of current expenses; thus—

It follows, therefore, that only £618,493 was really applied to Public Works and Immigration, mid if we deduct that sum from the £1,102,472 which was added to the debt, we get £483,979 to represent the increase of debt *for other purposes*, and that amount may very probably stand for the actual deficiency for the year just terminated. The detail are shown below.

There are two circumstances by which the public is liable to be deceived in regard to the financial operations of the Colony. One is the term Consolidated Fund, and the other is the occasional reference to the operations of the Sinking Fund. The name of the first seems to suggest all revenue converge to it, and that it is the source from which that all expenditure is defrayed, excepting that upon reproductive works. Consequently, when the Colonial Treasurer for the time being proclaims a surplus on the transactions of the Consolidated Fund a number of people accept the assurance with thankful surprise, and comfort themselves with the belief that it is all right—that we have at last established a balance between income and expenditure—and that the Sinking Fund will gradually eat away into the principal of our loans, and in process of time, rid us of them entirely. But the seeming surplus on the Consolidated Fund as we have seen is only created by charging large items of miscellaneous expenditure against borrowed money, and, until quite recently, it has been part of our avowed policy to defray the bulk of interest and other expenses on the Public Works Loan out of the capital of the loan itself.

As regards the Sinking Fund, under the system we are pursuing, its very existence amounts to no more than a pleasant fiction. A Sinking Fund is the apparatus by which a debt is gradually paid off; and, in cases where the debt is *not* being paid off, but, on the contrary, goes on increasing at a enormous rate, the institution of a Sinking Fund becomes a patent absurdity. To illustrate its operation I subjoin a table, showing the relative growths of Debt and Sinking Fund for the last two years.

In this instance the increase of Debt was about seven times that of the Sinking Fund. In the next year we shall find the discrepancy still greater:—

Here the increase of Debt is more than ten times that of the Sinking Fund. What more solemn farce can therefore be imagined than keeping up a pretence of paying off our debt, when that debt is advancing with such gigantic strides ? But it is not a mere question of silliness, nor even of uselessly complicating the public accounts. These operations cost money. There are "Commissioners" of the Sinking Fund, who, we may presume, draw salaries. At all events they make voluminous reports, and occasionally suggest the advisability of special legislation for the better performance of their duties. When, therefore, our debt is not being paid off, but on the contrary is rapidly accumulating, the operations of the Sinking Fund have and can have no other effect than to deceive the public, whilst putting the country to very considerable expense.

Whenever an attempt is made to draw attention to the enormous amount of our debt and the rapidity with which it accumulates, two arguments are used with the view of reassuring. One is, that debt incurred for reproductive "purposes is not a burden but a benefit—that if borrowed money be only judiciously applied to Public Works it will yield a return equal to the annual charge for interest, thus imposing no burden on the community whilst affording increased facilities to trade and general production.

As an abstract proposition this is of course undeniable, but upon the case in hand it has not the remotest bearing. The additions to our debt are not contracted for reproductive purposes only. About half of it, or £5,000,000, has been incurred for the wretched Northern War, and so far from that expenditure having settled the question it still costs us about a quarter of a million annually to maintain what I suppose we must call "peace." As shown above, the annual deficit amounts to nearly half a million a year, which regularly goes to augment the debt. Then, as regards the sums borrowed for public works can any one in his senses imagine that we get value for them, or anything like it ? What is the real worth of all the Public Works in this Province as compared with the sums expended on them? Not long ago I was conversing with an engineer of high standing and solicited his opinion on the matter Were they worth a half—a third—a quarter of what they had cost? After consideration he replied it was impossible to place so high a valuation as a quarter on them. They might perhaps be worth a fifth, but if swept away to-morrow could entirely be replaced for that fraction of their cost. Look at the Public Works of whose working we are furnished with accounts, such as the Post Office and Telegraph. The buildings and plant required for them are we may presume what would be deemed fitting objects on which to expend sums borrowed for reproductive works. And yet in what sense are these works reproductive except so far as *debt* tends to reproduce itself ? Instead of making a profit for the Government—instead of paying interest of the capital invested in them or doing anything towards it—they involve a direct loss of about £80,000 a year. And it must be remembered there is nothing in the nature of a

Post Office or Telegraph that makes it unreasonable to expect them to yield a profit, or at least pay their way. In America a vast number of letters are conveyed by private parties as a commercial undertaking. Most efficiently is the service conducted, and it shows every appearance of well remunerating the enterprising proprietors. When, therefore, we find the Government enterprises distinguished by such tremendous loss in cases where it is possible to keep track, what must we suppose it to be in cases where we have not the means of checking it ?

Sometimes we hear people admit that the money intrusted to the Government for investment in public works is certain to result in direct loss, and yet it is urged that the indirect advantages resulting therefrom will more than counterbalance it. The very term "indirect advantages" is one of that vague illusive character that do so much to confuse and mislead the unthinking. Strictly speaking there can be no such thing as an indirect advantage, for whenever a real benefit exists, it must be to the profit of some individual or individuals of whom the public is composed. And in such cases, seeing that private parties have generally a pretty keen eye to their own interests, the community at large might safely trust them to adopt measures most conducive to it.

If, however, it should be imagined that an increase to the revenue is to be included among the indirect advantages that are expected to result from our lavish expenditure, the idea may be banished at once, for it will not stand the test of experience. In 1867 our revenue culminated, and from that time to the latest period of which we possess complete and reliable accounts, it has steadily diminished. The following table shows the decrease:—

The receipts for the financial year ending June 1871, were £936,188, still showing a falling off.

If the above should not be deemed conclusive, we have the experience of other countries to guide us. In August last, a petition was presented to the House of Commons bearing the signatures of 4878 landed proprietors of Bengal and the Central Provinces of India, which represented that the proceedings of the Government had tended to worsen the condition of the country; that a loss of £2,000,000 a year on railways had to be made up by taxation; that the traffic in many places was reverting to the rivers, yet the Government designed to spend £28,000,000 on new lines of railway, and £39,000,000 on canals; that a large deficit was found almost every year in the Indian Exchequer, to meet which local taxes and cesses had been imposed in vain; and finally praying for the appointment of a commission to inquire into these grievances.

The other argument put forward in reply to the suggestions of prudence is the population theory. We are told to reassure ourselves, for immigration, by affording a wider base on which to levy taxes, will enable us to provide for the increased interest and other expenses of government.

If there were any probability of population increasing in the same ratio as our indebtedness, there might be some show of plausibility in the argument, though other countries will not tolerate the idea of allowing debt to increase at all. As compared with population, the national debt of Great Britain has largely diminished within the last fifty years. That of the United States, since the close of the war, has been enormously reduced, not merely in proportion to the population, but in actual amount. Whilst Northern Germany has practically no debt at all.

If, then, we made up our minds to look on contentedly, whilst debt and population advanced with equal strides, we should still be adopting a course which the foremost nations of the world repudiate. But even these conditions do not apply to us. Our population does not grow at the same rate as debt, for the latter increases in a ratio three or four times as fast—indeed, of late it has increased five times as rapidly, as may be seen from the following table:—

From 1857 to 1862 the debt had increased rather more than fifty per cent., but the population had simultaneously increased a hundred and fifty per cent., and thus the debt, though actually greater, had relatively diminished. Here, therefore, was room for congratulation, and if our finances had subsequently been as wisely administered, we should have little reason to complain.

But whilst up to 1862 population went on increasing at a greater rate than the debt, since then the conditions have been reversed. Population has not doubled, nor nearly doubled, but the debt has increased eight fold. In 1862 the percentage chargeable to every man, woman, and child, was little over six pounds; now it is more than thirty-six. In view of these facts it is nonsense to plead the increase of population as a set off against the accumulation of debt. Such an argument can only be put forward by those who are ignorant of the truth, or who, for purposes of their own, wish to conceal it.

But the advocates of our wasteful policy endeavour to impose upon the public by another assumption equally at variance with facts. They talk as if an increase of population necessarily implied increased revenue; and if one accepted their representations, it would only be requisite to double the population in order to get double the amount of taxes; but, this assumption is no less opposed to common sense than to ascertained facts, as shown below:—

Thus we see that for four consecutive years the population increased, whilst the revenue with equal regularity fell off. If there existed such an exact correspondence between population and revenue as is assumed, the revenue for 1870 would have been £400,000 higher than it was. It is true enough that additions to the

population have a *tendency* to raise the revenue, but that tendency may be neutralised by many causes —as, for instance, bad government, or the perversion of the public funds from their legitimate objects; and if we admit that, other things being equal, the revenue for the last four years would have advanced in proportion to the population, it stands to reason that adverse influences of a very prejudicial character must have been at work to counteract this tendency to such a fatal degree.

Besides, is it likely that population will be attracted to a country so deeply steeped in debt, and that tolerates its reckless increase with such indifference as we manifest? Our very reason for desiring population is enough of itself to drive it away. Whenever, it becomes known, as eventually it must, that we are sunk in a debt of such magnitude as to be unable to defray its interest, what use will it be to go to the labour market of Europe and ask people to come out and help us to pay it? A man notoriously insolvent might as well advertise for a partner with £10,000 capital.

There are people who affirm that the resources of New Zealand are such as will enable us to defray the interest of our debt even when increased to the dimensions shadowed forth in the programme of the Colonial Treasurer; but it is remarkable that those very people shrink from the idea of imposing taxes even to defray the interest on the present debt. But if we cannot pay interest on £10,000,000, how can we be expected to pay interest on £14,000,000 or £15,000,000 ?

The system we have been and are pursuing, cannot, in its nature, go on for ever. Some time or other our real position will become known, and then the bubble will burst. By the operation of some extraordinary delusion, English capitalists have been induced to advance millions to the New Zealand Government. Perhaps they may be under the impression that this money is only applied to reproductive works, and that we are honestly defraying current expenses out of revenue. Such infatuation can hardly be accounted for on any other hypothesis. They probably have not the means of knowing how enormously our expenditure exceeds income, and what large amounts of borrowed capital are annually applied to conceal the deficiency. The fact of such a Government as ours having carried on so long, can only be attributed to its creditors being in ignorance of our position, and the question of how long it may succeed in keeping up the game, is dependent on the success it may achieve in concealing the truth. Our financial position is like a barrel full of holes, into which people are pouring water, expecting to find it there when wanted. So long as they keep pouring in at a rate equal to the leakage, the water will maintain its level, and they may perhaps delude themselves into the belief that it is all there and available when wanted; but the moment the supply slackens the waste betrays itself. So it is with us. For years past our Government has been spending money at a rate absolutely furious, and the only reason that the increasing deficits have not forced themselves on public attention is, that capitalists in England have enabled it to proceed unchecked in its career of extravagance. At present even, it is doubtful if the country could support the weight of its burdens; but if any further additions to them are made, there will be but the alternative of repudiation, or such ruinous taxation as will dissipate for ever our dream of prosperity.

The evil is of such long standing, and seems to have worked itself so deeply into our whole system, that nothing but a united and energetic effort can suffice to throw it off. Our disease is so bad that only the most violent remedy will have any effect, and the very first step in the direction of retrenchment will necessarily be attended with disagreeable consequences. It is idle to think of accomplishing any real reform without first recognising our true position. To do that implies facing a long and severe period of adversity. The seeming prosperity that at present surrounds us is but the temporary effect of our infatuated policy of wasteful, reckless expenditure. Some time it must come to an end, and the practical question for the people of New Zealand is this—Will they put an immediate stop to the vicious system of bolstering up a rotten fabric, and resolutely face the worst that can befall them, or, for the sake of a short period of fictitious prosperity, will they consent to the ruin of their adopted country and the tenfold aggravation of the evil day when it comes?

Dunedin:

Mills, Dick & Co., General Printers, Stafford Street.

1872.

**The Permissive Bill:**

Being the Substance of a Speech

Delivered in the House of Representatives of New Zealand,

By Hon. William Fox,

October 18TH, 1871.

Wellington: Printed by T. McKenzie, At his Steam Printing Office, MDCCCLXXII.

THE following is a reprint from the Report in HANSARD, with only a few verbal corrections, and two or three additional passages, which I have inserted in the text in preference to adding them in the form of foot notes.

W.F.

# The Permissive Bill:

Being the Substance of a Speech

Delivered in the House of Representatives of New Zealand

By Hon. William Fox, OCTOBER 18TH, 1871.

SIR,—I trust that honorable members will not imagine that I am, on this occasion, going to deliver a teetotal lecture. I am not going to appeal to their moral sympathies. I am not here to make Felix tremble, while I reason of "righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come." I am here as a representative of the people, to endeavour to induce my brother representatives to recognize the existence of a great social evil which is sapping the very life blood of the Colony, and to persuade them to adopt the remedy which has been suggested by my honorable friend, the member for Eden, in conjunction with myself; or, if they will not adopt that, to suggest to this House some better remedy. I am satisfied that the bulk of honorable members will agree with me, that the time has come when some remedy must be applied to the drinking habits which exist among the Anglo-Saxon race, not only in these colonies but in every part of the world where that race is to be found. I may very well fortify myself on this subject by the opinions of statesmen who have figured on a larger stage and a wider arena than that which I have the honor to do on this occasion; and I do so the more readily, because I am aware of how little weight my own private opinion on such matters as these would have upon the community, and amongst so many men capable of understanding the social question at issue quite as well as I do. I am glad to appeal to the first statesmen of the day, in the old country, who are moving in a similar direction, backed up by the opinions of millions of persons who desire to see the issue attained at which I am aiming on this occasion. When, on a late occasion, the Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce, introduced a Bill into the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of entirely revolutionizing the law for regulating the sale of spirituous liquors at home, and regulating the system of licensing, the honorable member expressed himself in sentiments which so exactly fit me on this occasion, that I trust the House will allow me to read an extract from his speech: it will be a justification for me in the step I am taking in New Zealand at this time. Mr. Bruce said,—

*"The measure which he was about to ask the permission of the House to explain, was one which had been demanded by the general voice of the country, with an earnestness and an unanimity, to which he recollected hardly any parallel. The question was one which had stirred the hearts and feelings of all classes of society in this country. Committees of both Houses of Parliament, the Church in Convocation, ministers of every religion, Judges and Magistrates, collectively and individually, boards of health, and boards of guardians, had all united in proclaiming and impressing upon Parliament the mischiefs which had arisen from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors. Social and sanitary reformers, who spent their lives in doing good, had declared that their labours for the moral and social improvement of their fellowmen were baffled at every turn by the recklessness and moral degradation which sprung from and were occasioned by the liquor traffic. Our prisons, lunatic asylums, and workhouses, were filled with inmates, whose career had originated in their passion for intoxicating liquors. The back streets, courts, and alleys of most large towns were thronged with a squalid and dangerous population, who owe their degradation to the same cause; and even the rural districts were not free from the curse. But, above all, the working classes of this country, who were the most affected by and felt most the consequences of this system, had with united voice called upon Parliament to deliver them from temptation."*

This is the opinion of a statesman of high eminence. I will now give the opinion of the son of one who assisted to achieve another great social reform of the day—the abolition of slavery—and who has himself recently, I regret to say, ceased from his useful labors—Mr. Charles Buxton, a partner in one of the largest brewery establishments in London, the brewery of Messrs. Buxton & Co. In an essay he wrote on the remedy for drunkenness, he expressed himself in these words,—

*"Add together all the miseries generated in our times by war, famine, and pestilence, the three great scourges of mankind, and they do not exceed those that spring from this one calamity—drunkenness. . . Not only does this vice produce all kinds of wanton mischief, but it also has a negative effect of great importance. It is the mightiest of all the forces that clog the progress of good. It is in vain that every engine is set to work that philanthropy can devise, when those whom we seek to benefit are habitually tampering with their faculties of reason and will—soaking their brains with beer, or inflaming them with ardent spirits. The struggle of the school, the library, and the church, all united against the beerhouse and the gin palace, is but one development of the war between Heaven and hell. It is, in short, intoxication that fills our gaols; it is intoxication that fills our lunatic asylums; and it is intoxication that fills our workhouses with poor. Were it not for this one cause, pauperism would be nearly extinguished in England."*

Sir, it may be argued that the remedy for this is not with the statesman, but with the minister of



religion,—with the schoolmaster, the moralist, and the philanthropist. I will again quote from Mr. Buxton, who, in eloquent words, has expressed his opinion that, when the efforts of all have hitherto failed to check the tide of evil, it is the duty of the statesman to put his hand to the plough. Mr. Buxton, in the same essay writes thus,—

"We are convinced that if a statesman who heartily wished to do the utmost possible good to his country were thoughtfully to inquire which of the topics of the day deserved the most intense force of his attention, the true reply—the reply which would be exacted by full deliberation—would be, that he should study the means by which the worst of plagues can be stayed. The intellectual, the moral, and the religious welfare of our people, their material comforts, their domestic happiness, are all involved. The question is, whether millions of our countrymen shall be helped to become happier and wiser—whether pauperism, lunacy, disease, and crime shall be diminished—whether multitudes of men, women, and children shall be aided to escape from utter ruin of body and soul? Surely such a question as this, enclosing within its limits consequences so momentous, ought to be weighed with earnest thought by all our patriots."

Sir, I think no further apology is necessary from me in recommending this measure to the patriots of New Zealand. I trust that there is no person among us who, in his thoughtful moments, will not fully appreciate the force of the sentiments from the speeches and writings of two eminent statesmen of the present day. I may be told that the case is different in New Zealand: that the state of affairs described by those statesmen is that of the old country, with its habitual vices, its extended pauperism, and all the other evils of a densely peopled social community. I may be told that here, where our aristocracy and working classes meet in the green fields, and are engaged in the simple agricultural and pastoral occupations of a new country, that the evil is not of such a magnitude that we might not safely let it go on for some years longer, without bringing to bear the skill of the statesman or the rigour of the law to check or remove it. But, Sir, I am satisfied myself, from my experience, that the evils which naturally spring from intemperance—though perhaps not exhibiting the glaring squalor and repulsiveness which are the outward features of those evils in the old country,—are in reality making quite as rapid progress in this country; and call for the same energetic and stringent action which has taken place there. Let us see what is the position of this country in reference to this liquor question, as compared with that of the old country. In Great Britain, at the present time, the annual consumption of alcohol amounts to £3 or £3 3s per head upon the whole population—men, women, and children. I may be allowed to institute my comparison by taking my figures from the Colonial census of 1868, as I have not been able to go over the figures of the present one. I have made a careful calculation of the figures and statistics of the liquor trade of New Zealand at the period of the previous census, 1868, and they will be sufficient to enable the House to arrive at something approaching the exact rates of the cost and consumption of liquor in both countries. The total consumption of alcoholic liquors in Great Britain is estimated to amount to £103,000,000 sterling annually, or a ratio of over three guineas per head. New Zealand collected as duties, in 1867, upon ardent spirits, wines, imported ale in cask and in bottle, the sum of £429,000, which was received as revenue by the Government of the country; and those who are in any way acquainted with the trade, and the different ways in which this liquor reaches the public, know that the figures I have given represent nothing like the retail expenditure. Let us multiply the amount of duty by three to ascertain the retail price, and we see that the aggregate cost to the public is £1,287,000 on liquors imported into this Colony. Then, taking the 2,274,900 gallons of ale and beer brewed in the Colony at 3s. per gallon, we have an additional sum of £412,000 to add to the cost of liquor for the people of New Zealand. Thus we see that in 1867 the Colony consumed £1,690,000 worth of liquor. The ordinary revenue of the Colony was that year estimated at £1,225,584, and including the territorial at £1,757,000. We find that we actually consumed within £100,000 of the ordinary and territorial revenue of the Colony both put together. This was poured down the throats of 238,000 Europeans, and about 38,000 Maoris, or a total of 276,000 souls; or upwards of £6 10s. for every man, woman, child, and sucking baby in the country. After the figures I have just read have been compared with those I quoted from the statistics of the old country, I think I am justified in saying that the necessities of the case in this country are not less than they are in Great Britain, and that the frightful evils which spring up from the drinking habits of the people there find a counterpart in this Colony.

Having, I think, said sufficient to justify me in inviting the attention of the House and the country to the drinking habits of the people of this Colony, and the enormous costliness of those habits, I may make a few remarks upon the Bill introduced by the honorable member who, at my suggestion, and with my humble assistance, a few nights ago proposed it to the house. With regard to that Bill, the honorable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Bathgate) was pleased to say that it was hastily got up, and that altogether it was a crude measure, and apparently was led to make those remarks merely from the fact that there appeared two redundant letters in one of the schedules. Now, I beg to assure the honorable member, and through him the House, that the Bill has not been hastily or crudely prepared. It represents the most carefully considered ideas of social reformers on this question. A portion of it is taken from the Bill proposed in the Imperial Parliament by Mr.

Bruce; other portions of the measure are copied from certain American Bills, from Sir Wilfred Lawson's Bill, from Australian Bills, from the Licensing Bill passed last year by the Auckland Provincial Council, and from all others bearing upon the same subject that I could get access to; and in the collating of the various provisions of these Bills, I brought to bear such poor ability as I possess, with the view to produce a measure that would be workable and intelligible. Nor do I think honorable members will find that the Bill is of a complex nature. Nothing has been omitted of a material or essential character; and certainly there has been an amount of labour and care bestowed on its preparation that ought to save it from the charge of having been hastily put together by scissors and paste. That portion which regulates, for the future, the licencing of public houses by public enactments and otherwise, is mainly taken from the able Bill passed by the Auckland Provincial Council last year. Those portions which are termed the permissive clauses are taken word for word, *mutatis mutandis*, from the Bill of Sir Wilfred Lawson, and which, in the Victorian Assembly, has passed its second reading by a majority of two to one; these clauses I have merely adapted to suit the peculiar exigencies of this Colony. The adulteration clauses of Mr. Bruce's Bill I could not adopt entirely, as they require an enormous machinery to enforce them, and are of far too cumbrous a nature to be made applicable to this country; but the principle and something of the machinery are retained. The clauses which have been taken from that American measure known as the Ohio Act give a legal remedy to those who are injured by the drinking habits of others. These, Sir, are the main sources from which the Bill has been drawn, and there has been nothing of negligence in its preparation. I think, if the Bill is put into operation, it will be found to work smoothly, and produce an effect upon the social welfare of our society far beyond that of any other legislative remedy for the ills of society. The chief object of the Bill is to provide that the people of Now Zealand shall have the power to decide for themselves, in any particular locality, whether they will permit of the existence of licensed houses for the sale of spiritous liquors; and it amply provides police provisions, licensing provisions, and other matters of minor details incidental to the proper working of a Bill of this kind.

One material point, which has been alluded to by my honorable friend, and to which he has directed the attention of the House, is that I propose by this Bill to take the power of granting licenses out of the hands of the ordinary Magistrates of the country and to place it exclusively in the hands of the Resident Magistrates; and, in doing so, I hope I shall not give offence to any of the ordinary Justices of the country. My reasons for doing this are that both in this Colony and in the parent country, the evils which have grown up under the present system may be attributed mainly to the ordinary Justices of the Peace who have the power of licencing public houses—a power which they do not exercise with that discretion which might be expected from them. It is seldom, indeed, that we hear of a bench of those Justices refusing a license, and it is as rare to hear of them taking a license away for any misconduct, although complaints may have been made to them. In my humble opinion, Sir, the Justice of the Peace is too near to the publican both socially and geographically. I can give an instance to illustrate this, which has occurred within my own neighborhood and the particulars of which may be found in the local papers. Sir, the case to which I refer is that of a very frightful crime committed in this Province a short time ago, by a publican who, for certain reasons—the main one being, I believe, to cheat the insurance office out of its policy—wilfully burned his house down, and was the means of causing the death of one unfortunate fellow-creature, and nearly the death of three others, who only narrowly escaped. This publican was tried for that crime in this city and was convicted of murder. Well, Sir, while that man was lying in the Wanganui gaol, waiting to be removed to Wellington to take his trial for the crime, and after the whole of the evidence in the case was known to the Magistrates, he was allowed, by the licensing bench, from his cell in the prison, with the crime hanging over his head, to present to them a petition for the transfer of the license of the burnt-down house, even then smouldering in its ruins, and still reeking with the blood of his victim—he was allowed, Sir, to present his petition for the transfer of that license to his own brother; and although the police remonstrated against it, and declared that the brother had formerly occupied a public house, and had conducted it so badly that he was not a fit person to whom to grant a license yet, under these circumstances, two Justices of the Peace actually transferred the license to the brother of the criminal who in a few days afterwards was convicted of murder, there being, also, no house existing at the time. When the circumstances are properly considered, I think I am fully justified in the expression that I used in saying that the local Magistrates are too near the publican to be intrusted with the powers of this important law. The law already recognises the unfitness of many of its Justices, and disqualifies from the licensing bench a large number of the Magistrates, all merchants who import liquors into the country, and all persons who are in the remotest degree interested in the liquor trade. The power of granting licenses is therefore thrown into the hands of the few Magistrates who happen not to be engaged in the liquor trade in any way. I say then, on those grounds, that the evils that have grown up under this system have arisen from the practice of scattering broad cast over the land the granting of licenses by the ordinary Justices of the country, and they, I say, are responsible for the spread of the evil. Let us remedy the law in that direction, and we shall have advanced one stage in the removal of that evil, by placing the power of granting licenses to publicans in the hands of the Resident Magistrates. You will have at least

some better security that the licenses will not be dealt with in such a liberal manner as they are under existing arrangements. In introducing this provision, I have fortified myself by Mr. Bruce's Bill, which proposes to take, to a great extent, out of the hands of the ordinary Justices, the power of indiscriminately granting public licenses: in fact, it takes out of their hands altogether the power to increase the number of licensed houses.

There is another matter in connection with this part of the Bill which I propose as of a useful and satisfactory character. No one has a greater respect for the members of the legal profession than I have. I am a member of the profession myself, and take pride in being so; but I cannot see the necessity for members of the bar being allowed to appear at the table below the licensing bench, in order to adduce authorities from law books to enable the Justices to decide whether a license shall be granted or withheld. Yet that is what is done every licensing day, when you may see lawyers drawn up to support this man or that, in his application for a license. On such occasions you may see Boanerges ventilating his oratory on behalf of his client, talking of the liberty of the subject and Magna Charta, and blustering about the bloated aristocrat who is trying to rob a poor man of his beer. Then comes the junior partner of Dodson and Fogg, a gentlemen of most respectable appearance, whose client probably owns a respectable hotel, where respectable customers get respectably drunk; or the bench will be appealed to by Mr. Sampson Brass, who, in a rusty coat that once was black, and a limp yellow tie that once was white, pleads the case of the wretched tap where he received his instructions and took out his fees in kind. There is certainly nothing in this practice that is calculated to secure discretion in the distribution of licenses; and bringing lawyers into Court on these occasions seems to me to be done merely with the object of bewildering the Justices of the Peace. The lawyer comes armed with all the knowledge and all the artifices of his craft, simply for the purpose of influencing the opinion of the bench and inducing the Justices to grant a license which probably ought not to be granted. But this Bill properly provides that all such applications must be made and opposed in person by the parties who are interested. That at least, Sir, is a provision which I think must receive the unanimous concurrence of this House.

Without wearying the House by examining more minutely the minor provisions of the Bill, I will come at once to what I consider its strong point; and it is a point upon which I expect to see the Bill most severely assailed; and for that reason I should wish to lay such a foundation of argument in support of the provision I am about to refer to, that I may, by anticipation, meet and dispose of all the objections which are likely to be used in opposition. I refer to the prohibitory clauses. Those clauses propose to give to the majority,—not the majority that is ordinarily meant by the term,—not a majority of one, by which a question would be decided in this House or elsewhere,—but a majority so large and overwhelming as must indicate the public sympathy and support—a majority of two-thirds of the inhabitants of a district, power to prohibit the issue of any license within the district. That is the nature of the prohibitory clauses as honorable members will find enacted in the Bill—so clearly that there can be no difficulty in understanding the clauses. I will now proceed to forestall the arguments which I know will be directed against those clauses, and endeavor to remove the prejudices which some honorable members of this House, to judge from their remarks, entertain in regard to them.

One of the commonest arguments used against the proposal is, that the question is not one which comes properly within the scope of legislation, on the ground that "you cannot make a man sober by Act of Parliament." Now, whether this be true or not, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that we can make a man drunk by Act of Parliament. If we effect that by the law as it at present stands, surely we can pass a law which shall do the reverse, a law which shall lessen the inducements to get drunk. At present a man cannot go to a fair, or a market, or a court house, ride along a road, or proceed upon a journey, without being continually exposed to the temptation of spirituous liquors, because those houses where intoxicating liquor is sold stare him in the face on every side. If we can, by passing this Bill, remove those temptations, we shall be doing something towards making a man sober by Act of Parliament. Let us be consistent in this matter. You say we cannot make a man sober by Act of Parliament; I reply neither can you make a man honest by Act of Parliament; but that does not prevent our inflicting penalties for embezzlement, forgery, and the numerous other crimes which are dealt with in our Statute Book. In every one of these cases you inflict a penalty for the commission of an act, and keep up an external pressure to prevent a man being guilty of offences which might endanger himself or other people. This, I think, is a sufficient refutation of the argument that it is not the province of the statesman to interfere by law with the drinking habits of a people. If the State is not to interfere by law with the drinking habits of the people, then I say that you are not justified in suppressing any other crime. If there is justice in the one case there is justice in the other. In your mode of dealing with liquor traffic at present, you fine a man by Act of Parliament for getting drunk; and if you try to make a man sober by Act of Parliament by such a method, why may you not endeavor to make him sober by such legislation as I propose?

Another favorite fallacy is that the Permissive Bill is an interference with "private" liberty. Considering that it only proposes to deal with "public" houses, the very term might suggest the fallacy. But there are two liberties to be considered—the liberty of the man who wants public houses, regardless of the evil they inflict on the community, and the liberty of the man who objects to public houses because he suffers by the infliction of

the evil. Why is the liberty of the former to be preferred to the liberty of the latter? and why is the liberty of one-third to be preferred to the liberty of the two-thirds? The argument of consistency here, also, again applies. If it would be tyranny to interfere with "private liberty" by shutting up the house of call, why does the existing law interfere with my "private liberty," neither allowing me to distil, brew, sell, or drink, but under such regulations and limitations, and subject to such penalties, fines, and lockings-up as it thinks proper? Where is my "private" liberty when "his Worshup" gives me forty shillings fine, or a week on the roads for getting merry at the public house? And is not the tyranny double, first to establish the public house by law, and then to punish me for doing what if I, and others, did not do, the public house would have to put up its shutters? You will not allow me to drink as much as *I* think good for me; and you will not allow the landlord to sell me as much as *he* thinks good for me. "Where is my private liberty, and where is the landlords? And yet with a law like this in force, you say that to give the people the power of closing unnecessary public houses is "the grossest interference with private liberty."

An argument against the Bill was raised by the hon. member for Newton—to whose sound common sense I am always inclined to pay the greatest respect—which is intended to frighten the Government. It is this: that by the action proposed by this Bill, the Colonial Treasurer would be deprived of a large portion of his resources, and that he would find himself in the position of having no money in the Treasury. I will ask my honorable friend whether he could squeeze more from a wet sponge or a dry one, or get more corn out of a full bushel or an empty one? It seems to me that if a man does not throw away his money in public houses, he will have more in his pocket, and that if he does not waste his money in that way, he will be a better tax-paying creature than if he did. But you would not require to increase the taxation. You would not have to keep up so many lunatic asylums, so many gaols and hospitals, nor to spend such unlimited sums upon the repression of crime and pauperism if you put an end to the drinking. You would have a less expenditure to waste upon the various evils and sores of society, the outcome of intemperance, and more to expend upon reproductive objects. We have heard a great deal about cutting off 25 per cent. from the salaries of the poor hard-worked officials; and one honorable member even went so far as to say that the estimates would bear to be reduced by £50,000; but what is that compared with the saving which would be effected in the mere repression of crime by making people more sober? What does Judge Gresson say on this point? That the annual cost of crime to New Zealand is £80,000; and it is well known that the greater part of that crime originates in the public house. In the first place, then, there would be more money for the Colonial Treasurer; in the next, he would be able to get that money easier; and lastly, crime, and poverty, and vice, would absorb less of your money, and leave you more for the legitimate purposes of Government. These are good reasons why the Colonial Treasurer should have no reason to apprehend any difficulty from an alteration in the law. Another honorable member dreads that the proposed alteration would be too sudden; that such an alteration in the ordinary income of the Treasurer might become embarrassing. But there need be no apprehension on that ground. The change would not be made at once. Public houses would not be abolished all at one blow. It might be that, in a particular locality, a zealous band of temperance advocates would be found, and that public houses in their neighbourhood would disappear more rapidly than elsewhere in the country; but all districts would not be of the same opinion in granting or refusing licenses to public houses. The object of the Bill can therefore only be effected gradually; but I think a few years would see the country swept of many of the public houses, and that would be ample time to the Colonial Treasurer to turn himself round and devise new methods of taxation. The embarrassment, if any, would be the embarrassment of riches. He would have to deal with a great influx of wealth into the treasury, which would constantly keep flowing in from a wealthy and sober people, to spend in works of a more reproductive character than a great portion of his expenditure went for in previous years.

Others, again, say that we cannot shut up public houses without opening the way for sly grog shops to spring up, and that it is far better to have liquor sold fair and above board than to have the villainous shanty system, with its train of attendant evils; but that is no argument against the principle of the Bill, and it is an objection which I think will be found to be amply provided for in the machinery of the Bill. It is argued that the suppression of the sale of liquor cannot be effected by closing the public houses. My answer is, that it has been done, and, therefore, that it is to be done; and where it is done, there are no sly groggeries. It is done on a large scale, and on a small scale, in many hundreds of cases. I will mention one case in particular, which was lately referred to by Lord Claud Hamilton, on a London platform. He is a member of Parliament for County Tyrone, Ireland, and I believe the inhabitants of that county are credited with the consumption of a considerable quantity of whisky. Well, there is now a part of that county where, in consequence of the exertions of one philanthropic gentleman, a public house does not exist in eight miles square. Through that area run three large main lines of road, and it contains three market towns. Lord Claud Hamilton further says that, by the unanimous voice of the people, all the public houses in the place were closed, and what was once a place famous for drinking and fighting, has now only one policeman in the whole district, and the rates are reduced by one-half. If sly grog selling had usurped the place of public houses, this improved state of affairs would not have resulted as it has

from the suppression of the latter. Therefore, I think I have very good reason for saying that the thing can be done. I can furnish many other instances of an analogous character. There are 1,000 parishes in one-half of England in which liquor is not sold, as may be seen by referring to the report alluded to the other night by the honorable member for Franklin; and the state of society in those parishes is all that could be expected by the most sanguine supporters of Permissive Bills—there is no crime, no vice, no destitution, no crowded gaols, no costly lunatic asylums. Well, then, look at America, where the principle has been introduced to a very great extent, and see what is said by Mr. Eustace Smith, M.P., Mr. Mundella, M.P., and Dr. Lees, the latter gentleman a distinguished member of the abstaining army at home, and who has been studying the subject for thirty years. Those gentleman state that where the prohibitory system has been carried out in America, the very best possible effects have resulted; in fact, Dr. Lees came to many places where he saw handsome and durable gaols standing absolutely empty, or with only one or two persons confined within them for an infringement of the liquor law. I may mention one case in particular. In the town of Vine Land, in the State of New Jersey, a town of 12,000 souls, or a population a third more than is in Wellington, there was neither crime, policemen, nor paupers; the gaol was empty; and the taxes which were levied upon the inhabitants for the repression of crime did not amount to ten dollars on ten thousand. Now these are proofs that it can be done, and that it has been done. It is no answer to say that some sly grog selling goes on in these cases, as the latest advocate of the publicans, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, alleges is the case in the United States. There may be some; but the great bulk of the evils resulting from drink are cured by the suppression of the licensed public house. Empty gaols, no police, no poor rates, where before the gaols were full, the police many, and the rates onerous; these are the true test of the success of the prohibitory law, which no assertion can gainsay, and no sophistry can evade. That Mr. McCarthy could get a drink by stealth in a dark cellar, *and could get it nowhere else*, is a state of things which I should be delighted to see, alongside of empty gaols and a sober people, as he saw it.

But there is another argument which is commonly urged, and certainly it is a very plausible one; at the same time it is the most fallacious and the easiest to answer of all. We are told, Sir, that this is a class movement: that it is an attempt to rob the poor man of his beer. We are told that the rich can go to their wine merchants and obtain their wine and spirits, and so forth, and enjoy themselves, which the poor man cannot do. We are told that to put down the public houses is a cruel thing, and a piece of class legislation; that it is an instance of the rich men looking after the morals of the poor, with not too much attention to those of themselves. But the answer to all that is, that the Permissive Bill can only become law by the express wish of two-thirds of the population. This is the first principle of the Bill; and two-thirds of any population include the poor labouring men. It is just exactly the poor labouring men who must consent to this Act before it can come into operation. Look at the petitions that are presented to Parliament in favor of this measure, and you will see that they are signed chiefly by the working men; and it is the working men in England, and America, and everywhere else, who ask for it. The man who opposes it is the man in the upper tier of society, who has no care for such matters.

These are some of the principal arguments that have been used against the Permissive Bill. I trust I have answered them by anticipation, and that, at all events, if honorable members proceed to repeat them, they will also be prepared to refute the reply to them which I have given. But there is another point to which I invite the attention of the House, namely, the argument of the honorable member for Newton, who spoke apparently in no unfriendly spirit to the Bill, but to an effect which will prevent, if acted on, the carrying out the permissive clauses, and make them a nullity. His argument is, that if public houses are shut up the publicans must be paid compensation. This is an argument which I know many honorable members will urge, but let us consider how we stand as to that. In the first place, let us see what we are to compensate the publicans for. The publican's license is only for a year; he has no right to a renewal of it; and if the Magistrates should take it away he has no right to compensation. What vested interest can a man have in a license renewable every year? There is a class of farmers in England who hold their farms from year to year. They are liable to lose their farms each year, but I never heard of one of them, when he lost his farm, being compensated for the loss. He considers this liability to loss when he takes his farm. However, this is not so much the reason why I do not consider the publican entitled to compensation, in the event of this Bill passing, for the removal of a great national evil, for the sweeping away by law of the incubus that is breaking down the strength and sapping the vitality of the British nation. Have we ever compensated for injury inflicted on large sections of people by legislation for the general good? I can only remember one case, and in that a very serious mistake was made. I allude to the abolition of slavery, where the British Government compensated the slave owners by giving them £20,000,000. When free trade was introduced did we compensate the farmer? When the navigation laws were altered, did any one get any compensation? When the French treaty was negotiated by Mr. Cobden, did any of those who suffered by it get compensation? Was not Coventry reduced to ruin by it? Honorable members will find that the few cases where compensation was given are wholly exceptional, and that there are a thousand others in which vast trades have been swept away and no compensation has been given. Take the instance of the railways. Was any

compensation given to the owners of coaches running between Exeter and London when the Great Western Railway was opened, or to the owners of coaches when the line from London to Edinburgh was made? Who compensated the turnpike road trustees for the loss of their revenue? But I need not go to Great Britain to show that the principle of compensation is not admitted. Only last year in New Zealand we committed as great an act of injustice as, it is alleged, this will be to the publicans, by passing the Land Transfer Act, by which we robbed the lawyers of one-half of their profits. Did they come to us and cry for compensation? A gentleman, a member of a legal firm in one of the principal towns in New Zealand, told me the other day, "You have ruined us." I said, "I am very sorry to hear it." He replied, "We have usually had from fifty to sixty conveyances in progress in our office, but now we have not one." I was very sorry to hear it; but the argument by which the Act is justified,—the argument by which I justify it—is, "If you have lost, the public have gained." And we may say the same thing in reference to the publicans: "If you lose, the public will gain, and what you have gained, and are gaining, the public have lost and do lose." But I have another argument against giving compensation. If the publican will pay the State for all the injury his trade has done for the last ten years I will be very happy to give him, by way of compensation, the price of his good-will for the next ten years. If he will pay the State for all the crime, the destitution, the misery; for the human beings degraded to brutes, for widows left in desolation, for children left to run wild Arabs in our streets, for the million and a half spent on drink every year, for the countless evils which flow from his trade; if he will pay the State for all this, I will be very happy to balance the account, and pay him what is due to him. It would be a very moderate estimate to say that every public house inflicts injury on the community to the extent of at least one hundred pounds a year. Now, as there are some three thousand houses in New Zealand licensed for the sale of liquor, this amounts to three hundred thousand pounds a year, and extend this over ten years, and then I will be very happy to strike a balance, and pay the publican the value of his good will. I have no objection to grant compensation on these terms, but let it be fair and mutual, —not one-handed, but two-handed. But there are practical instances in England of the action of the principle that such institutions are not entitled to compensation for abolition—institutions carried on on both large and small scales. Only the other day there were the "Alhambra," "Cremorne," and "Highbury Barn" large drinking establishments, with dancing licenses attached, which indeed were the great source of their profit, and without which the places were not worth keeping up. The proprietors were making their tens of thousands, and yet their dancing licenses were taken away with the scratch of a Magistrate's pen—on the ground that they were injurious to public morals—and the proprietors never ventured to ask for compensation. In Liverpool, when free trade was first introduced, the Liverpool people went mad about it, and, in carrying out its principles, they determined to make the liquor trade free as far as possible, and they did so. Everybody who chose got a publican's or a beer shop license provided his house afforded decent accommodation, and the result was that Liverpool became a perfect Pandemonium —so bad, indeed, that the Bay of Islands, at its worst, was not so bad; and the Liverpool people stood aghast at their own work. In the end they had to go to Parliament and get a Bill passed to get rid of all these public houses; and what did they do when they had got their Bill? They swept away at once nearly three hundred beer shops, and not one shilling of compensation was paid. The same was done in Manchester and in other places. But if compensation must be paid, who is to pay it? Surely not the sober part of the community, which has already paid so heavily for the existence of public houses in the shape of taxation for the suppression of crime, and in other ways? To make them pay compensation would be as unjust as it would have been to make the traveller pay compensation to the highwaymen of Hounslow Heath when their trade was suppressed by the police. To make the intemperate pay, after their having been ground to the dust in the publican's mill would be to add insult to injury.

The only way in which compensation could be provided with justice, would be to charge it on the continuing houses. The value of their monopoly would be vastly increased by the removal of competition which would result from the suppression of those which were closed. They could very well afford to pay it. I have no doubt if the offer were now made to one half of the public houses in any of our towns to suppress the other half, on this condition, it would be accepted. What did the fact of several old established publicans signing the petition for the Permissive Bill mean, but this, that they saw the advantage they would gain by the removal of competitors if they contrived to survive, as they hoped they would? To oblige the people to tax themselves to get rid of this gigantic social evil which has taxed them so heavily and so long, would be an act of the greatest injustice. To make the surviving publicans provide for the extinction of the suppressed, thus getting rid of the competition of half the trade at least, would be perfectly equitable. When the day comes that there are no survivors to pay for the extinction of the last, why then we will give their case special consideration.

It is not necessary for me to further urge on the House the adoption of this measure. I know that it is one which has many imperfections, but in Committee, honorable members will have the opportunity of adding to its usefulness, and I can assure them we shall be most happy to receive any suggestion in that direction. On the other hand, if honorable members cannot see their way clear to the adoption of this measure, but still admit, as they must, the necessity of the case—the necessity, that is, of doing something in the matter—I trust they will

tell us what measure they will propose in its place. I have heard and read innumerable attacks directed against the principle of this Bill, but I never yet heard a reasonable suggestion for another which would work better. I have been charged by some members, especially by the honorable member for Newton, with having a craze on this subject. It is a common enough thing, when a man advocates a social reform with enthusiasm, to say he is either a fool or a fanatic. The remark of the honorable member amounts to this, that I am not in my right mind. But "I am not mad, most noble Festus." If I am mad, I am mad in good company. Nearly 12,000 persons have signed petitions to this Parliament in support of the present Bill, and they represent a much larger number than themselves. Eight hundred thousand signatures in favour of a similar measure were presented to the English Parliament. Three millions and a half in Great Britain; five millions in America, hold the same opinions as myself. It is not we who are mad, but those who can see so great a social evil among them and be content to let things be as they are. They are the madmen. They call us "fanatics." It was the term applied to those who objected to the debaucheries of the Court of Charles II. It was that which the slaveholders bestowed on Brougham, Lushington, Wilberforce, Stephen, and Buxton. It is a convenient nickname; the more so as not one in twenty can tell you what it means. Daniel O'Connell made a fisherwoman furious by calling her a "hypothense." However, nicknames will not frighten us. Nearly all great social reforms have been effected by enthusiasts and fanatics, and I am glad that our opponents recognise this qualification in us. Our fanaticism consists in believing that there are too many public houses, and that there ought to be fewer; nay, we think it would be better if there were none. We are fanatical enough to think that this might be accomplished if the power now vested in the Justices of the Peace who have suffered the evil to grow up were transferred to the hands of the people themselves, who are crying out for a remedy for the evil, just as other local powers are—powers of road making, school establishing, and so forth. For this wild creed we are called fanatics. But does this name calling prove anything? If we are fanatics, is it any less true that the drinking habits of the day are, "the crying sin of the age?" If we are fanatics, is it any less true that the present law encourages the evil? If the Permissive Bill is a remedy, why should it not be tried because offered by fanatical hands? I again ask, can you who call us fanatics devise any thing better? If you can, do. I think this country is awakened on the question, and whether they pass this Bill or not this session, the House will find that the question is one which will yearly assume greater importance, and which they will hear of not only in this House but on the hustings.

## **Extracts from Speech Delivered by Archbishop Manning at Meeting of United Kingdom Alliance (Permissive Bill Society) at Birmingham, OCTOBER 18TH, 1871.**

ARCHBISHOP MANNING, who was introduced in most friendly words by the Chairman, and was much cheered, said:—"Mr. Chairman, I heartily give you joy, and congratulate the United Kingdom Alliance on the circumstances and the auspices under which we meet to-night. For many years you—I wish I could say we, for my participation in your work is recent and is feeble—you for years past have been rowing against a tide so vehement and so obstinate that many thought the attainment of your object was impossible. I will not say that that tide is turned; but I will say that that tide is turning. (Hear, hear.) I will say that though we may not relax our arms, every stroke of the oar sends us onward, and that the tide is turning so that we shall float before it. (Hear, hear.) That which was pronounced impossible has begun, in the judgment of all men, to be inevitable. (Hear, hear.) It is a simple question of time, and the work will be done. (Hear, hear.) I have to congratulate you, Sir, first of all on this great change in the public opinion of the country, a change marked in the tone of our public newspapers, which hitherto have trifled with the subject—(Hear, hear)—as forty or fifty years ago, which you, Sir, say you remember, the public newspapers of England trifled with negro slavery until its abolition was inevitable. (Hear.) The change of public opinion has been marked also in Parliament, and marked in the Government. . . .

I wish to congratulate you, Sir, once more upon the fact that the opponents of this course of legislation have begun fairly to reason upon it. (Hear, hear.) The first objection was that my Hon. friend's bill was fanaticism. Well, now, it was the fanaticism of Father Mathew, in which I should count it a very great happiness to walk. (Hear, hear.) It is a fanaticism in which I believe all who hear me are prepared to walk onward without relenting, and without looking to the right hand or to the left. We are agreed in these two things—the first is, that drunkenness must be put down—(hear)—and secondly, that the ratepayers, by a vote of two thirds, must have the power to put it down. (Cheers.) If this be fanaticism I confess we are all fanatics together. (Hear, hear.)

But before men so speak, let them examine the whole course of our legislation and see whether local self-government be not the very nature and genius of our whole system. Another objection which was made was this: that it was an extreme measure. I would ask, Sir, whether any remedy to an extreme evil can be adequate and commensurate without being extreme likewise? (Hear.) It must cover the whole wound, or it will not make a cure. (Hear.) And when I look at what that evil is; when I see that it is devouring men, body and soul; that it is devouring women; that it is devouring children; that it is invading classes hitherto free from drunkenness; that in my own flock I know that there are boys and girls of twelve who are beginning to be drinkers of spirits; when I see around me that homes are wrecked, that children wander barefooted in the streets until they contravene the laws of the land, and, being committed, become hardened criminals, seven-fold worse after their liberation than they were when they entered the prison;—when I see this spreading on every side, and when I know that our whole political fabric—(for I am leaving all question of Christianity and of morals aside for the moment)—is built on piles, and those piles are the social morals of the people, and that drunkenness is fretting away the foundations upon which the whole social and political fabric of the country rests—any man who, seeing this, can for one moment say that the evil is not so extreme that language can hardly adequately give expression to it, and can hesitate to apply any remedy which is alone commensurate, alone efficacious, I cannot count that man either a Christian or a lover of his country. (Hear, hear.) It was but the other day, Sir, that my duties carried me through that part of London which lies on the north bank of the river Thames. I would invite any man who has a doubt upon this subject to walk with me through Ratcliffe Highway. (Hear.) I went to visit the schools of my flock. There were little children, from eight to thirteen years of age, morning and evening, passing through streets, the very atmosphere of which was heavy and rank with sin. There is not a sin which the imagination of man can conceive which is not rife in that North Bank of the River Thames. I saw there figures and faces deformed and defiled by the sin of drunkenness, and therefore, by every other form of sin: a population horrible to look upon, and that is the creation of drink. (Hear.) And when I remember that the majority of the people of Great Britain is to be found in the towns, that the rural people is the minority, and that drink is corrupting and demoralising our town people—those vast centres of your national life—I can only conceive it to be an infatuation in any statesman who does not at once apply an adequate and vigorous remedy to this enormous evil. (Cheers.) So much, Sir, for the extremity of this measure. And now the last and only further objection that I will touch is this. I was told by the same writer, and I thought it well to take down at least the substance of his words, that this bill of my noble friend was at variance with free Government, Liberal principles, and our constitution. All I can say is, if free government mean unbridled license to manufacture, sell, and drink, I only hope that our own free government may be brought to some rational liberty. (Hear, hear.) If liberal principles mean a free trade in drink, in which the capitalist is to double and turn three and four times over the amount of money invested, by the destruction of men, women and children, home and domestic life, morals and religion, the sooner we look for better principles the better. (Cheers.) But I deny altogether this allegation. I say further, that the whole genius of your constitution bears on the principle of this Bill. In the 6th year of King Edward VI. there was a Statute enacted, and the first of its kind, which runs in these words:—"Forasmuch as intolerable hurts and troubles to the commonwealth of this realm do daily grow and increase through such abuses and disorders as are had and used in common alehouses, and other houses called tipping houses, be it therefore enacted that the Justices of the Peace shall have power, two of them to remove, discharge, and put away the common selling of ale and beer in the said common alehouses and tipping houses in such town or towns, &c., as they shall think meet and convenient." Well, I ask what have the friends of the Permissive Bill done more than this? The only difference is, that they do not trust the Justices of the Peace—(hear)—and that they do trust the people. (Hear.) And so do I with all my heart, and I do so for a thousand reasons, and one which is sufficient—because they know the mischief under which they suffer. (Hear, hear.) . . . The working men of England, or the peasantry, or the artisans of England will, I hope, make a strike as I said against the drink trade, because theirs is the only power which can counterbalance the capitalists who brew, and who distil. (Hear, hear.) There is a tyranny of capital over all the springs and powers of politics, and legislation, and the only power in this country that can countervail it is the unanimous will of the working men. (Cheers.) Well, now, I hope that we shall re-constitute the homes of the people of which we heard the other day. I hope to see the time when every working man shall have a home in which his family will be around him, and in which he will have time to speak to his family, and to see them at his knee. I hope he will see them at his knee on the Sunday, and that there never may be permitted the slightest infraction of the old Christian tradition of England which holds sacred the first day of the week. (Hear, hear.) Now there is one other word, and it is the last. The other class on whom I call in virtue of their patriotism, their philanthropy, and their Christian zeal are our statesmen; and I hope that they have given up or are giving up the chattering of political economy in connection with this subject of drink. (Hear, hear.) The theory of free trade in drink has been the misery of Liverpool; it has been well tried there and more than its failure has been demonstrated. (Hear.) And I hope we shall not hear any more about "labor markets." "Labor markets" always make me think of slave markets, Let us



hear no more of the relation between man and man constituted by money. We are men, brethren, friends, fellow-Christians. Let us be related to one another in this sense, and if statesmen will look upon the millions of our people in this way—instead of spending time, as you well said, Sir, over political economy questions, very interesting to contending politicians, but which do not touch the social or domestic state of the people—if they will give up caulking, and painting, and careening, and coppering the old vessel, which is perfectly seaworthy—we have done enough for it lately—if we will only let it go, and if we will take care of the crew—(hear)—if the screw are sober, and moral, and obedient, and under discipline, we need fear none of those disasters which only a year ago filled a thousand homes in England with mourning. The heart of England is sound; and the heart of England is Christian. Let us hold fast to that. We are entering upon a new struggle, and I hope, Sir, that we shall redouble our efforts, and I feel perfectly sure that the tide is turning, and that before we meet again in this hall next year, as I trust we may, a great progress will have been made in this subject, and I have no doubt we shall see the end of the conflict; and may God defend the right. (Cheers.)

## **What Claim have the Dealers in Intoxicating Liquors to Compensation in the Event of Legislative Changes Affecting the Profits of their Trade?**

*[Abstract of Paper by Mr. SAMUEL FOTHERGHILL, read at the Social Science Congress Leeds, October, 1871.]*

- The liquor sellers have no title whatever to compensation. The cry of "confiscation" raised by the Home Secretary, and echoed by the publicans, has introduced a vicious element into the discussion. They have no case for compensation. No part of their property is taken from them. They are deprived of no right. They are simply deprived of a privilege granted conditionally for the public benefit, and liable at any time to be withheld from them, as it now is from all the rest of the community. The tenure of the license has been made to hold only from year to year, for the express purpose of enabling the Government of the country to keep a very tight reign upon a trade which, in all ages and in all countries, has proved itself a nuisance, and a source of moral and social deterioration. The only plea now held out as the ground of a supposed "vested interest" is the culpable leniency with which the Government and the magistracy have long treated the holders of licenses. To make the supineness of Government, and still worse its complicity with acknowledged abuse, an excuse for further leniency towards those who profit by it at the expense of society in general, would be a most dangerous innovation in the principles of legislation. The license-holder knows the exceptional risks of his trade—he calculates on its exceptional profits—and he has therefore no more title to compensation than would any other tradesman whose business fails to answer his expectations.
- But the liquor trade is an acknowledged nuisance, only tolerated because of its supposed necessity. It would be contrary to all precedent and all justice to offer compensation to the perpetrator of a nuisance. On the contrary, he is saddled with all the expenses attendant on its removal, and is also liable to heavy damages for the injuries he has already inflicted. If, as Mr. Bruce said, "all existing interests" are to receive "full and fair consideration," then must the victims of public-house temptation, the drunkards, their wives and families, the sufferers from drunken violence, the tradesmen whose businesses are injured, the neighboring property depreciated by the proximity of a public-house, the excessively taxed ratepayers, be permitted to advance their claims. When the liquor sellers have met these long-standing claims, it will be quite time enough for them to advance their own.
- The conditions on which licenses are granted and the liquor traffic tolerated are notoriously not fulfilled. Witness the aggravated and alarming evils of intemperance and the urgent call for a remedy. It is impossible, in fact, to carry on the trade without both permitting and encouraging drunkenness, and thus defeating the purpose for which the trade is placed under special control. The publicans having failed to fulfil the design of their special privilege, its withdrawal would be simple justice. It is thus withdrawn from some every brewster's sessions.
- But the trade will not suffer to the extent that is generally supposed. Even if the sale of strong liquors were totally prohibited, the legitimate trade of the publican and hotel-keeper would remain unimpaired. Entertainment and refreshment for man and beast would be as much needed as ever, nay more, for trade would be immensely improved, travelling for pleasure as well as for business would increase with the

growing prosperity, the hotels and public-houses would flourish, property in them would be little if anything impaired in value, and a disagreeable and demoralising business would be transformed into one that is thoroughly respectable and eminently useful to the community.

- The plea put forward of the enormous wealth of the trade, and the number of persons supported by it, is totally fallacious. If the trade is ruinous to the best interests of society, it would be the height of injustice, it would be monstrous to perpetuate it for the sole benefit of a class of men willing to profit by the suffering and ruin of a large number of their fellow-citizens. The greater the wealth of the trade, the worse for the argument,—for so much the greater is the wrong to society. A sense of shame, had it existed, would have kept back this plea.
- But further, no class of the community will be so much benefitted by the proposed change as the liquor sellers themselves. Publicans are not a prosperous class. They suffer most of all from the peculiar evils of their trade. They are oftner in the bankruptcy list than any other trade. They are notoriously short-lived. They and their families fall victims to intemperance with fearful frequency, and help to swell the lists of pauperism and crime. In fact, any check to drunkenness, and to the number of license-holders, effected by a change of the laws, will be as much for their benefit as that of any class whatever. The privilege which they have long enjoyed for the convenience of the community has proved to society, and still more to themselves, a terrible curse. The known facility with which men part with their money when under the influence of liquor, and the consequent diversion of wealth into this demoralising channel, has proved to men greedy of gain a powerful temptation. But the penalty they have paid has been terrible. They require to be protected from themselves and from the unreasonable demands of the drinking community, who, for the gratification of their depraved tastes, require from the liquor seller a service which, in a way to an extent that has few parallels, degrades and injures those who carry it on. The only compensation that could benefit the liquor-sellers, or have a shadow of justice, would be their effectual protection from the temptation held out by the license system to embark in a ruinous and demoralising traffic.

## The London "Times" on the Licensing Bill,

OCTOBER 30TH, 1871.

IF the topics of a future session can be taken as prefigured by the topics of a recess, we might certainly anticipate a new Licensing Bill next February. Indeed, we have only to look at Sir George Grey's words last week, and we shall be led to think that of all Ministerial measures a Licensing Bill should come first. He observed that it was impossible to address an audience like that before him "without adverting to what was now on all hands admitted to be the great obstacle to moral, social, and intellectual improvement." Arguing from that statement of the case, we may certainly assume that the removal of an obstacle thus characterised ought to be one of the first objects of any Government. It cannot, for instance, be said of open voting that it is any such recognised impediment to the well-being of the people, nor is it allowed "on all hands" that a Ballot Bill will make us morally, socially, and intellectually better than we are. A Local Government Bill, again, may do the country some good if properly framed, but the want of such a scheme is certainly not the "great obstacle" to the general welfare of the community. That obstacle Sir George Grey defines as "the vice of intemperance"—in other words, the excessive consumption of spirituous liquors, and it would seem to follow, therefore, that the restriction of this consumption should be the earliest work of a Ministry in legislating for the benefit of the country. There were many objections to Mr. Bruce's Bill, but the objection made to it by the representatives of the Liquor Trade amounted simply to this—that it would do what it was intended to do. The people of this country spend in drink, we are told, £100,000,000 a year. It seems impossible to say within ten millions or so what the amount really is, but it is, at any rate, not below the figures we have given. Since Mr. Bruce's Bill was withdrawn it has been asserted that it would, if it had become law, have cut that expenditure down to £50,000,000. It was against this prospective curtailment that the Licensed Victuallers and their friends so loudly, and not unnaturally, protested. They said it was "confiscation," and so beyond doubt it was, to the extent, in fact, of 50 per cent. A trade losing half its custom must lose half its profits, and all the capital invested in it, no matter in what shape, must be depreciated some how or other in like proportion. What the great brewers, the great distillers, the owners of public-houses, and the other members of the Liquor Trade alleged on the subject was perfectly true. What they forgot was that the result they thus deprecated was necessarily the very object of the legislation proposed. Nine out of every ten reasoning men would be prepared to say that if any measure could really reduce the national expenditure upon drink to half its present amount it would be nothing short of a national blessing. *This is what any Licensing Bill must aim at, and it will be successful only in proportion as its end is attained.* Yet, the attainment of the end, however devised, will practically be equivalent to the "confiscation" denounced with such vehemence last spring. There is no escaping from this difficulty, as we

have said more than once, and as we now—for the whole question hinges on the point—say again. If the drink trade is to be protected against "confiscation"—in other words, against the loss of custom and profit which would attend an increase of national sobriety, it follows that "the great obstacle to moral, social, and intellectual improvement" must be left as it is. It matters nothing to the question what form the promotion of this sobriety by legislative means may take. To the same end, as regards the interests of the liquor trade, we must come at last. Diminished intemperance, however brought about can never mean anything but diminished expenditure upon drink, and diminished expenditure upon drink can never mean anything but that indential reduction of profits which the dealers in drink have been taught to consider "confiscation."

We insist upon this topic because it includes and expresses all the grounds of that opposition which proved fatal to the last Licensing Bill, and which, it may be confidently assumed, any new Licensing Bill will encounter in its turn. One party, represented by the framers and supporters of the measure, will be attempting to reduce the dimensions of the Liquor Trade, the other will be fighting desperately for the preservation of that Trade, with its attendant profits, in undiminished proportions. That must be the real issue, and there is no disguising it. Whether the principal adopted he that of prohibition or that of control,—whether the requisite machinery be lodged with the ratepayers or left with the magistrates,—is, as far as the substantial purpose of legislation goes, of no consequence whatever. Once effect or promise to effect that purpose, and the protests of the trade will be as strong and, from its own point of view, as justifiable as ever. Every movement or meeting on behalf of temperance, every suggestion proposed in these columns, every contribution, in short, to the question before us, has this "confiscation" for its end, and nothing else. Sir George Grey, for example, thinks prohibition would never, in this country, be either practicable or effectual, but when he proceeded to say that a "great improvement" might be made in the present licensing system he was but moving in the same direction by a different road. His proposals for increasing the stringency of control over the Trade would either be prejudicial to its profits, or they would be worthless. Nothing in the way of legislation would be effectual unless it accomplished the object deprecated by the Liquor Sellers. Every shilling diverted from the profits of the Publicans is so much loss to the trade. The diversion may be effected by teaching, preaching, influence, example, or force, but, however effected, it will come to precisely the same thing.

Published By F. Fraser, Bookseller,  
Manners Street, Wellington.  
Price, Sixpence Per Copy.

## Permissive Bill.

The Celebrated Report of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury (England),  
On Intemperance & the Remedies  
Now on Sale by Undersigned,  
IN CLOTH, WITH CUT EDGES,  
One Shilling Per Copy.  
F. Rrase,  
Bookseller,  
Manners Street, Wellington.

The Seventeenth Annual Report of the Committee of the Unitarian Church,  
Macquarie Street, Sydney,  
Presented to the Annual Meeting,  
Held in the Church on Monday, the 24th, of April, 1871.  
Sydney: Printed by Robert Bone, "Phoenix" Office, 140 PITT STREET. 1871.

## List of Officers, 1871-72,

### Trustees:

- MESSRS. A. M. àBeckrtrt,
- W. Hanson
- W. Mac Donnell
- J. Williams.

## Minister:

- Rev. James Pillars, B.A.

## President:

- Mr. A. M. àBeckett.

## Treasurer:

- Mr. R. Young.

## Secretary:

- Mr. C. Pearce.

## Chapel-Wardens:

- Messrs. J. Dunage
- W. Pollard.

## Librarian:

- Mr. E. Braiiam.

## Committee:

- *(in addition to the Six ex officio members last-named.)*

## Messrs.

- I. Aaron,
- R. Biddell,
- R. Bonk,
- H. Gilchrist,
- G. F. Jackson,
- T. H. Kelly,
- J. Service,
- W. Shaw.

## Address.

THE PRESIDENT said—As the matters relating to the condition and prospects of the congregation to which we belong will be communicated to this meeting through the medium of the annual report which will be read this evening, I shall not occupy your time by any detailed reference to them, but I may perhaps be permitted briefly to offer the result of such reflections as have occurred to me on the bearing and influence which the growth and extension of the principles by which this and other similar constituted religious bodies profess to be guided, may be expected to have on the moral and religious aspect of the age in which we live. In the first place then, my friends, notwithstanding the many obstacles which are often not very worthily offered to our progress,

we can congratulate ourselves on the fact that we are free—mentally and spiritually free; and if to this remark it be replied, as it will probably be by many, "So are all Protestants free," I say that so long as the name of dissenter carries with it any reproach, so long as the term Free Thinker is permitted to cast a stigma on any man to whom it is applied, and so long as a change of religious opinion, as the result of a fidelity to conscience, causes a man to be branded as an infidel, there can be no freedom for that large class of persons, who, having arrived at what they believe to be a clearer perception of their true relation to God, dare not disclose their convictions, lest they should bring upon themselves the enmity and persecution of those who adhere, outwardly at least, to the so-called orthodox and popular belief. I am sure that I need scarcely remind my hearers that there is an immense number of persons in this condition, and that the revelations of science and the advancing spirit of inquiry are tending daily to swell that number; and it is, moreover, not difficult to conjecture what kind of influence will be likely to be exerted over the destinies of mankind by those who, having lied to their consciences and to their God, find little difficulty in their dealings with men in carrying out to the fullest extent the debasing principles of selfishness and falsehood. In making this statement, which, to some, may seem of rather a comprehensive and, perhaps, a sweeping character, I would wish to offer one qualification. I am conscious that there are individuals, who, from motives of the purest and most tender character, refrain from imparting to those nearest and dearest to them, the religious conclusions at which they have themselves arrived, but whilst believing, as I do, that the religious utterances of any intelligent, true, and earnest man cannot be productive of evil, I must look upon the reticence to which I have alluded as a grave error. Freedom to think, to speak, and to act openly on the highest subject that can engage our thoughts, lies therefore at the root of all true religion, and the demoralising effect of an enslaved condition of the mind in this respect, is seen and exemplified in the history of nations as well as of individuals. The events which, during the last few months, have startled and horrified the whole civilised world, could never have transpired in any country where the principles of Christianity really held any sway, for it would not then have been possible to obtain the blind and brutal assent of truly Christian men to enter upon a deliberately organised system of human slaughter at the fiendish instigation of one man. The most complete religious organisation, as far as relates to forms and ceremonies, was nevertheless in full operation in the country in which these atrocities have occurred, and infidelity in the true sense of that term has long prevailed amongst a very large proportion of its people. Let us, therefore, my friends, show less anxiety for the furtherance of our views as a means of improving our worldly position, than to cultivate and preserve individually that spirit of freedom by which alone the heart can appreciate and the conscience can direct the most solemn duties of our lives.

## Report.

IN submitting their Report to the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of this congregation, your Committee are drawn at once to the interesting subject of the prospects, which at length exist, of a new Unitarian Church being erected in this City.

The Church Land Bill, which, it will be recollected, was before Parliament, at the date of the last Annual Meeting, received the Royal assent on the 20th April, 1870, and enables the Trustees to dispose of and convey the land comprised in the Grant on Church Hill, and apply the proceeds, either in the purchase of other land for a Church or School, or both; or in enlarging or re-building the present Chapel. To decide which course should be adopted, measures were early taken to convene a meeting of Unitarians generally, which was held in the Chapel, on the 2nd August last, when it was determined that the proceeds of the Grant should be invested in the purchase of suitable land, and in forwarding the erection thereon of the contemplated building. A site, considered by the meeting to be exceedingly eligible, adjoining Hyde Park Terrace, was immediately secured by the Trustees of the Clarence Street Grant; and the purchase money, amounting to £800, was available forthwith from the sale of three of the seven allotments into which the land in question had been subdivided for auction. A Committee was also appointed at the above meeting to receive and solicit contributions on behalf of a building fund for the proposed Church; and it will be satisfactory to state, that expectations have not been disappointed in the amount of assistance to the project which the fund already exhibits. Subscriptions, estimated at £250, are now in the hands of collecting members; while the fulfilment of outstanding promises will swell the sum to £400.

In August last, your Committee, recognising the general feeling, requested their Chairman, the President of the Church, to call a meeting of its members for the 22nd September, "to consider the expediency of an application being made to the Trustees of the Church property in Macquarie Street, \* \* \* \* requesting them to sell the same by public auction or private contract, as their discretion might direct, and to apply the proceeds thereof in or towards the erection of a new Unitarian Church and School on the site recently purchased by the Trustees of the Clarence Street land." A very full attendance responded to the notice which had been duly

advertised and otherwise published in terms of the Trust Deed; and a resolution was unanimously passed, upwards of three-fourths of those present attesting the same by their signatures, as required by the Deed, affirming the willingness of the Congregation to co-operate in the erection of the intended Church, by selling the present building, and devoting the proceeds to the new one, "upon condition that it be mutually understood by and between the Trustees of the Clarence Street Land and the Trustees of the Chapel property that all arrangements as to plans, estimated cost and otherwise howsoever relating to the intended building, together with the Trust Deed of the premises thereof be approved by the Congregational Committee \* \* \* \* for the time being; and that for the purpose of acting in the matter of the said arrangements, and for that purpose only, the Trustees of the \* \* \* \* Clarence Street land and the Minister be at all times *ex officio* members of such Committee, in addition to the Trustees of the \* \* \* Chapel Trust property, already such, under and by virtue of the Trust Deed thereof."

The Trustees of the Chapel were communicated with accordingly; and, so far as the proposed edifice depends upon the contributions of the value of our present place of worship, the matter is only contingent on the respective parties of Trustees arriving at the mutual understanding referred to.

A reply was received by your Committee from the Trustees of the Chapel, on the 10th November last, in which it is stated, that "they do not think it desirable to take any steps towards parting with the present place of worship, until a thoroughly matured and practical proposal be placed before them, shewing the amount required, and the funds actually available towards meeting such expenses as must be incurred in the erection of a new Church and School; and that, as the Trustees are led to believe, that contributions towards the object proposed may be expected from England, they do not feel justified in adopting any measures for parting with the "present building within the next four months. The interval named, expired on the 9th March last; and it is now understood that steps are in progress which will soon give effect to the Committee designated by the General Meeting, and empower them to commence the undertaking which all desire to see accomplished.

As instructed by the Annual Meeting last year, your Committee have had under consideration the desirableness of introducing changes in the rules forming the constitution of this Church, and annexed to this Report is a draft of Leading Principles and Regulations, which your Committee have agreed to recommend for your approval, in lieu of the existing rules.

The more important alterations appear in the first section, which, though enlarging and somewhat modifying the former statement of "fundamental principles," maintains in distinctive prominence the supreme moral right of private judgment, and the paramount obligation of the dictates of conscience. In the second section, relating to congregational matters, the principal change suggested is in reference to the arrangement for electing the non-official members of the Annual Committee, which it is thought will commend itself, without further remark.

Some time since, the subject of extending the sources whence the lessons read during Divine Service should be selected; and while their individual opinion would be in favor of a class of readings not exclusively from the Bible, it was considered most advisable to place nothing on record which might possibly interfere with the discretion of the Minister, or forestall an expression of a preference on the part of a General Meeting.

It affords your Committee unmixed satisfaction that our respected Minister has distinguished himself most admirably, in defence of the liberty of conscience, in a matter within the shortest memory. The case of Mr. Lorando Jones, the victim of a prosecution for blasphemy in the eye of obsolete law, your Committee have little doubt would have been condoned and forgotten had it not been for the manful championship of the rights of free thought and free speech by the Reverend Mr. Pillars, the more to be esteemed, as assumed in the cause of one whose sole bond of union with us consists in his assertion of moral and mental independence.

The Sunday School, under the management of the Rev. Mr. Pillars, continues its career of usefulness. There are nearly a hundred registered scholars, although the average attendance of such, owing chiefly to the long distances many of the children have to come, is not more than fifty. The Superintendent believes that the School will be largely increased by the removal of the Church from Macquarie Street to Liverpool Street, and hopes, at an early date, in view of that event, to enlist the services of such friends as may be disposed to co-operate with him in making the Sunday School a really important department of our Church operations.

In addition to the ordinary celebrations which have been observed with success, in their regular place, through the congregational year, your Committee were happy to afford the auspices of our name to a *fête champêtre* at Frederick's Hall, Parramatta River, on the Anniversary of the founding of the Colony in January last, when numerous parties of friends and members enjoyed the excursion, and spent a day to be pleasantly remembered.

The state of the funds has pressed itself upon the notice of you Committee with its accustomed force during the year; and instead of the Tea Meeting with which the establishment of this place of worship has usually been commemorated, arrangements were made for a Musical and Literary Soiree, the proceeds of which should be appropriated to the general fund. The entertainment took place at the School of Arts, on the 13th December last,

a well pleased audience rewarding the exertions of the Sub-Committee entrusted with the management, although the pecuniary result was inconsiderable.

The Treasurer's account, which will be laid before you immediately, will show our financial condition in detail.

It is incumbent on your Committee to draw attention to the diminished receipts for sittings and subscriptions, in the year which has just closed, as compared with their amount in the previous year; the total deficiency shown in the account of £44 16s. 1d. being composed of £33 2s. 6d. from this source, and £11 13s. 7d. from minor causes, the principal of which is a debit of £7 5s. 5d. from the last balance sheet.

The continued depression in Colonial business has necessarily told upon the support of a cause, to which the number of contributors is comparatively limited, and therefore, not large enough to permit a protracted want of average prosperity to remain unnoticed.

The Treasurer, however, is of opinion, that the list of payments outstanding may be relied on, to the extent of about £16. But, on the eve of engaging in a new enterprise, and one that demands increased exertions like the raising of a commodious and attractive structure for Church purposes, your Committee are sure that the difficulty requires only to be fairly stated in order to be promptly met; and with this object, they have felt it right to authorise a Special Subscription to make up the amount of the existing deficit, leaving the available arrears for the year nearly entered on.

This matter is accordingly commended to the earnest liberality of the present meeting.

Arthur M. Beckett, CHAIRMAN.

*Sydney,*

*24th April, 1871.*

## The Treasures in Account with the Unitarian Church Macquarie Street, Sydney,

Dr. From 25th March, 1870, to 25th March, 1871. Cr. £ s. d. To Seat Rents and Subscriptions ... .. 235 11 6  
" Donations ... .. 42 15 0 " Weekly Collections ... .. 63 14 1 " Surplus from Annual Meeting ... .. 3 7 6 " Picnic  
... .. 0 5 9 " Books sold ... .. 0 15 6 " Collections for Benevolent Fund ... .. 10 6 0 " Sunday School ... .. 5 2 6 "  
Balance due to Treasurer ... .. 44 16 1 £406 13 11 £ s. d. By Balance due to Treasurer ... .. 7 5 5 " Minister's  
Stipend to Feb. 5, 1871 ... .. 350 0 0 " Organ Blower to March 11, 1871 ... .. 6 0 0 " Chapel Cleaner to Nov. 5,  
1870 ... .. 8 0 0 " Gas Account to Dec. 31, 1870 ... .. 8 12 0 " Insurance to Oct. 18, 1871 ... .. 2 5 0 "  
Advertising to March 25, 1871 ... .. 2 3 0 " Collector's Commission ... 1 17 0 " Collection for Benevolent Fund  
handed ... .. " to Rev. J. Pillars ... .. 10 6 0 " Collection for Sunday School ... .. 5 2 6 " J. Hawksford, Gas  
Repairs ... .. 0 4 6 " R. Doyle" ... .. 0 8 6 " R. Bone, Printing Annual Report ... .. 4 10 0 ... £406 13 11

*March 25, 1871.*

William Shaw, Treasurer.

Audited and found correct, Charles Pearce, Auditors.

William Heron,

## The Minister in Account with the Unitarian Church.

Sunday School General Fund, From March, 1870, to March, 1871. Receipts. £ s. d. To Balance in hand ...  
... .. 1 11 7 " Annual Collection ... .. 5 2 6 " Proceeds of Picnic ... .. 24 19 0 " Proceeds of Lime-Light  
Exhibition ... .. 2 8 0 " Donation ... .. 0 5 0 " Balance due to Superintendent ... .. 5 10 11 ... .. £39 17  
0 Expenditure. £ s. d. By Picnic Expenses ... .. 33 13 0 " School Tea-Meeting Expenses ... .. 1 16 0 "  
Books for Scholars ... .. 3 10 3 " Interest on Deposits ... .. 0 17 9 - £39 17 0 Benevolent Fund. Receipts. £  
s. d. To Balance in hand ... .. 1 3 1 ,Four Collections ... .. 10 6 0 " Contributions ... .. 2 12 0 £14 1 1

Disbursements. £ s. d. By Subscription to Infirmary ... .. 2 2 0 " Benevolent Society ... .. 1 1 0 " Disbursements by Minister ... .. 10 15 0 " Balance in hand ... .. 0 3 1 £14 1 1

## Progress Report of the Building Committee.

IN pursuance of the resolutions adopted at the general meeting of the congregation held on the 22nd of September, the Trustees of the several Church properties, together with those members of the Congregational Committee not trustees, resolved themselves into a Building Committee, to select a design for the new Church, and to take such steps as they might think necessary for carrying out the wishes of the general meeting.

At a meeting of the Committee, held on the 23rd March last, after an examination of the designs sent in and full consideration of ways and means, the following Resolutions were adopted:—

- "That the design furnished by Mr. Rowe for the New Unitarian Church, to be erected in Liverpool Street, Hyde Park, Sydney, be adopted, subject to such alterations as the Committee, consisting of the Trustees of the Clarence Street and Liverpool Street Unitarian Church properties, the Trustees of the Unitarian Church, Macquarie Street, the Minister of the said Church, and the Congregational Committee of the said Church for the time being, may approve; and that tenders be called for, and the erection of the New Church proceeded with, as soon as the Building Committee have £1500 at their disposal."
- "That a Bazaar, on as large and remunerative a scale as possible, be got up in aid of the Building Fund, and that the ladies of the Congregation be invited to give their assistance."

Two allotments of the Clarence Street land yet remain unsold,  
Since sold for £520.

but the Committee believe that they will shortly be disposed of, and that with the amount then in hand, together with subscriptions already received and promised, the required sum of £1500 will soon be realised. Tenders will then be called for, and the Committee feel sanguine in the anticipation that a very short time will see the commencement of a work which will be gratifying to all; and which, besides being an ornament to the city, will largely promote the worship of the One True God and the spread of free religious inquiry.

The cash now in hand amounts to £793 10s., which, with the proceeds of the two unsold allotments, subscriptions received and promised, will, the Committee believe, nearly realise the amount required, and enable them to lay the foundation stone of the Church; and they now earnestly appeal to their friends to use their exertions to effect this object.

Arthur M. àBeckett, CHAIRMAN.

AT the Annual General Meeting of the Unitarian Congregational Church, held in the Chapel, Macquarie Street, Sydney, on Monday evening, the 24th April, 1871, A. M. àBeckett, Esq., President, in the Chair, the following leading Principles and Regulations were adopted, in substitution for the "Fundamental Principles" and "Rules," forming the Constitution of the Church:—

### Leading Principles:—

- The recognition of one God, to whom, as the embodiment of all the excellencies which the highest human mind can conceive, it behoves us to render the homage of our adoration and the devout service of our lives.
- The recognition of Reason and Conscience as of higher authority than any book or any church; and of Inspiration as manifesting itself whenever man, by reverently accepting the guidance of these faculties of his nature, obtains insight into what is true and good.
- The recognition of the exercise of the right and duty of Private Judgment in religious matters as essential to completeness of character; and of free and unfettered religious inquiry as indispensable to the discovery of truth.
- The recognition of purity and uprightness of life as superior to mere belief in any doctrine whatsoever; and of our obligation to be good and to do good without regard to the losses our integrity may bring upon us in this world, or the gains it may secure to us in the next.
- The recognition of Jesus of Nazareth as chief among the prophets and apostles of God comprising the good and noble of every age, race and creed; and, therefore, as worthy of our highest admiration and our deepest love.



# Regulations.

- Every person using the Church as a place of worship, or contributing to its support, shall, unless a wish be expressed to the contrary, be considered a member, and entitled to vote at any meeting of the Congregation.
- The following, chosen from the members, shall be Officers of the Church:—a President, Secretary, Treasurer, Librarian and two Church Wardens—all to be elected annually by a majority of votes, at a General Meeting to be held on, or near, the 25th March. These, together with eight other members, chosen by ballot from a list of nominees—each nominee to be nominated by two members—posted at the Church entrance on the Sunday previous to the Annual Meeting, shall form the Committee of Management.
- The President shall preside at all General Meetings, have power to call special meetings of Committee or of the Congregation at any time, and generally to act in such manner as may seem to him fit and necessary for the Church's welfare: provided always that such action shall be accordant with the rules and principles of the Church.
- The Treasurer shall receive contributions to the Church funds, and, with the sanction of the Committee, meet such claims as may be made upon them. He shall also prepare an annual debtor and creditor account, to be audited and passed at a Committee Meeting, prior to Annual Meeting for Statement of Accounts.
- The Secretary shall prepare and issue notices of Committee and other meetings; he shall make minutes of proceedings and conduct the correspondence of the Church.
- The Church Wardens shall have charge of the Church and all church property. They shall receive applications for sittings and see that strangers are accommodated with seats and books. They, or one of them, shall be in attendance at the Church half an hour before the time for commencing service.
- The Committee shall at their first meeting appoint one of their number to be Chairman of Committee during their year of office.
- Any member of Committee, absenting himself from four successive meetings of Committee regularly summoned, shall be considered as having resigned his office, but may be reappointed by a vote of the Committee; and in the same manner shall be filled up any vacancy that may occur.
- To constitute a regular Committee meeting the following conditions shall be observed:—1. That each member shall have sent to him not less than two days' notice; such notice to specify the object of the meeting. 2. That it be held on the second Thursday evening in the month. 3. That five members at least be present. A special Committee Meeting may be convened at any time by the President, or by three members of Committee.
- A resolution in Committee to be valid must be proposed, seconded, and carried by a majority of votes; the Chairman having, when the votes are equal, a second or casting vote. Every such resolution shall be entered by the Secretary, or Chairman, in the minute book.
- A General Meeting shall be called by the Committee at least once a year, for the purpose of electing a new Committee, passing the Treasurer's account, and for other business, not less than fourteen days' notice to be given. A Special General Meeting may at any time be convened, on giving not less than eight days' notice, by the President, the Committee, or the Minister, or at the request of eight members.
- The Church records shall include the following:—1. Treasurer's Book, for the congregational accounts. 2. Secretary's Book, for minutes of proceedings. 3. Register of baptisms, marriages, and burials, to be kept by the minister. Such records may, at any suitable time, be consulted by members of the congregation, but not removed.
- Any addition to, or alteration in, these rules may be made at the Annual or at any Special General Meeting: provided always written particulars of the proposed alteration, or addition, shall be sent to the Secretary three weeks before the day of meeting, and also be posted at the Church doors in the interval, for the inspection of members of the congregation.

## Extracts From Minutes Of Annual Meeting, 24TH APRIL, 1871.

Moved by Mr. H. Gilchrist, and Seconded by Mr. Young,—

"(1.) That the Report brought up by the Committee be adopted, and printed for general circulation. (2.) That the Treasurer's account for the past year be provisionally adopted, and that Messrs. William Heron and Charles Pearce be appointed to audit the same; the account, as audited, to be printed with the Report. (3.) That the Minister's Statements of the Sunday School and Benevolent Funds be adopted and printed with the Report,"

Motion put and passed.

Moved by Mr. Aaron, pursuant to notice, and Seconded by Mr. Shaw,—

"That the 'Leading Principles' and 'Regulations' now read be adopted, in' substitution for the 'Fundamental Principles and Rules' forming the present Constitution of this Church; and that the same be printed with the Annual Report."

Motion put and passed.

Moved by Mr. Aaron, and Seconded by Mr. Dunage,—

"That the Report now brought up, in reference to the building of the proposed New Church, be adopted, and printed with the Annual Report."

Motion put and passed.

## Preface.

THE following remarkable poem and interesting narrative are the work of a lady who has already established for herself a fair literary reputation, but from prudential motives she has decided to withhold her name for the present from the title-page of this book.

The publisher saw objections to placing it before the public anonymously, lest it might be looked upon as little more than a clever fiction. To remove this difficulty, and in the belief that the work is a most valuable contribution to the cause of truth, I have consented to introduce it with my name.

The authoress, who is residing abroad, assures me that every spiritual occurrence herein narrated is absolutely and accurately *true*; and that all the actors in the varied and curious scenes are veritable living personages, whose names she has furnished to me.

During the progress of this work, the authoress became aware of a gradual development of mediumistic powers in herself, and she is now producing some extraordinary drawings and writings, under, as she believes, the guidance and dictation of the spirit of her late lamented husband.

Differences of opinion there will be on the points of reasoning and the principles enunciated in this book; but there can be none I think as to the high literary talent and freshness displayed in the treatment of the subject, nor as to the extremely interesting nature of the facts which the narrative discloses.

Benjamin Coleman.

51, *Pembridge Villas, Bayswater, London,*

*May, 1805.*

## To the Memory of my beloved Husband.

HE stood unmatched on this terrestrial sphere,  
Scarce less than angel, far, far more than man!  
Too pure, too good, too blest to linger here,  
Irradiating life's fleeting, sombre span—  
Valued, esteemed; to every being dear,  
Whose heart and mind his peerless worth might scan.  
Beaming and glorious his high soul has flown  
To spiritual spheres, where angels dwell alone.

What words may tell, what phantasy divine  
The rich and varied treasures of strange lore,  
The boundless wealth of the exhaustless mine,  
Of that grand intellect, the virgin ore!  
All that can elevate, instruct, refine,  
Garnered unheeded in that priceless store !  
Science and truth in their most dazzling light,  
And all that genius gives most glorious, fair and bright.

Supreme the splendour of his godlike mind;  
But all were vain to picture the fond heart,  
To every living creature warm and kind;  
For ever seeking blessings to impart;  
Devoted, gentle, cheerful, pure, resigned;  
Unstained by earthly dross, or worldly art;  
Burning with such unselfish, tender love,  
That none may know its like, save seraphim above.

Oh ! blest beyond all others was the one  
Whom that unrivalled ardent heart endowed  
With its rich freight of deepest love alone !  
All the vain honours of which men are proud,  
Royal tiara, and imperial throne;  
The empty pomps to which the world has vowed  
Its homage and its lusts,—all, all were nought,  
Beside the peerless bliss with which that love was fraught

For they were fitly met,—no sordid aim  
Had dimmed its lustre. All was on a par,—  
Soul, mind, and passion. Both could justly claim  
Their brilliant portion. No false chord did jar  
That glowing hymn. No flaw was there to shame  
The limpid crystal,—no lost link, to mar  
That glory which angelic eyes delights,  
Two lofty, twin-born souls, whom God Himself unites!

What that this world may offer, can compare  
With that deep joy, that ecstasy supreme,  
When two fond souls each thought, each feeling share,  
And life glides on, a spiritual dream?  
While hand in hand advance the loving pair,  
Each other's echo; as with lightning gleam,  
deas flash from each responsive mind,  
Till ere the words are breathed, already they're divined !

What can replace it ? There is nought on earth  
So radiantly divine! All things must pall  
When once 'tis savoured.—Of celestial birth,  
Pure, exquisite, sublime! 'tis all in all  
To those twin spirits.—Nothing else is worth  
A sigh or tear ! All worldly joy doth fall  
Too far beneath its spells! Supreme disdain  
All other raptures wake,—cold, colourless, and vain.

Lo ! he is gone ! The master mind has fled;  
The loving heart, the sympathising soul,—  
All are extinguished! He is with the dead !  
Where can we find the courage to control  
Such maddening woe? Eternal night has spread  
Its darkness round. What Power can console  
The mourning one who dismally survives,  
Whose agonies alone betray that still she lives?

All things with him have perished! Bleak and drear  
Looks this fair earth. Chill, melancholy, pale,  
Its brightest scenes. The sun has ceased to cheer  
With his warm smile the mountain and the vale.  
Cold, mocking phantoms do all men appear;  
Wit, talent, genius, valueless and stale.  
For what can fame and glory profit yet  
To that crushed, broken heart whose only sun has set?

Can this be life? Is happiness accurst?  
That those whose bliss is pure, whose love is true,  
Deep, passionate, supreme, should be the first  
Their lofty hopes, their joyous hours to rue?  
Can it be just that fate should do its worst  
Upon the blameless hearts,—the chosen few?  
Is it decreed that all things bright and fair  
Should vanish in the gloom of hopeless, black despair?

Is there no providence? no mercy here?  
No justice on the earth? no God above?  
Nothing to hope, and everything to fear?  
That such felicity, such noble love,  
Such ardent prayers, He can refuse to hear ?  
If such deep grief be powerless to move  
His heart, in pity, to console and save,  
Then is the world indeed but one wide, ghastly grave !

Can this be true ? Is then Omnipotence  
Another name for tyranny's stern might ?  
Can ruthless rigour, harsh indifference,  
Quench in His heart all pity, justice, right ?  
Can hopeless grief, can suffering intense,  
Delight his ears,—be pleasant in His sight ?  
Can abject terror, superstition vile,  
The loathsome homage be on which a God can smile ?

Answer me Thou ! Almighty One, reply !  
Hear Thou the mourner's passionate appeal!  
Are men in error, or art Thou too high,  
Compassion for our misery to feel?  
Dost Thou disdain us? or do we belie  
Thy sympathy for human woe or weal?  
Can it be true, that merciless, cold, stern,  
Of these sad, tortured hearts the anguish thou dost spurn?

What gleaming light is flashing in the skies,  
Piercing the gloom? What solemn voice is this,  
That answers to my prayer?—that bids me rise,  
Resigned, serene, from chaos' black abyss?  
What dazzling vision bursts upon my eyes!  
What radiant hope! unutterable bliss!  
All has not perished !—Joy has not fled !—  
The loved, the lost return !—O God! they are not dead

Wonder of wonders ! Do I wake or dream?  
Does some strange madness whirl my frenzied brain?  
Too marvellous the glorious truth doth seem;  
Too wild the ecstasy that stills my pain.  
Full on my glance the opening heavens beam.  
God is no myth ! We do not live in vain !  
Through every vein electric fires burn,  
With rapture echoing, The loved, the lost return !

I do not dream. It *is* his voice I hear;  
The loving thoughts, the accents all his own.  
"Be comforted," it murmurs in my ear;  
"I have returned to thee; I have not flown  
To some far distant, brighter, happier sphere,  
And left my love to sorrow here alone.  
Weep thou no more, for I am at thy side;  
Rejoice, for thou art now a glorious spirit's bride.

Weep thou no more ! Behold, pure love is blest.  
Lite is no malediction; 'tis a boon  
Most grand, most bounteous! All is for the best.  
The hour is ripe. God has decreed that soon  
The wondrous truth shall be made manifest  
Throughout the world. Then shall all men commune  
With spiritual spheres; all men believe;  
And miracles unfold their minds can scarce conceive.

The world is not a chaos. All is wise,  
Beneficent, omniscient, just, divine.  
God is too great His creatures to despise;  
'Tis ignorance alone makes man repine.  
What though the mystery elude his eyes!  
Sage are the means; stupendous the design.  
Eternal bliss awaits the immortal soul.  
Sublime infinitude its vast, transcendent goal.

"Evil is transient. By His bounteous will  
All must progress. Dread death is but a name  
For transformation. Nothing may stand still;  
Nothing may perish. Anguish is the flame  
That purifies the ore. Each must fulfil  
His destined task, ere he can justly claim  
Reward or merit; for no worth nor pride  
Belongs to aught unearned, or what is yet untried.

Men are not cast upon life's troubled tide  
To float or sink, like atoms on the stream,  
Swept onward by the wave, whate'er betide,  
Devoid of helm or steerage, or a gleam  
Of light Divine their unknown course to guide.  
Nought is uncertain, hazard, as men deem;  
Nought is unmeaning, fruitless, aimless, vain;  
Throughout the universe all things doth He ordain.

Glorious Creator, how has not Thy name  
Been outraged by Thy children! Through all time  
Men have not feared Thy splendour to defame  
With impious profanation. Every crime  
That stains their annals, every deed of shame,  
They foisted on Thy Majesty sublime,—  
All the vile instincts which their souls pollute;  
Each passion that has power to make their conscience mute.

"Every weak mortal on whom men bestow  
Kingdoms and crowns, to pamper-vice and lust,—  
Before whose altars abject courtiers bow,  
And groaning thousands, trampled in the dust;  
That by their base example all may know  
*Thy* providence alone should nations trust,—  
With blasphemous appeal dares to invoke  
Thy grace Divine, Thy name, iniquity to cloak.

"Zeus, whom men unblushingly array  
In all the carnal grossnesses that mar  
Each loftier impulse; at whose feet they lay  
Ignoble incense. Sanguinary Thor,  
Before whose blood-stained altars they can pray !  
Leader of ruthless hosts, of savage war;  
Jehovah, God of vengeance and dismay !  
Thou, whose unsullied glory men degrade  
To their own sordid type, whose image they have made.

"Exterminator ! Thou, who givest life  
To every creature that doth breathe and move.  
Abettor thou of carnage, rapine, strife;  
Of infamy that even men reprove!  
Thou, whose perfection with all good is rife;  
Source of all virtues, genius, science, love;  
Protecting, blessing all existing things,  
O'erspreads the universe with providential wings.

"Father of spirits ! Infinite, Supreme !  
Thought fails to image, language to reveal,  
Of Thy creation the transcendent scheme;  
The marvels which its mysteries conceal.  
Bliss so ineffable, that like a dream  
Its revelations o'er our senses steal;  
Visions whose gorgeousness a thousand-fold  
Surpass all men might hope to win or to behold.

"Nothing is lost. No struggle here is vain.  
Nought that we cherish earnestly and well  
Fades from our grasp;—no treasure we obtain  
By sacrifice and truth. Death fails to quell  
One burning aspiration. We retain  
Friendship, love, science; genius' magic spell.  
All that is spiritual, noble, pure,  
Eternally expands; for ever shall endure."

O joy ! there is no separation more,  
Dismal, blank, hopeless ! No eternal night  
O'ershadowing the world. The mystic shore  
Of higher spheres looms tangibly in sight.  
Despair, doubt, darkness, are for ever o'er;  
All is magnificence, conviction, light.  
There is no death. The dear ones hover near;  
Our eyes may view them yet ! their voices we may hear

None are abandoned to remorseless fate;  
None utterly condemned, without a gleam  
Of comfort or of hope, to expiate  
Their guilty past, though black its record seem.  
Remorse, repentance, never come too late  
An evil soul's transgressions to redeem.  
The gates of heaven Thou dost ever leave  
Open to those who strive their errors to retrieve.

Almighty One ! how shall Thy children lay  
Homage not wholly sterile at Thy feet?  
How their vast debt of gratitude repay,  
In part at least, by tribute not unmeet  
Their failings to atone? How fitly pray  
With that deep truth Thou wilt benignly greet  
With grace and favour? How condignly prove  
Their passionate return of thankfulness and love ?

Thou, whose pure essence words cannot express;  
Whose godlike pleasure is but to create  
Myriads of thinking beings Thou dost bless  
With soul, light, freedom, to work out their fate,  
Through noble deeds to endless happiness.  
Ever the embryo angels' gifts innate,  
Thy bounteousness imparts, developing;  
Soaring from orb to orb on bright, triumphant wing.

Only by following the grand career  
Thou hast designed; endeavouring to be  
All Thou dost will. Through each progressive sphere  
Chiming with transport in the harmony  
Of Thy vast Cosmos; striving to come near  
The seraphs Thou dost love; to proffer Thee  
The worship of high souls. Oh, thus alone  
Can spirits offer up pure incense at Thy throne.



O smile Thou on us ! generously raise  
Our earth-bound souls to their celestial aim,  
That each may join in the glad hymns of praise  
Which through all worlds Thy majesty proclaim.  
Let Thy full glory beam upon our gaze,  
That our deep adoration's mystic flame  
Even on earth may not unworthy be  
Of hallowing Thy name throughout eternity.

## Spiritualism

Is a Great Fact of the Age.—*Quarterly Review*.

*Fair Truth; for thee alone we seek,  
Friend to the wise, supporter to the weak,  
From thee we learn whate'er is wise and just,  
Creeds to reject, professions to distrust,  
Forms to despise, pretensions to deride,  
And, following thee, to follow naught beside."*

*Mr. Hiram, A. Stiles, a leading member of the Congregational Church, in Middleton, Massachusetts, being, on the 10th July, 1868, excommunicated from the Church for being a Spiritualist, addressed the Church, making the following interesting defence of Spiritualism:—*

In Presenting for your consideration some of the truths and principles adhered to by the Spiritualists, I shall labor under much embarrassment, from the fact that the theme is so *important* that I confess my inability to bring to your minds, in so clear and satisfactory a manner as I could desire, the claims which my subject demands. But I remark, in the first place, that Spiritualism is founded on the knowledge of and belief in spiritual intercourse and communion. *All* may be regarded as Spiritualists in theory who honestly believe this, but a part only can truly be called practical Christian Spiritualists.

It is estimated that there are from ten to eleven millions of nominal believers in spirit-communion in our own land. It embraces some of the ablest writers of the day, many of the brightest intellects, and those possessing eminent literary and scientific attainments. And no *sane* person, with an ordinary degree of intelligence, ever investigated the subject of modern Spiritualism, in all its bearings, without being convinced of its truths and teachings. These facts *alone* entitle it to the serious and careful consideration of every candid mind.

There are perhaps in America five hundred media or more, who arc publicly, from week to week, advocating the doctrine of spirit communion, and spreading broadcast over the land the "bread of life," or the "*spirit of truth*," to the hungry, starving millions. They are literally obeying the Divine injunction, given by the despised Nazarene to those illiterate men, "Go, preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils, and, when they shall deliver you up to the councils and scourge you in their synagogues, take no thought how or what you shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak, fore it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."

It is an undeniable fact that nearly all of our media, as they go from place to place to address the people, make no preparation or take many thought whatever as to what they shall speak, and vary frequently the subject is given them by their hearers, so that not one moment's time for reflection is given them upon that subject. The apostles and earlier Christians recognised and practised the method of *healing* by the laying on of hands, in imitation of Christ, and in obedience to his commands.

In Mark xvi. 18, we read: "And they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover," By the touch of the hand, under spirit-control, and the exercise of the will-power (or faith) there is a wonderful electric influence or spirit-substance imparted to the patient, the effects of which are in proportion to the power of the spirit operating, and the organization, faith and condition of the patient. This method of healing is said to be done on the strictest principles of science. There are many who are healing by virtue of this power. One of the most prominent and famous, and who has recently been near us, healing many of their infirmities, is Dr. Newton. He

fully believes in the teachings of Christ and the apostles, and, in his work, he is exemplifying the truth of the promise made by Christ to his disciples, "Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do he shall do, also, and greater than these shall he do." Jesus said to his followers, "If ye have faith, &c., ye can remove mountains."

I used to scoff at religion, and hold the Bible in law esteem. Now I read it every day, and find therein parallel phenomena to those occurring in modern days.—*Dr. Elliotson.*

Dr. Newton asserts that much faith is an important requisite to perform the cures and works which were made by Christ, the only *test* of true belief. Dr. Newton further assures us that he can do nothing of himself, though conscious of what he is doing and what is transpiring about him; he is also aware that there are *ministering angels* supplying to him the healing balm as fast as it is imparted to others through his organism, and, what is better, (thank God,) he states that they are just such angels as We may be when we lay aside this mortal form.

Standing near him, observing some important cures, I was forcibly reminded of the wonderful cure of a woman, performed by Christ, who had an issue of blood for twelve years. She says: "If I can but touch his clothes I shall be made whole." And he, perceiving her faith, and that *virtue* had gone out of him, said: "Go in peace, thy Faith, hath made the whole."

While Newton was pronouncing cures, bidding disease depart, &c., some one touched him. He immediately said: "That is right, have faith, go on your way rejoicing." Then, turning to the throng, he said: "I wish it distinctly understood that it makes no difference whether you touch me, or that I lay my hands upon you—the effects are the same, and you cannot do it without my knowledge."

The *Apostle Paul* possessed many and different gifts as a medium. This is obvious, from the fact that he saw and felt the effects of the remarkable spiritual manifestation which attended him on his way to Damascus. He healed many of their diseases, and we read that the people brought unto him aprons and handkerchiefs, and he healed them. In like manner has *Newton* healed many far distant who were unable to visit him. But you will say, perhaps, that many of these cures are not permanent or lasting in their character, and many are not relieved at all. We find it stated that Jesus was not able to do "many mighty works," in a certain place, because of their unbelief. Shall we not infer from this that there were certain conditions to be complied with? Was it not equivalent to saying: "You are *faithless* and unbelieving? I cannot do many mighty works in your midst." Or, "I have tried and failed." Now, who will positively declare that Dr. Newton could not have performed *many more* mighty cures, were it not for the *doubting, sceptical, unbelieving, faithless* Scribes and Pharisees that surrounded him in *Old Salem* !

But you will say that the age of so-called miracles is past. Is there anything recorded within the lids of the Bible to warrant such a conclusion? Was Christ partial in his promises; to believers? Was not the blessing promised to Abraham and his seed? Did he not Expressly state that these signs should *follow* them that believe? Most lame and impotent conclusion. How unreasonable and absurd. Paul says: "Concerning spiritual gifts, I would not have ye ignorant. To one," he says, "is given the gift of healing; to another the gift of prophecy; to another the discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues, and *all* by the same spirit." The plain meaning seems to be that these gifts are attributable to the same law or principle. For instance, an angel or spirit may perform a cure through the mediumship of Dr. Newton, and many others, but be unable to release him from prison as Peter was released, because his peculiar organization differs from that of Peter. A spirit can speak divers kinds of tongues, such as the Hebrew or Latin language, through the mediumship of many of our illiterate media, which is very often the case, but be unable to give a test which shall identify himself, or move a ponderable object or discourse sweet strains of music from the piano, without the aid of mortal contrivance, or present to your vision a spirit hand, or face, or other demonstrations which were done in this hall, through the same organism. Paul says: "Earnestly covet the best gifts." Touching the resurrection, he says: "Some man will say, 'how are the dead raised up, and in what bodies will they appear?' Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." How fitting, sublime and truthful the illustration. Yet Paul is hardly understood at the present day. Presuming you understand him, I cannot but explain: If we deposit a grain of corn in the earth, it will not germinate until the case or hull begins to decompose—the tender shoot is the vitality, the essence, yea, the very Soul of the grain. Paul goes on to say: "That which thou sowest does not appear, literally

SPIRITUALISM.—The very nature of the subject, the most intricate which man has ever had to deal with, makes it one which the general public cannot comprehend, but that Spiritual Phenomena exist, any man possessed of common sense can prove for himself by experiment.—*Varley, after 10 years' study of Spiritualism, and 25 years' study of Electricity, Chemistry, and Natural Philosophy.*

but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and every seed its own body." And after further illustrations says: "So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, and is raised a spiritual body. There *is* a natural body, and there *is* a spiritual body." Do we not possess two natures?

At the chemical change called death, commences the spiritual birth, the process of which is said to be exceedingly beautiful, as seen by some clairvoyants, and others in their superior condition.

This may seem to you somewhat vague and visionary; but is it any more mysterious than the formation of our natural bodies? Who can understand or explain the process as they are formed, particle after particle, atom to atom, in their earlier stages of development? The new-born soul, then, as it enters the higher life, assumes a position in harmony with its growth and development, carrying with it the characteristics of earth-life, and being judged by the deeds done in the body out of the "Book of Life," which is the book of memory, it receives its rewards and punishments.

Said Jesus to his followers: "The kingdom of heaven is within you." We are not to infer from this that the spirit-world is a locality, but a condition of mind; and have we not *all* had some foretaste of heaven? and have we not also had a foretaste of hell?

My friends, can you not see the reasonableness, the harmony and beauty of these truths, when compared with the unreasonable, illogical, unphilosophical and absurd idea that we shall slumber in our graves until some remote period, and then come forth in *bodily form* to be judged !

After the resurrection of Christ, we find the disciples together in a room with closed doors, when Jesus stood in their midst, and said, "Peace be unto you !"

I have already alluded to the fact that angels *may* and *have* produced to our natural vision, under favorable conditions, an exact picture of their own natural bodies. These facts are not intended to show a power equalling that of Christ, but simply as approaching to it. Stopping at the home of Brother G. H. Tufts, at the north part of this town, was an artless girl, Mary Eddy. Through her mediumship, (without the slightest possibility of deception, collusion, or trickery,) *spirit hands* of different sizes were presented to the natural vision of all the members of the family. My eldest son being present on that occasion, describes the scene as being intensely beautiful and interesting, and states that they appeared natural; and, as one was passed gently over his forehead and face, it felt more like soft velvet than the hand of flesh.

At a public séance held in the city of Lowell, the Eddy media being in a very passive condition, a distinguished gentleman, once a dweller in human form in that city, presented to the view of the audience a picture of his natural body in so perfect a manner that he was immediately recognised by his relatives and many others in the assembly.

Now, my friends, could not the wonderful power of Jesus Christ amid that *splendid array of mediumistic talent of his own choosing*, under such harmonious conditions, produce to their unobscured vision a *fac simile* of his own natural lacerated body? Did he not expressly state to Nicodemus that flesh and blood could *not* enter into the Kingdom of Heaven? With this *spiritual* view of the scene, closed doors, brick, or granite walls even, afford no barrier to the entrance of the disembodied spirit, for it is indestructible and eternal as God himself.

Assuming, then, this position, we may easily imagine why he was seen only by comparatively a few. He was not always recognized by his own friends; and they could not tell why he often vanished from their sight. The question naturally arises, what became of his natural body? Angels of high order, of superior intelligence, though claiming not infallibility, whose opinions we are in duty bound to respect, inform us that, notwithstanding the vigilance of the guard about his tomb, his body was secured by his friends or relatives.

There are many passages in the Bible which may be cited to prove direct and tangible intercourse with mortals from the angel-world; and, as God is un-

Everybody should read "Human Nature," and the "Spiritual Magazine,"—Monthly, 6d. each, and postage; "Banner of Light," and "Religio-Philosophical Journal,"—Weekly, about 20s. each per annum, including postage.

changeable, the same laws by which they communed with mortals are in existence and in operation to-day.

It is apparent that the terms angels, spirits, men of God, men in shining garments, &c., signify the same spiritual beings, who were once dwellers upon earth in human form; and it is equally true that all the (so-called) miracles, revelations, angel visitations, powers invisible, &c., recorded in the Bible, are accounted for and are explainable and understood by the same laws and principles that govern the spiritual manifestations of the present time, thus showing that the past, present, and future are linked together, and proving that there is a continual and divine inspiration in man.

If Spiritualism be not *true*, then there is no truth in the Bible; for if the Bible be shorn of its Spiritualism, it becomes a dead letter. If there is no truth in Spiritualism, there is no heaven—there is no hell—there is no soul in man, and, consequently, no immortality beyond the grave. But thanks to God and the angel-world, Spiritualism is true. Millions have proved it; they have had the facts demonstrated to them in various ways; yea, more, the angels have *told them*, so; and are they all deluded? Answer it.

It has converted the Infidel to a belief in God and the immortality of the soul; it has healed the sick—comforted the mourner—reclaimed the vicious and wandering—caused the lame to leap for joy—made the blind to see—unstopped the ears of the deaf—and has cheered the dying with joys unspeakable, and with

visions of glory beyond the tomb. To believe in Spiritualism is *one* thing; but to be a practical Spiritualist is *another*, and quite a different thing; stern duties are enjoined by our angel-friends, and many practical lessons are enforced to be lived out. They commune with us, that they may make us better, purer, wiser—to make our lives more like Christ, and our homes more like heaven. Although millions have yearned for the truths, the consolations, and the assurances of a life beyond the grave, which Spiritualism affords, yet it came into this world rather unexpectedly; but, however you may ignore the fact, it is going to *stay*; I repeat it, it is going to stay, and happy, thrice happy he who cordially receives it, exclaiming, "Even so, Father, for it seemeth good in thy sight."

I have now given you an imperfect idea of some of the leading truths as connected with the beautiful philosophy of Spiritualism. They are my honest and highest convictions of right. Twenty-seven years have passed since I became a member of this church, and my experiences in it, and in all of God's dealings with me, I cannot but regard as stepping-stones to a clearer and more exalted and rational view of God, of Christ, and the wants of humanity. I have a work to do. It may appear to you somewhat radical and revolutionary in its character; you may regard it, as you have, a hindrance to your faith and form of worship, yet in the name of Christ it must be done. But when the church shall return to the faith once delivered to the saint, when you shall recognize the Divine principle of God in man, when you shall care more for the truth than the creed, more for the spirit of progress than the sect, and when you shall not knowingly exclude from the pulpit the ministry of the angels, no matter how objectionable the media may seem to be, it is then, and then only, that you may expect a blessing from on high, that there may not be room to receive it, and be filled with the Holy Ghost, and begin to speak in different tongues, and truly enjoy a Pentecostal season.

The time is fast approaching when we all shall be of one faith, and can you not discern the signs of the times? The angels are preparing the way. They are knocking for admission to our hearts, striving to dispel the gloom, the darkness, the errors, the ignorance and superstition in which we are enveloped.

In conclusion, let us then accept the glittering pearls that escaped the Nazerene's lips, that we may be prepared to enter the higher life with joy. Though now we look through a glass darkly, yet soon shall we be seized away from this mortal sphere of existence to enjoy the communion of the loved ones that have gone before us to learn of them and more illuminated spirits, face to face in the Summer-Land forever.—*Banner of Light, 17th July, 1869.*

All works on Spiritualism may be had from Mr. James Burns, 15, Southampton Row, Bloomsbury Square, Holborn, London, W.C., and at the "Banner of Light" Offices, Boston and New York; and also at the office of the "Religio-Philosophical Journal," Chicago.

Mills, Dick and Co., Printers, Stafford Street, Dunedin.—4th November, 1869.

Scepticism and Spiritualism:

*The Experiences of a Sceptic.*

By the authoress of

"Aurelia."

London F. Pitman, 20, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1865.

Scepticism and Spiritualism.

## Scepticism and Spiritualism.

The Experience of a Sceptic.

AT a moment when a succession of surprising phenomena are startling the whole London world out of their most cherished convictions and proprieties, it is time for all those who have found leisure to steal an hour from business or from frivolity, with a view of investigating these puzzling and astounding manifestations, to give the benefit of their experience to the world at large, in order that others may be induced to follow their example.

There is at least room to hope that among the reflecting and earnest minority there may be found some who occasionally feel that pounds, shillings, and pence were, perhaps, not originally intended to absorb the whole time and thoughts of reasoning mankind, and that there are matters of deeper import and more thrilling interest to the human soul than the accumulation of guinea upon guinea, or the indulgence of the *vanitas vanitatum* of worldly ambitions and aspirations in any of their multiform disguises. Perhaps, too, some few may be tempted to think that what is affirmed by so many disinterested and intelligent witnesses ought at least to receive the benefit of doubt; and that where there is room for doubt on a question of such transcendent interest to the entire human family, it may surely be esteemed worth while, even by the most obstinate sceptics, to look a little beneath the surface for themselves; nay, I go so far as to flatter myself that here and there some earnest searcher after truth, undeterred by squibs and platitudes, may be induced to devote to a matter so extraordinary, a little of that patience, of that personal investigation, that persevering and grave research, which is indispensable to the

acquisition of all knowledge or attainment, even in the most superficial and frivolous branches.

It is neither by rejecting all evidence and obstinately refusing to seek it for one's self, nor by pooh-poohing and denying all that is novel, startling, or apparently incomprehensible, that society has ever progressed, or that philosophy and science have ever profited. The golden rule of equity and wisdom,—that no cause should be judged without a fair and adequate trial; that no respectable, sensible, and impartial witnesses should be refused a fair and patient hearing because their testimony does not square with the preconceived ideas and inveterate prejudices of the multitude; that no marvel ought to be persistingly ignored with no other proofs, and for no better reason than because it is a marvel,—ought surely to be applied to Spiritualism, no less than to every other branch of honest and earnest inquiry. Least of all should these indispensable requirements of common justice and common sense be denied to the advocates of a cause who themselves come forward openly and straightforwardly, to fulfil all the conditions which honesty, equity, and reason exact.

The phenomena produced are physical facts, demonstrable to all who choose not wilfully to close their eyes to them. Believers are not sought for, but rather conscientious, honest, and persevering inquirers and witnesses, Ocular and tangible evidence is freely offered to all who will take the trouble to seek it for themselves; a necessary condition in all science no less than in all revelation. The witnesses are countless scattered over Europe and America, and, in innumerable instances, rank among individuals of the highest standing, both as to intellectual attainments and social position. The theory they advance is likewise the only one which can afford any rational or satisfactory solution of the astounding facts they proclaim. What more then can be offered or required as inducements, if not to belief, at the least to patient, persevering, and profound investigation?

Into the theory, however, I am not here about to enter. The grand question at issue, for the present, between Spiritualism and its antagonists is a simple question of positive fact.

Are the extraordinary apparitions and manifestations which are now taking place in London, and which have been publicly reported to have taken place in almost every part of Europe, no less than America; which have been, and are being, attested on all hands by the most credible, respectable, and intelligent witnesses,—truth or delusion, fiction or facts?

It is this question of facts which I am about to discuss, or rather to illustrate, by a simple narrative of personal experience, which may prove not uninteresting at the present moment, evidencing as it does, that it is within the power of every individual willing to pursue the inquiry with that amount of patience and good will which is indispensable to carry out any investigation whatever with success or fruit, to satisfy themselves of the truth, even within the narrow limits of their own private circle, wholly beyond the radius or the possibility of any juggling or conjuring operations, true or supposititious.

It may appear superfluous or idle to state, resting as the assertion must, for the present, on an anonymous affirmation, that the writer of these lines is generally acknowledged to possess an amount of intelligence and sagacity considerably above the ordinary average of mediocrity; although, perhaps, time may yet prove that this is no vain boast. What, however, it is imperative to affirm, is that credulity is so far from being one of my weaknesses that I have never been able to accept even a minimum dose of the illogical and transparent fallacies and contradictions which are contentedly digested by so vast a majority of educated persons, on the strength of reputed authorities, whether human or Divine; and for no better reason, apparently, than the *reductio ad absurdum* which was formerly held up as such a convincing argument by erudite theologians.

In other words, I was a confirmed sceptic as to all which can be classed under the head "not proven," a determined disciple of the supremacy of reason, and an inveterate adversary to all blind faith, whether papal, puritan, or protestant;—finally, one whom no theological anathemas, nor pulpit eloquence—were it even that of Bossuet or Lacordaire—has ever discouraged from the determined purpose of sifting all things with my own eyes and my own brains, and submitting every statement and every argument, it matters not whence claiming its derivation, to the sternest, most searching investigation, and to the severest logical criticism. In a word, I held, and hold, the doctrine that truth can but become more dazzling the greater the light which is thrown upon it, and that it is only falsehood which seeks and requires obscurity.

Thus much for myself. As far as my narrative is concerned, I have to premise that all names, initials, and localities, I have purposely changed, in order to prevent recognition; a precaution due to friends, no less than to one's self, at the present stage of the inquiry, when, if one no longer need fear to be drowned in the first horse-pond, or burned at the first stake, one may, at least, anticipate the detrimental and mortifying consequences of being pilloried in every journal and in every drawing-room as a liar, a charlatan, or an imbecile, for having the courage to affirm what the prejudices and the ignorance of the *moutons de Panurge* are pleased *de but en blanc* to deny. With respect to the facts in question, however, I here beg to affirm that I am about to narrate them without emphasis, metaphor, or exaggeration—simply, plainly, and accurately, as I myself witnessed them; and as any other individual might and may witness others of a similar nature, if he will devote to the research the time, the earnestness, and the trouble which I did not grudge to it.

Without further preamble, therefore, I proceed. Residing in Paris some eight or ten years since, a celebrated

American medium arrived there from the United States. Soon the rumours of his marvellous powers filled the papers, and echoed through every circle, from the busy world of the *haute finance* to the more aristocratic saloons of the Faubourg St. Honoré, and even to the most recondite penetralia of the hotels of *la rive gauche*. Princes and peers were numbered among the witnesses, and the converts of the novel and marvellous phenomena; imperial highnesses and crowned heads held private *séances*, and were fairly frightened into the conviction that there exist talismans and occult powers in the world more omnipotent than the eloquence of money bags, and more redoubtable than *Cosacques* and *coups d'état*. Nay, it was even whispered that all the dismal denunciations of the Père Felix and the Abbé Doguerre failed to preserve their fair penitents from stealing a *petit quart d'heure* from vespers at St. Thomas d'Aquin or the Madeleine, to nibble, like incorrigible daughters of Eve, at the forbidden fruit. Calumny even went so far as to assert that more than one haughty *duchesse* or *marquise*, the purity of whose pedigree not even the hypercritical St. Simon would have ventured to contest, had been seen slipping into the *porte cochère* of the northern wizard's residence, under the shelter of a thick veil, and the protection of some discreet cavalier, as their aristocratic sisters might occasionally be espied slipping through the dark alleys and illuminated *bosquets, en partie fine*, at Mabilille or Chateau Rouge.

In short, all Paris was upside-down, and I, no less than many others of my literary *confrères*, began to think that the little wits and less sobriety imparted as a general rule to the *beau monde* European capitals had fairly taken their departure to the moon, like those of Astolfo and Roland of yore.

The matter, however, began to look more serious when the first celebrities of the artistic and literary world, who vindicate the claim of Paris to be the favourite capital of the Muses, began to show signs of being infected with the strange contagion. For the opinions and dicta of coroneted and diademed authorities, I have always felt a most irreverent disrespect. I am apt, on most occasions, to question their honesty, seeing that, with a few honourable exceptions, chiefly, be it said to our credit, confined to England, they show so little respect for it themselves; and as for their judgment and talents, I consider that, taking them as a class, they fall decidedly below par. Moreover, I am an obdurate disciple of the Dumas theory, and hold genius, science, and talent to be the only aristocracy worthy the name; a single scintilla of Shakespeare's crown of glory, a single stroke of Raphael's pencil, or one lightning gleam of Byron's genius appear to me worthier of ambition and apotheosis than all the blue blood that ever flowed in the veins of the haughtiest grandee, and all the jewelled tiaras that ever concealed the empty brains and selfish hearts of the loftiest of earthly potentates.

It was not, therefore, till one after another, names known throughout Europe for their transcendence in art or literature, were added to the lists of witnesses and believers; it was not till pens and voices I was wont to revere and admire, joined in the chorus of astonishment and conviction, that I began to be aroused out of my indifference, if not out of my incredulity. I had thought little of the affirmations of imperial and royal lips, and less of that of lions and *lionnes* who had been no less eager of yore to form part of the circle round Mesmer's *baquet*, than to gloat in the Place de Grève on the execution of a Brinvilliers, or the breaking on the wheel of a Count de Horn, in their search after excitement at all price. But I thought much of men noted for the brilliancy of their perceptions, the shrewdness and depth of their powers of reason and observation, their talent, wit, and genius, staking their veracity and intellects on the demonstration of phenomena which altogether surpassed anything that juggling or legerdemain had ever produced, and that under conditions which left no room for cither.

I was neither surprised nor startled to find that the clairvoyant, Alexis, and the unrivalled conjurer, Robert Houdin, had been called in as detectives, and had been compelled to avow themselves baffled and eclipsed. But I am fain to confess, that although incredulous as ever, I *was* both surprised and startled when such names as those which daily appeared in the *feuilletons* of the Parisian papers, came boldly forward in attestation and confirmation of these incomprehensible wonders.

"There; what say you to that?" exclaimed a familiar voice, as I sat writing one fair spring morning in my study.

The visitor was an *habitué* of the house: an English author of well-earned celebrity; a great friend of mine then and now.

"As for me, I begin to think that the whole world is going stark staring mad," he continued, flinging on the table the *Independance Belge*, where in one of its delightful *feuilletons* an animated relation was given of a meeting at the house of a great artistic *célébrité*, whereat the usual host of wonders were stated to have taken place, authenticated by the corroboration of several of the leading members of the Parisian press, by the master of the house, and two or three other notabilities of high literary and artistic standing. "I am so dumbfounded that I want to hear what is your opinion on the matter. You know I entertain a high esteem for your lucidity."

"*Bien obligée*. Then if you really want my judgment, *le voici*, it amounts to this, that although these things appear far too strange to be true, nevertheless, as we know that all the world is *not* mad, as the individuals who daily sign their names to these extraordinary accounts are the very reverse of dull, foolish, or credulous; and as it is a patent truth that clever people neither disgrace themselves by telling falsehoods, nor imperil their

reputation for intelligence and integrity without solid grounds, in causes where there is nothing to gain by affirmation, and everything to lose by detection, we are only judicious to conclude that, however exaggerated or misinterpreted, there is, at least, a probability of there being something under the rose not altogether chimerical, and which may be as yet undreamt of in nineteenth-century philosophy. Consequently, I advise you strongly to investigate the matter thoroughly for yourself,—the only satisfactory and rational mode of arriving at a true solution of the mystery, and one to which I myself should certainly resort were I not, as you know, *pro tempore* invalidated and confined to the house. Therefore you see, my counsel, like most others, is not wholly disinterested; for knowing as I do, that I can thoroughly trust your intelligence, sagacity, and veraciousness, disabled as I am, I want you to be my *alter ego*, a commission which I should certainly not confide to any other proxy, distrustful as I am of most eyes, brains, and tongues, except yours and mine."

"Add to which, that you reckon not a little on my pertinacious Scepticism; is it not so?"

"Perhaps."

"Well then be satisfied, for I had previously arrived precisely at your conclusions, and determined as I am to penetrate *le fin mot* of the enigma, I got introduced to the wizard last night, and have tendered him an invitation to come and spend six weeks at my chateau at Mendon next month."

"I congratulate you. That certainly is the way to fathom the mystery without fail."

"Yes, I think he will be very clever if he escapes detection under my roof and my watchful eyes."

But I must try to be brief. The projected visit took place. The greater part of the phenomena which had created such a sensation in Paris was reproduced in this gentleman's house, and that under conditions which precluded all possibility of deception, legerdemain, collusion with servants, or any other jugglery. The room, a large hall in the house, where the *séances* took place, was scrupulously locked, the key being kept in the gentleman's pocket, neither the medium nor any one else being suffered to enter it till the moment when the *séances* were about to commence. The medium was narrowly watched, and not allowed to conceal anything about his person, while most of the phenomena produced took place in strong moonlight, let in from five or six open windows, and the light of a gas lamp shining through a large glass door.

It may be guessed how astounded I was to hear from the lips of one of whose shrewdness, disinterestedness, intellect, and veracity I was as certain as of my own, that he had beheld a heavy arm chair advance to the table *wholly untouched*, and had clearly distinguished a cloud within it; that detached hands had appeared on the table, and had written papers he preserved—the whole in the presence of several witnesses, and being distinctly visible in the bright moonlight; that a heavy mahogany table had tilted up at an angle of forty-five degrees, with a large carcel lamp burning on it, which had never stirred; that it had risen four or five inches horizontally from the ground, and remained suspended in the air for several minutes, while the gentleman himself was kneeling under it, with a candle in his hand, to ascertain that there was no illusion or trickery in the fact, although a powerful man lifting up the table by main force could not have accomplished the feat, whereas the medium's hands were passively laid upon the surface.

These, and innumerable other phenomena of varied descriptions, I forbear to dwell upon, as I purpose only to narrate those of which I have myself been a witness. I pass over, therefore, all these and subsequent manifestations, no less extraordinary, at which other friends of mine were present; such as an accordion playing, untouched, at the request of one person, a man of business, assuredly not given to freaks of fancy; an unpublished air, written many years previously by a long-forgotten composer, a relative of the gentleman who asked for it, was played, although it was beyond all question that neither the medium nor any one else there could possibly have known anything of it except himself.

While these proceedings were taking place at my friend's house, an *attaché* of a foreign embassy dropped in one evening by chance to pay me a visit of *prima sera*. He was a clever, intelligent young man, but a very recent and slight acquaintance.

The conversation was not long without turning, *comme de raison*, on the topic uppermost at the moment in every one's thoughts.

The phenomena produced at my literary friend's, of which he daily kept me *an courant*, were discussed.

"I am not at all surprised at what you tell me," replied the *attaché*, "for things quite as extraordinary have occurred in the embassy at Stockholm, in the presence of my mother, sisters, and other friends."

Pressed to narrate his experiences, he at last, somewhat reluctantly, informed me, that trying the tables two or three years previously, with a party of friends, raps and tippings had intelligently answered all their questions, including the correct number of rings in the gold bracelet of a lady present, which she herself nor any one else had ever dreamt of counting; and that finally, on one occasion, ordering the table, if animated by a spirit, to fling itself against the door, it had suddenly leapt a distance of about twenty feet, and fallen down precisely at the spot where it had been commanded to go, a feat which had so dismayed the assembled company, that one of the ladies present fainted, and his mother, vowing it must be the devil, had made him solemnly promise never to practise such unholy proceedings again. For here I succeeded in eliciting from him

that the medium through whose agency these wonders had been produced was no other than himself.

This piece of information was even more interesting to me than the twice-told marvels he had related. Debarred from assisting at the *séances* which so greatly interested me by hearsay, and although not questioning the veracity of one whom I know to be incapable of swerving one hair's breadth from truth, yet absolutely unable, like all investigating and sceptical minds, to admit any conviction save on the evidence of my own senses, in a case of phenomena so strongly at variance with all the preconceived ideas instilled by education and science, my most ardent anxiety was to be enabled to obtain some personal evidence which might steer me a little less dubiously through this strange chaos of queries and enigmas.

Could there really be anything genuine in it? To one who from earliest youth had been brought up with, and had constantly mixed in, the society of persons gifted with high intellectual powers, developed by profound erudition and varied knowledge, the idea of ghosts, apparitions, and spiritual communications or inspirations seemed to be indissolubly associated with Hoffman's fantastic tales and the exploits of Jack the giant killer. Such hobgoblin absurdities appeared to me only suited to frighten babies, and to vary the monotonous village gossip of rustic *commères* at the evening *veillée*.

To behold a ghost *in corpore*, or to hold a polite conversation with a departed spirit, would have surprised me little less than to have seen our globe fizzing up in the embrace of that terrible comet which so pertinaciously disappoints the prophets of its destructive intentions, or to have contemplated the planetary orbs run mad—dancing a *gavotte* together in the heavens. What, then, could be this inconceivable delusion, which seemed to possess the unaccountable power of bereaving the wisest, the cleverest, the most sagacious, and the most honourable of their senses, which seemed to defy alike the scrutiny of sceptics and the reasoning faculties of the most highly gifted?

To say the truth, an incorrigible disbeliever of so-called supernatural agencies, I was considerably more interested in fathoming the subjective operation of the delusion than the objective nature of the facts.

Not being, however, a member of the Institute, an F.R.S., nor, indeed, an academician of any denomination whatever, British or foreign, I had succeeded in arriving at the decision that the only possible means of satisfying a mind which nothing can induce to believe without full and incontrovertible evidence, was to spare no pains to procure that evidence for myself, and to grudge no more time or research to what I considered seriously worthy of investigation, than I should devote, *au besoin*, to the acquisition of Arabic or algebra.

Here, then, was an opportunity not to be thrown away. I fell upon the *attaché* without scruple or mercy, and vowed I would not let him out of my sight till he had given me, at least, a slight sample of his diabolical powers. The victim was loth to be victimized. He strove hard to slip his head out of the noose into which he had so unwarily run it. He was going to a ball—his partners were waiting—he was inscribed first on the list—he would be on their black books for ever if he were not forthcoming in due time. I could not be so hard-hearted as to wish to damage his *affaires de cœur* for the entire season. There was no time; there was no table small enough for the manipulation of a *tête-?-tête*; and, what was worse, it was incontestable that there was no good will.

Never was a wizard so little disposed to give proofs of his art. He declared he would return in less than a week—in forty-eight hours—in a day. There was nothing he would not have bound himself to, provided only I would set him free then and there. But I was inexorable. One must have been greener than I am apt to be not to discover that there was some *arrière pensée* behind his extreme reluctance to assist me, other than the fear of losing a *valse*. At last, *de guerre las*, the secret came out. He had been so pestered to display his mediumship for the idle curiosity of the frivolous butterflies of society, so badgered, harassed, ridiculed, and insulted, both by friends and enemies, that he had at last, like many other converts, and as many sceptics and Deists, been fairly bullied into silence; and, obtaining his translocation from the capital where he had endured such annoyance, he had resolved never again to expose himself to similar consequences.

My perseverance, however, overcame his obstinacy, and under a solemn pledge of not divulging his name, he consented. The mistress of the house lived in the *entresol* beneath. To her I sent to beg the loan of a small table for the experiment. The *guéridon* was immediately sent up, with a request that she too might be permitted to assist at the *séance*, being very curious on the subject.

She was the wife of a retired tradesman in humble life. Hence, of course, there was no chance of her ever coming across the *attaché* in the society wherein he moved, consequently, there could be no *inconvéniént* in granting her the favour she asked. She came, and we all three sat down round the little table. It was a small square work-table, without a drawer, about two feet across, standing on four legs. No cover was on it; and we all tucked our feet under our chairs, so as not to touch it otherwise than by our hands, slightly laid upon the top. In about ten minutes it began to vibrate and jerk with a strange straining, creaking noise. In a quarter of an hour it began to turn very slowly. The *attaché* ordered it aloud to stop, and requested that if it were prepared to answer questions by means of the alphabet, it would rap on the floor with one of its legs. The table immediately tipped up one leg, and gave an audible knock.



So far there was nothing very wonderful. It was small and easily moved, and although I failed to detect any apparent motion in the medium's hands, I easily conceived that it would be no very difficult matter, for a person who had practised the trick, to move or tip it up, so that it might be imperceptible to any one else.

"Will you tell us your name?" interrogated the *attaché*, while I with difficulty refrained from smiling at the seriousness of his countenance and tone. "One knock for yes, and two for no." The table immediately returned one distinct knock. The *attaché* then began reciting the letters of the alphabet, after ordering the table to rap when it came to the requisite letter.

As he called out the letter *H* the table tipped up and knocked. He recommenced, and it did the same at the letter *E*; the process being thus repeated till it had spelt out the name of Henriette.

"Had either of you a friend called Henriette, who is dead?" he asked.

Both replied in the negative. "Who then do you seek?" said the medium; "tip up your leg next the person for whom you come." The table tipped up at the angle next the French woman.

"Try and recollect; it must be some friend of yours," said the *attaché*.

She repeated her *dénégations*. She knew several living Henriettes, but none dead.

Thus baffled, he turned to the table. "Will you give your family name?" The table struck two knocks, purporting to mean No.

Three times the refusal was repeated.

Thus far the experiment was anything but convincing. A little table-rapping, turning, and tipping, as any dexterous trickster might have made it, giving an anonymous name which no one recognised, and refusing to afford us any elucidation, were not precisely the sort of phenomena to which I was disposed to surrender my better judgment; and I inwardly smiled, as I thought that if the *attaché* had no better juggling arts in his sleeve, I, at least, was not to be caught by such paltry tricks as those.

The *attaché*, however, was *piqué au jeu*, and he persisted. "You *must* give your surname," he continued; "I request, nay, I insist upon it." A reluctant affirmation was extorted from the table at last.

Again the wearisome process of calling out the alphabet recommenced.

Six letters of a somewhat uncommon French name were slowly given. "*Ah, mon Dieu!*" almost shrieked the French woman, turning suddenly very pale, as the sixth letter was spelt out. "I am afraid I recognise it. Let it go on."

Two more letters were added. "*Dieu de Dieu! it is she*, as I suspected; who could have dreamt of such a thing? It is the name of a young school friend of mine with whom I was very intimate, but who died ten years ago. So that I was no more thinking of her than of Malbruck. What a marvel! She died in an out-of-the-way place, and in a strange manner; if you can get her to tell us where and how, *ma foi!* I shall believe anything henceforth."

To abbreviate the process, the *attaché* proposed to name in succession the various towns in France. The table being ordered to strike two knocks for no, so long as he guessed wrong, and one rap for yes, when he mentioned the right one. He went through a long list of names, but the table persisted in a succession of reiterated negations, till at last he named a remote provincial capital, near the Spanish frontier. The table struck a most decided Yes. The reply was correct. Other inquiries were then answered alphabetically with no less accuracy.

I was decidedly startled. The *attaché* might move the table indeed, but how could he possibly have hit upon the *bourgeoise* friend of this woman he had never seen before, a person deceased ten years previously, and thus answer all questions, he had no means of knowing, with perfect accuracy? That the woman herself was not moving the table was likewise very evident, for from the moment the spirit had announced itself for her, I had made her place her fingers upon the table so lightly that she could not possibly have stirred it without pressing them down in such a manner that it could not have escaped detection; not to speak of her being ashy pale, and trembling with terror; besides the fact that it was on her side that the table continued to tip up: whereas, had her fingers been pressing on it, it must have been the reverse.

Meanwhile, these operations, tedious as the A B C always is, had been protracted for nearly two hours. The *attaché* fairly *à bout*, if not of his Latin, at least of his patience, started up, and declared that he really could not remain any longer.

But I wanted some evidence more satisfactory to myself, and I entreated him so earnestly to let us make another half-hour's experiment, that at last, *bongré malgré*, I prevailed. On this occasion I requested him to invoke a spirit who might be able to answer me. In a few minutes after we had again sat down, the table moved and rapped. "Who are you?" he asked.—"Louise." This was the name of the spirit who, he had told me, always came to him.

My object now was to obtain some data for myself, and I inquired if the spirit could answer my questions. On receiving an affirmative, I demanded the name of a deceased friend, a stranger to the place where I was then residing, wholly unknown to any one of the circle wherein I moved, and whose name I was positive I had never

mentioned to any one there. A wrong letter was struck.

"Is that correct?" asked the medium.

I shook my head.

"Have you made a mistake?" he inquired.

The table struck, "Yes."

"Then," he said, "begin again."

This time the name, of seven letters, was unhesitatingly spelt out. I asked various questions concerning him. Messages were conveyed to me from him, extremely like the language and ideas I should have expected from him; but this, of course, being only presumptive, was useless for conviction, so I returned to my tests.

"What sum of money did I send to another friend two years since? For every hundred francs strike one rap." Fifteen raps were struck; the number was correct; the fact being wholly unknown to any one save myself. "How many pictures are there in the room?" There was a considerable number scattered on the walls. Eighteen raps were struck; the number, on counting them, turned out to be accurate; for I did not even know it myself; and as for the medium, as it was only the third time he had been in my house, and he had never appeared to pay any attention to them, it was very unlikely that he should; although, of course, there was a possibility there which was not the case in the previous two instances.

Various other questions were thus answered. I could not trespass any more on the patience of my victim, so to bring the *séance* to a close with something even more striking, I implored him to repeat the Stockholm experiment and to order the table to fling itself to a distance. He complied, and desired it to throw itself on an arm-chair at some seven or eight feet's distance from where we sat.

On receiving the command, the table, which had been previously quiet, staid, and gentle in its movements, began to oscillate suddenly and strongly to and fro. We all three immediately took our hands off it, and drew back our chairs, to leave its motions perfectly unimpeded.

The oscillations continued for about the space of half a minute, with increasing force, till it swung so violently from right to left that by all those laws of equilibrium and gravitation, so irrefragably argued by Professor Faraday and other learned pundits, it must inevitably have fallen on one or other of its sides, on or about the spot where it then stood; the consummation which, as a matter of course, I expected. When lo! to my utter stupor and amaze, it suddenly made one strange, unnatural, convulsive bound, no longer in its previous direction, from my left to right, but *in the opposite diagonal*, straight away from me; leaping the intervening distance, and falling precisely on the foot of the designated arm-chair.

Such were the first facts of spiritual phenomena of which I was a witness in my own drawing-room, with two chance visitors, unknown to each other, and nearly as unknown to me; on an improvised occasion, neither prepared nor anticipated, either by them or me. And it must be confessed that they were sufficiently startling, although, of course, not conclusive to any philosophic and sceptical mind.

There was quite sufficient singularity in what I had seen, however, to induce an individual who takes a real interest in anything beyond mere temporal concerns and aims, to look more deeply into the matter; for although the experiment was insignificant and trifling, it was characterized by features that were not easily explained away. How came it that the table should have correctly answered in so many instances things which, whether the medium moved it or not, he could not have suggested, not knowing them? If he were a clairvoyant, and read in my mind what I was thinking of—a thing of itself sufficiently extraordinary—he could not have read in the French woman's a long-forgotten name she was *not* thinking of. If again *she* had moved the table for herself, which I was perfectly positive she neither had thought of, nor could have done, from the position of her hands, the way it moved, and the closeness of my scrutiny, she could not have made it answer me; and for my own part, I could vouch that I had not been an accomplice. If, on the other hand, as some of my wiseacre friends suggested, the medium had read in my glance the letters and numbers at which to make it rap, which I well knew he had not, as I had cautiously taken care to give no sign that could not in any wise account for the inexplicable fact witnessed by me in the full light of a carcel lamp—of the table springing forward in a direction *contrary* to the one which its oscillations had taken when our hands were still on it, and flinging itself precisely on a designated article, at a distance, when no human being was touching it, or could touch it unobserved, inasmuch as we were all removed two or three feet from it. Here was, at once, the combination of intelligence and of that favourite impossibility on which Professor Faraday so complacently perorates.

The question was decidedly becoming more and more of a charade. Not being, I repeat, an F. R. S., as my definition of impossibility is a thing that cannot be, I came with unacademical *naïveté* to the conclusion that since what I had beheld was an undeniable fact, which the lucid scrutiny of my acute waking senses bore incontro-vertible testimony to, and was not produced by any juggling, preparation, or *ficelles* whatever, tangible or metaphorical; the *resumé* amounted to the affirmation that since it *could be*, it was clearly not impossible.

Being moreover quite as deeply convinced as Professor Faraday that inert matter is wholly incapable of rebelling against the laws of gravitation unaided, I felt myself driven into a corner, and could only arrive at the

surmise that such "fantastic tricks before high Heaven" could only be played by wooden tables when under the influence of some antagonistic force sufficiently powerful to counter-balance the laws of equilibrium and attraction.

Query, what was that force? There indeed lay the brunt of the question. "Time will show, and shall show to me at least, *Deo volente*," I muttered to myself, as I laid my puzzled head on my pillow, wearied with pondering upon the insoluble paradox; while I inwardly recorded the solemn engagement to myself, never to suffer the waters of Lethe to efface the memory of what I had that night witnessed, meagre and unsatisfactory as it was; and never to neglect an occasion of obtaining new light upon the subject till I had succeeded in fathoming the mysterious problem one way or another.

Such was my first personal experiment in Spiritualism. The sequel will show how I kept my vow, and how far the results exceeded, and the phenomena I subsequently witnessed surpassed, all I could possibly have anticipated, or anything that my inveterate Scepticism could have credited from the testimony of those dearest, most highly appreciated; and implicitly believed; I will not say from apostles or from saints, for I am afraid that the peculiar temper of my mind rather induced me to be particularly suspicious of the latter category; however much this candid avowal may damage me in the opinion of their modern emulators.

Summer advanced. The migratory swallows began to scatter right and left, and I, like the rest, took my flight to cooler breezes and purer skies than those of the avenue de l'Etoile. The wizard, too, had taken his departure, and the nine days' wonder excited by his miraculous performances had rapidly faded away in the bustle and perpetual excitement of Parisian life. A new batch of Arab fire-eaters, and a troupe of Spanish danseuses had already taken his place in the mobile fancy of the fashionable world. The *cachemires* and the diamonds of Dwarkanauth Tagore had set all the belles and *petites maîtresses* of Paris on the *qui vine*, from the proudest inhabitants of the Rue de Varennes or St. Dominique down to the most *racy princesse* of the Rue de Breda, and the most humble *debutante* of la Chaumiere. Last not least, a novel importation of Siamese or Japanese ambassadors, fondly supposed to be gilt from top to toe, and to scatter diamond-dust like dross, had just landed at Marseilles, and it will hardly be deemed wonderful that the wizard should have been already forgotten, and that Spiritualism bid fair, to all appearance, to die a natural death, so far at least as the fashionable world was concerned.

As for my literary friend, he had taken an insurmountable disgust to the spiritual theory, because having endeavoured to call up spirits on his own account, he had been provokingly *berné* by the agencies in question, whatever they might be. They had given him such contradictory answers, talked such nonsense, and told him so many falsehoods, that he declared they could not be spirits at all.

I pointed out to him that the conclusion was decidedly illogical, for that one might as well deny the existence of men because they speak falsely and act foolishly as that of spirits for no better reason; seeing that it is not a necessary sequence that all spirits should be perfect. But he declared that they were decidedly *mauvais genre*, and that he saw no reason why he should *encanailler* himself with the souls of individuals simply because they were no longer of this world, whom he would not have suffered to cross his threshold while they were.

To this argument I likewise demurred, it appearing probable to me, simply on logical grounds, that, admitting the supposition that spirits do possess the faculty of corresponding with men, it could hardly be supposed that the privilege should be confined to inferior spirits alone, or that higher entities were debarred from similar powers. Consequently I suggested to him that if he really had conversed with invisible intelligences, as he appeared to believe, it might perhaps have happened to him in the spiritual world as so often occurs in this, namely, that arriving there as a stranger, without proper introductions, a good *carte du pays*, or any patron of lofty standing or high degree to act as his cicerone, he had fallen into very doubtful and compromising company. In his place, however, I assured him that if I had once been so fortunate as to obtain the *entrée*. I should certainly make good my footing, and endeavour to work my way up to the *crème de la crème*.

But my friend was obdurate. He was a busy and ambitious man. Time was precious to him; the spirits, if spirits they were, had unquestionably used him unhandsomely, he had been bamboozled, cheated, and, as he averred, fairly made a fool of, by them, and he had irrevocably decided that "*le jeu ne valait pas la chandelle*"

On this moot point I differed from him *in toto*. Had the evidence I had personally obtained been as conclusive as that which had been vouchsafed to him, I felt that I could not have thus easily dismissed the inquiry. To my mind it was evident that if it were indeed true that incorporeal intelligences could place themselves in communication with us, even in this world, it cannot have been the design of Providence that only confusion, absurdity, falsehood, and inanity should be the result. But it was in vain that I represented the profound interest offered by the investigation of this *terra incognita*; that I assured him that if I ever succeeded in sighting the unknown shores beyond the grave, I should think little of the discoveries of a Columbus or a Vespuccius in comparison; that the perseverance of the great Genoese would be, if possible, surpassed by mine;

and that were I met by a whole score or legion of *folletti*, or spiritual black legs at the *débarcadour*, all the malicious tricks and the audacious lies that ever Puck or Rübezahl played off upon their hapless victims, would not deter me from prosecuting my explorations in the superlunary spheres. My friend was not to be moved from his purpose. He had cut the entire concern, and washed his hands of it. Not that he had seen any cause to discredit the facts he had witnessed, but simply because the spirits he had called had turned out deceivers, that time was valuable, life was short, and investigation slow and troublesome.

Reasons which, I believe, resume those of many thousands who see, hear, doubt, and turn back on the threshold, like the gentleman in question.

As for myself, I was more than in doubt. I was, and remained a sceptic. Something there was in it no doubt, something strange and puzzling; but as for spirits, bah! that was too absurd to dream of. After the first three months had blown over, I had fairly succeeded in explaining everything away to myself except the preternatural leap of that possessed table. The thought *would* recur to me that it was a downright impossibility. The gravitation stumbling-block was quite as indigestible to me as to Professor Faraday. As for the rest it might be understood on the theory of clairvoyance.

"But," demurred Scepticism, "clairvoyance is only a degree less incredible than Spiritualism. I thought you had fully made up your mind as to the *charlatanerie* of mesmerism. If you admit that another individual can see into your mind and read your thoughts as clearly as if they were written on your forehead,—that his soul can quit his body, travel away to any distance, and tell you what it there beholds, there need be no limits to your credulity." "Yes," replied reason, "but I must be allowed to believe in something. If you refuse to let me accept Spiritualism you really must permit me to take refuge in clairvoyance. Something it *must* be, that is certain. Trickery it was not, and could not be; *that*, at least, I know; and as for believing in effects without a cause, you will never induce me to accept that illogical theory."

*En fin de compte*, poor reason thus uncomfortably tossed to and fro between Scepticism and fact, was compelled to arrive at the conclusion she ought to have adopted from the first, and to decide that the matter was dubious, and deeper investigation both necessary and desirable.

So passed a year. I had not forgotten my experience, nor renounced my curiosity; indeed, that unlucky antigravitation leap would not suffer me to forget it had I been so disposed, for it kept perpetually rising up before my mind's eye with pertinacious perversity. But mediums were scarce, Spiritualism was at a discount, and study, worldliness, and pleasure swept all before them.

At last, my wanderings led me to Spain. I was in Granada. It chanced one day that I was standing in one of the windows of the Hall of the Ambassadors, looking down upon the "silvery Darro" of poetic fame, and thinking most prosaically that it was wonderfully muddy, considering its reputation.

"Ah! you are looking at those curious gipsy caves in the Barranco. They are strange dens certainly, and there is more within than meets the eye. I wish I could fathom their mysteries."

The speaker was a gentleman to whom we had brought a letter of introduction, and who had installed himself, *pro tempore*, as our cicerone.

"Yes," he continued, "there is more within them than ordinary observers suspect. Many a buried treasure, both there and in the caverns beneath the rocks on which this wondrous palace is built. But I do not despair of discovering some of them yet."

"I thought," said I smiling, "that the Spaniards had made so many fruitless efforts in that direction that no one was likely to be sufficiently adventurous to renew the research."

"Certainly the pickaxe and the spade have been so long used in vain, hereabouts, that I for one should be little disposed to resort to those common-place methods of exploration, but I have a more recondite, and effectual talisman to assist me in my attempts."

"And what may that be?" I asked with curiosity.

"Communion with spirits. But this *entre nous*. For although they can no longer throw me into the dungeons of the Inquisition, *Dieu merci!* the *parti pretre* is still so powerful with a large majority in Spain, that they would fairly persecute me out of the city if they knew of my unhallowed proceedings; so I need not ask you not to betray me. The fact is, I am a very powerful medium," continued the Count, drawing himself up, evidently rather vain of his supernatural gifts, "and I am surrounded with spirits who tell me everything I want to know."

"But, in that case, you ought to have fished up all the treasures of the Alhambra long ere this," I said, smiling.

"Ah! but you see, I have not succeeded yet in evoking the spirits of those obstinate old Moors. I suspect they have still an inveterate prejudice against Christians, and that they are resolved that no hated *giaour* shall be the better for their wealth; for do all I can, they will not come; and as for my particular friends, Plato and Demosthenes, Newton, Byron, and Galileo, they are altogether above such sublunary matters, and tell me that they neither can nor will help me."

I looked up in surprise, half supposing that the speaker must be jesting.

"No, I am quite in earnest," said the Count, catching the interrogation in my glance. "I know it sounds extraordinary, but it is all perfectly true; and if you are curious about it I will bring them some evening to converse with and convince you.

Here was the coveted opportunity: a medium who evidently asked no better than to be drawn out. I resolved "*saisir l'occasion par les cheveux*"

"Oh, by all means!" I exclaimed; "I ask no better than to see, hear, and be convinced. When shall it be?"

"To-night—to-morrow—when you please, provided only you keep it a secret."

I am rather impatient by nature, so I fixed on the same evening.

The Count came. We were alone. We sat down to a little table. It moved, as a matter of course, and precisely in the same manner I had witnessed before. Various answers were rapped out by the foot. One only was singular. I inquired the name of the country house of a deceased friend—a strange Baroque Breton name, consisting of three words, and referring to a remote spot far away in one of the most unfrequented provinces of France.

The three words were correctly given, although, mindful of the suggestions of my friends, I had taken special care to give no sign of affirmation or negation till the whole was accurately spelt out. Nay, I had carried my scruples so far, that I had kept my eyes immovably bent down on the table, in order that I might be unable subsequently to accuse them of having betrayed me. It was strange, therefore, to say the least, that the answer was thus accurate, for the name was far too peculiar to have been hit upon at hap-hazard; and indeed it was for that reason I had selected it as a test. But here, of course, clairvoyance came in to the rescue.

Nevertheless I thought I might as well seize the occasion of seeing something more on another evening. This time the medium was of the most amiable disposition; it was clear that if I were not convinced it would not be *his* fault. Unfortunately, however, nothing being perfect in this world, his brains did not take rank precisely in that category which possesses the secret of influencing mine. 'He might be a medium certainly, but he was unquestionably no sage,—a conclusion at which I had arrived at the close of his first visit, and which every subsequent interview tended to confirm.

Warming with the interest which I appeared to take in his favourite pursuit,—wherein, it struck me, judging from the mania which seemed to possess him on the subject, that he was very likely to leave the little sense he could boast,—he offered to let me see an extraordinary clairvoyante whom he was in the habit of magnetizing, and another medium who, from his account, appeared to be his chief informant on spiritual matters, and who, I gathered from his scattered anecdotes, were in even closer *rappor*t with the spirits than himself.

The proposal was not to be spurned by one really desirous of seeking for information. The rendezvous was fixed for the following night. The clairvoyante was a poor girl of humble parentage, residing in one of the faubourgs of the city. The medium was a young clerk employed in a counting-house.

At dusk, the following evening, the Count called for me, enveloped up to the chin in a sombre cape; for the visit, of course, was to be wrapt in profound mystery.

It was no easy matter to thread one's way through the intricate and ill-lighted streets of the old Moorish quarter. Many were the turnings and the windings, innumerable the suspicious-looking lanes, the narrow passages, the quaint-looking places, through which we zigzagged up and down on the sharp stones and the steep spurs of the cliff, on the summit of which the vermilion towers, famed in song and story, overlook the no less famed Yega of Granada.

Had I not been fully persuaded of the innocuous nature of my companion, I should almost have suspected him of carrying me off surreptitiously to some gipsy or brigand haunt, some sinister *tapis franc*, on fell designs intent.

As, however, on the score of his innocence I felt perfectly assured, I pursued my path in all confidence, picking my way over the sharp pebbles whereby Granada shines conspicuous, surpassing even the acute angles and piercing points of Bolognese paving stones; as if the Catholic penance of walking upon peas were expressly provided for the daily martyrdom of the pious inhabitants of these two most Catholic cities.

I was rewarded for my faith: for after all these vicissitudes I was safely landed at my destination without having experienced a single qualm, or having heard anything more sinister than the tinkle of a distant guitar, or the whisper of a pair of *novios* here and there; nor beholding anything more alarming than a little white hand passed through the traditionary *reja* (grate), to charm the *ennui* of some constant worshipper conscientiously fulfilling the duties of that truly Spanish institution, "*pelar la pava*,"

"To plume the peacock," the curious *chic* term for balcony and grate flirtation.

a spectacle which, however London or Parisian scepticism may contest its possibility, is not the less to be met with in any nineteenth-century Spanish town, as easily as in the days of Cervantes and Lope de Vega, or the "Impressions" of Alexandre Dumas.

It was a gloomy, penury-stricken, lofty house, through which we clambered up interminable flights of stairs, to the fourth story.

After ascertaining that we were neither brigands on a nocturnal raid, nor *shirri* or *mouchares* in disguise, or any contraband interlopers whatever, by one of those precautionary interrogations which so surprise neophytes in Italy or Spain, in the form of a "*chi è*" or a "*quien es*" bawled through the door, we were cautiously admitted.

The janitor appeared, in the form of an elderly female who displayed her wrinkles and grey hairs in all that unadorned and unattractive repulsiveness which old age assumes in these southern climes, where female charms being solely confined to youth and good looks, the woman who feels that both have irretrievably deserted her, abandons herself to the ravages of time with a neglect and apathy generated by the recklessness of despair. Through two or three of those large desolate rooms, whose cold stone floors, bare, ungarnished walls, lack of furniture, and ignorance of comfort strike a chill to every English heart, not always confined either to the dwellings of the low and the poor, we were ushered into the *soi disant salon*, which was rendered somewhat less dismal by a few rush chairs and a square wooden table, in the centre of which stood a tall brass *lucerna*, whose three oil wicks had been lighted, *par extraordinaire*, in our honour.

The clairvoyante, a sallow, sickly-looking, dark-eyed Spanish girl, was decidedly in keeping with her ghostly avocation. Not so, however, the medium. The latter was a chubby, brown-haired lad, of about seventeen or eighteen, with a simple, inexpressive countenance, rather ingenuous and dull in appearance than otherwise, certainly the very reverse of astute, roguish-looking, or sagacious, and particularly quiet, unassuming, and natural in his tone and manner.

The *séance* began with the clairvoyante. She was duly mag-netized, the Count being the operator, and in about ten minutes thrown into a real or assumed trance; a fact ascertained and accepted by the usual query, "Do you sleep?" Various questions were then put to her concerning her own health and that of the magnetizer, which were answered by details and prescriptions of the value or genuineness of which I had no means of judging. At last she was interrogated with respect to me. The answers returned were not inappropriate, but, to my mind, at least, they were vague, and altogether inconclusive. In one instance only did she succeed in making a hit that bore a close approximation to circumstances which certainly neither she nor the magnetizer had any means of divining, unless indeed she read them in my mind. I inquired whether she could tell me anything about a near relative recently deceased. She replied, after some thought, that she saw him; that he was young, and had died a violent death in a barbarian country. So far she was correct, for he had been killed in war in the heart of India. Beyond this, I could get nothing out of her; and the Count, considerably mortified at the result, affirmed that her want of lucidity was due to indisposition.

It was now the turn of the medium. A small round table was introduced, about two and a half or three feet in diameter. A sheet of paper was placed on it, and on this the youth laid his hand, holding a pencil between his fingers, so loosely, I am bound to say (for the purpose, he declared, of convincing me), that certainly I could not have written with it in the same manner. In a few minutes the table began to swing to and fro, till at last it got into the most rapid, violent vibratory, oscillating motion, shaking the pencil back and forward in his hand, till, under this strange jogging motion, it began to form letters, and presently wrote a running hand currently and with apparent ease.

The feat was decidedly curious, for the table continued to shake with the same violent, convulsive velocity during the entire performance; so violently indeed that my first acquaintance, the female janitor, was obliged to place her hand on one edge of it to prevent its toppling every two or three minutes.

This last circumstance seemed suspicious, for I could not tell how far her fingers might contribute to the motion, although I saw no signs of her doing more than preventing its falling.

Admitting the suspicion to be just, however, the singularity of the writing remained not the less unaccountable; for, how any one could form even an intelligible word, not to speak of the long sentences and pages which were thus scribbled off, in a very clear hand, before my eyes, under these anticalligraphic conditions, seemed altogether mysterious.

But I was desirous of obtaining tests still less ambiguous. The first spirit who presented himself was the celebrated Hahneman, who, it appeared, was an *habitué* of the house. Here was a chance. I requested that he would speak German to me, and asked some counsel about my health. A long sentence, containing rather a clever prescription and some good advice, was shaken out, for I really cannot call it written. There were however two flaws in it, which I could not get over. The great homœopathist had fatally committed himself by perpetrating one gross grammatical blunder, and secondly by misspelling his own name; *i.e.*, he coolly wrote *gebracht* for *gebrochen*, and signed *Haneman*, thus omitting the second *h*. Here was a poser. I am rather squeamish, habitually, about orthography, and was altogether indisposed to admit that the celebrated *savant* should be ignorant of the participles past of his own language, or have forgotten how to spell his own patronymic.

I inquired of the medium if he knew German. He replied naively that he could speak a few words of it, but was very slightly acquainted with the language.

If the medium were a trickster, as I had already fully decided that he must be, on the strength of Dr.

Hahnemann orthographical delinquencies, it became evident that he was a very green one, for the natural thing would have been to have denied all knowledge of German whatever, it being a rare acquirement in such southern latitudes. I requested that another spirit might be evoked. Off started the table again with all the excitement of a special train; and a good deal of the unpleasant jarring side-to-side motion of its high-pressure velocity. This time the new arrival was a celebrated Italian writer, the Abbate Casti, whose anticlerical and antimonarchical satires, cutting, sparkling, and brilliant as diamond, were very nearly as much dreaded, and quite as bitterly proscribed in the Bourbon and Papal Italy of ten or twelve years ago, as those of his rival, the popular improvisatore, Giusti.

The witty author of "Gli Animali Parlanti" apparently thought it beneath his dignity to speak from the other world in anything beneath the sublimity of verse, so he launched out, full tilt, into the soaring flight of Italian *terza rima*. Thus were three pages of poetry dashed off with an unhesitating rapidity, only exceeded by the restless activity of the dancing table on which it was scribbled. I read the effusion with considerable surprise, for the Italian was pure, the diction was poetical, the ideas were brilliant and witty, and moreover it was addressed to me, and specially *apropos* to the occasion for which it was evidently composed.

I tried to read in the eyes of the lad if they bespoke any of the mettle or the fiery inspiration which betrays the *estro* of southern improvisation, and which had so often electrified me in the countenances of the famed improvisatrici, Rosa Taddei or Giannina Milli. But no, he looked, if possible, more stolid and uninspirable than ever. Clearly the poetic *verve* had never originated behind that bread-and-butter mask. "Bah!" replied Scepticism, "your visit was announced beforehand; what easier than to get some clever rhymester to pen off these stanzas by anticipation?"

"I should rather like to know that individual, for he must be a decided genius, considering the excellence of the verses, their length, and the little time he had to prepare them," I thought to myself. But it is with spirits, not with improvisatori, that I am seeking to make acquaintance for the moment, so *en avant*, let us seek something more satisfactory than anonymous rhyme.

In pursuance of my testing plan, I requested the medium to call a dear and near relative, by whom I had been brought up. He complied; the spirits reannounced themselves, according to their custom here apparently, by another furious jiggling of the table.

"Is it the friend I have invoked?"

"Yes."

"Will he address to me whatever he would wish to say to me himself?"

The table shook out a long rigmarole speech, full of wise saws, first-rate morality, and excellent advice, but entirely composed of generalities, which might have proceeded from any one, and been addressed ditto: consequently, anything but what the clever and intelligent individual I had called up would have directed as a mode of persuasion to a mind of my calibre, which it would have been his first object to convince. Moreover, nothing could induce him to address me in any other language than Spanish. This to me was a clincher, for polyglot acquirements being completely at variance with his antecedents, and a decided preference for his native English, the only tongue he had ever been able to speak and write with fluency, being one of his marked characteristics, I felt perfectly satisfied that whoever had been polite enough to give ear to my adjuration, it was, at all events, not the one to whom I had addressed it.

The medium was fatigued, as well he might be, for the shaking his hand and arm must have received during the preceding hour's operations would have dislocated my bones, and jarred my whole nervous system for a week. The *séance* was therefore raised. Several bulky volumes of manuscript were then displayed for my benefit, purporting to be the *post-mortem* lucubrations of Solon, Plato, Demosthenes, Socrates, Numa, Pliny, Aristotle, Theodosius the Great, Byron, Homer, and various other worthies of a similar standing. The greatest part of these communications, the Count informed me, had been vouchsafed by these great authorities to himself, first through alphabetical raps, and subsequently by spiritual dictation; *i.e.*, by making his hand write under the propulsion 'of their volition.

I glanced cursorily over the pages with an irritation which, but for my sense of the burlesque gaining the upper hand, would almost have amounted to indignation. Could I have brought myself to swallow Hahnemann oblivion of German, and my own friend's newly acquired foreign propensities, the grotesque idea of the noblest intellects and most brilliant geniuses of ancient and modern times deserting the empyrean spheres, in order to bestow their leisure moments upon such palpable mediocrity as the Count's, and devoting their lofty faculties to the hopeless and ungrateful task of enlightening his addled brains, to me was altogether insurmountable.

True, had I been as logically lucid for myself as in the preceding instance for my literary friend, I might perhaps have called to mind the arguments I had used on that occasion for his special benefit. Having so shrewdly reasoned in his behoof, that incorporeal intelligence is not necessarily synonymous with truth or perfection, and that there is no logical evidence afforded of a spirit's nonentity, from the fact of its not being addicted to veracity, I might on the present occasion have reflected that one lie is as good as another, and that if

spirits can and do indulge in such derelictions from the rules of propriety, spiritual or mundane, it might appear quite as amusing a lie as any other to malicious or mocking beings to put on the tragic or epic *cothurnæ* of Euripides and Homer, to assume the stoic's mantle or the bays of Cæsar, for the pleasure of befooling and turning into ridicule the absurd vanity of imbeciles who think that such lofty beings are likely to come at their beck, or to frequent their society with any greater condescension than they would have done during their lifetime. I might have remembered that even among our tangible contemporaries, many a wit and punster would think it a capital joke to pass himself off on the credulity of friends or enemies for the ghost of Theodosius the Great, Shakespeare, Milton, etc., or even to overwhelm the flunkeyism, and delight the aristocratic aspirations of the Smiths and Browns' of cockney celebrity, by persuading them that he was the Czar of all the Russias, or the Kaiser of all the Austrias, travelling *incognito*, specially ambitious of cultivating their acquaintance; and that the jest would be reckoned *impayable* if he only possessed the ring of Gyges to render himself invisible, and might thus count on eluding detection.

In a word, I might at least have reflected that the fact of an unseen intelligence answering to the name of Solon, Plato, or any other notability, ancient or modern, was, logically speaking, no proof whatever that it could lay any genuine claim to the title, and that these high-sounding denominations might be as easily assumed by way of an amusing hoax as any other.

Hence it was clear that, so far as logic went, I had as little ground for resting my conviction of the impossibility of these being spiritual communications mainly on the absurdity of the supposition that they could have emanated, under the circumstances, from their reputed authors, as my friend in his negation of their existence, from the mere fact of his having been deceived by them.

Doubtless these self-obvious considerations, to any really reasoning mind, supposing the question to be hypothetically argued on purely logical premises, would not have escaped me, had my friend's cause been on the tapis instead of my own, and, last, not least, had I not been *froissé* on one of my weak points.

The truth is that I am altogether uncharitable to that particular genus that comes under the denomination of bores. They produce upon me something nearly akin to the unpleasantly exciting effects of galvanism upon a frog.

They irritate my entire mental epidermis to a degree which must be felt to be believed or understood. Half an hour's infliction of the platitudes of a bore sets all my nerves ajar, and sends the blood rushing down through the minutest veins of my body, and boiling up in downright effervescence through every tissue of my brain. In short, if I have not altogether decided that they have no business to live, and if I should not precisely, like Caligula, desire to annihilate the race at one fell swoop, I am afraid that no amount of Christian charity would ever induce me to put up with the society of a single individual of the species, were I even reduced to live like Robinson Crusoe on a deserted island.

The idea, therefore, that the idols of my cherished genius and hero-worship should be at the mercy of a Count M——and his medium to defame and calumniate; that any fool should dare to flatter himself that he could call their glorified spirits back to earth to entertain him or her *en tête à tête*, or to be held up as a rare show for the benefit of his acquaintances, not to speak of the outrage of having any trash or bathos which such brains might generate, posthumously foisted upon their glorious intellects, was to my feelings downright revolting. Indeed I hardly ever remember to have boiled with such a burst of posthumous irascibility except on one unlucky occasion when I chanced to behold Lord Byron in wax, tricked out in a Greek dress, all tinsel and finery, at Madame Tussaud's.

Thus it happened that I proved infinitely less logical for myself than for my friend, a case at which none may marvel, for it is remarkably general.

It is really unaccountable how lucid one's reasoning faculties are when they are brought to bear on the cases of conscience or the fallacies of our neighbours, and how easily, the moment our own inclinations or prejudices come in question, they become the converse. Doubtless some of the ingenious wits who are so rife just now, will think it very smart to fling this dictum in my teeth on the present occasion. But I am quite prepared to brave the attack, and, I have reason to believe, am fully armed to meet it. Not that I labour under the gross delusion common to pontiffs, professors, and academicians, that I, any more than any other mortal, can boast of being infallible, but simply because I make it a point to be prudent, and to observe scrupulously the wise French axiom, "*Dans le doute, abstiens toi.*" Consequently, as I never advance a positive affirmation on the strength of any other grounds than what I know to be true, I have good cause to be certain that I can never be compelled to beat a humiliating retreat.

Thus I have no fear that any one will be able to disprove my postulates, that admitting the probability of the existence of spiritual intelligences, there are no reasonable grounds for arguing that they should be either all good or all evil; secondly, that starting from this premise, if we presuppose the possibility of their communicating with us, there is no sound reason for denying that evil or worthless spirits may be liars as well as evil men; consequently, that the fact of their telling falsehoods, or assuming names to which they have no



right, affords no logical premise whence to deduce their non-existence.

Such, however, were not the impartial conclusions at which I had then arrived. Prejudice and passion had got the mastery over me too. Demosthenes, Homer, and Byron degrading themselves to party quarrels with Count M——, his clairvoyante, and his medium, was altogether revolting to me. All that I had seen and heard, by my friend's senses no less than by my own, I resolutely argued, subtilized, and explained away in the most satisfactory manner. All but one sturdy fact; the antigravitation leap of the little table in Paris. It was in vain that I turned and twisted that troublesome detail in every conceivable manner. Do what I would, I could not dispose of it so as to satisfy my reason, notwithstanding my utmost good will and my most ingenious theories. No mental phenomena I could have stumbled on, would have proved half so insurmountable to me. Had I been one of the gaping thousands who, history informs us, heard with stupor the infant prodigies of the Camisards lisping their cosmopolite eloquence in every known tongue, I should have smiled with pity at the credulity of the multitude, and affirmed that the small parrots were very cleverly taught. Had I heard rustics declaiming Ciceronian Latin, or seen the paralytic walk, and heard the dumb speak, I should have persuaded myself it was a sharp trick. There was no psychological marvel my fertile brain would not have accounted for. But the one unlucky *physical fact* stood its ground in the teeth of all opposition.

"There were both intelligence and an antigravitation in the leap," quoth reason. "Ridiculous and impossible," retorted Scepticism, insultingly.

"It is precisely because it is impossible that it makes such an impression upon me," said reason.

"Bah! a paltry, inert little wooden table, absurd!" pooh-poohed Scepticism.

"I don't care whether it is absurd or not, it is a patent fact; I saw it with my own eyes, and I can swear to it," persisted reason.

"How can you maintain such nonsense? Do you not know that Professor Faraday has publicly declared it as a downright impossibility, and that none but fools or madmen can believe it," says Scepticism.

"I don't care a straw for all the professors in the universe, when they contradict the demonstration of my own lucid senses. I am quite willing to bow to his superior knowledge in electrical phenomena or scientific problems, of which, no doubt, he is a much better judge than I. But I altogether contend that on a question of plain matter of fact he is not one atom more competent to decide than I am. If I required his or any one else's leave to credit the fact that I see my dinner on my table, or that I have swallowed it, I must be a confirmed imbecile; and if Newton or Bacon were to come down from the seventh heaven on the same fruitless errand, they might swear never so determinedly (not to speak of Professor Faraday) that what I saw was impossible,—I know I *did* see it; I know too that I neither was nor am mad or dreaming, and that is fully convincing to *me*, if not to others," sturdily persisted reason.

Here I must state, that I am quite prepared to meet the full quiver of the satirical shafts that will doubtless be levelled at me by the lively critics who make so merry on the other side of the water, over the amusing antics performed by young ladies descending in parachutes, detached hands administering impolite corrections, and possessed fiddles and tambourines performing jigs and polkas over the bamboozled brains of dyspeptic hypochondriacs and hysterical spinsters, verging to that grand climacteric when spiritual *cavaliere serventi* may become more and more desirable, in proportion to the alarmingly increasing scarcity of their corporeal rivals.

I hear them inquiring, with the flippancy which they are so innocent as to mistake for wit, to what amounts all this smart verbiage. I hear them too informing the simple public who are foolish enough to indorse their feeble mockery and still feebler sophisms, not indeed because they have not brains enough to see through them, but solely because it costs less time and trouble to accept another's shallow fiat than to reason for one's self—that the whole may be resumed in two words, *i.e.*, that an *incognito* somebody, or nobody, pens off a dozen or two pages, rather amusingly written, in order to convince an indifferent public of what nobody cares to know, nor is bound to believe; viz., that the anonymous writer saw a little wooden table take an antigravitation leap.

To these microscopic Walpoles and Bouffiers I here respond, that their retort may be very witty, but in order to be either cutting or *a propos*, it lacks, like *most* of their arguments, three indispensable ingredients, *i.e.*, depth, truth, and relevancy.

If I am not very much mistaken, the difficulties which confirmed the Scepticism of myself and friend comprise the three strongest theoretical objections which ever have been or can be urged against spiritual phenomena. In demonstrating, as I believe I have, on the clearest logical grounds, that all three are based on incontestably illogical premises, I may fairly flatter myself that some sensible individuals may perhaps open their eyes to the fact that before they blindly accept the decisions of *soi-disant* authorities, they would do well to submit to the criticism of their own reasoning faculties the data upon which these authorities take their stand. Neither will these pages prove either so vain or supererogatory if they succeed in recalling to reasoning minds an incontestable fact which somehow or other seems on the present occasion to be altogether overlooked in the argument; viz., that those who set out upon false premises may calculate with tolerable certainty upon arriving

at false conclusions.

As for the leap of the little table, I have not dwelt thus diffusely upon its vagaries with the hope of convincing any one of the fact through my nameless affirmation. My intention lies much deeper and aims much higher. It would be of small consequence that I should succeed in persuading a few dozen individuals that I really did behold that or similar phenomena. Such facile converts "delight not me," for one, and can be but a very slender acquisition to any cause. If, however, I thereby suggest to such persons as are capable of reasoning for themselves, that it is not altogether impossible that the saltatory freaks of wooden tables may not be quite so useless and unmeaning, consequently so ridiculous and puerile, as the sapient critics on whom they pin their faith gravely or mockingly assert, I shall have achieved one step at least towards inducing numbers to investigate these curious things for themselves, who are now weakly and foolishly deterred from the attempt by apathetically accepting the fallacious arguments and transparent casuistry which is daily foisted on the common sense of the British public.

One simple question I would put to these satirical gentlemen and their disciples. Let us suppose for an instant that Moses and Isaiah, Peter and Paul were to return upon the earth in nineteenth-century garb, and to start upon a reforming mission throughout civilized Europe. Let us imagine them thundering forth their eloquence, their prophecies, and their denunciations from every pulpit, and in every thoroughfare between London and Kams-chatka. Would they not be the first to put them in one basket with Messrs. Spurgeon and Co., and to set up their healing of the blind and the lame with the ingenious performances of winking Madonnas and bleeding wooden Christs.

I ask them, too, if all the wisdom and the speculations of the greatest theologians and the profoundest *savants*, ancient or modern, could they even be condensed into a volume whose dimensions might induce them to skim it over, would have power to force upon their minds suggestions so startling, or induce queries so insatiable, and a conviction so irresistible, as the motion of the untouched arm-chair, and the antigravitation leap of the table, beheld by my companion and myself.

It has been, and no doubt will be, asked to the end of the chapter, why such paltry domestic articles as chairs and tables should be resorted to? May it not be precisely because they are familiar objects at every one's disposal? Or is it absolutely necessary to remove the planetary spheres from their orbits, if a wooden table is fully adequate to accomplish the purpose intended?

There is a lucid definition of Divine wisdom I happened to light upon the other day in a little book designed to teach young or uneducated minds how to shoot, which, it strikes me, that many an adult and educated mind might ponder and digest at the present moment with considerable advantage. In a little treatise on the solar system, published by the Religious Tract Society, (I trust my authority will be considered sufficiently orthodox and edifying, more especially when quoted by a sceptic,) we are told that "Wisdom is the perfection of an intelligent agent which enables him to proportionate one thing to another, and to devise the most appropriate means to accomplish important ends."—It then proceeds to state that a person would be reckoned foolish in the extreme who should construct, at an enormous expense, a huge piece of machinery solely for carrying round a grate, for the purpose of roasting a small fowl, instead of making the fowl itself revolve, and it concludes, that what would be "the height of folly in mankind," cannot be "characteristic of the plans and operations of Divinity."

These premises are logically incontestable. And I ask these sapient critics, therefore, may not the fowl perhaps aptly represent the case of the wooden table? And since it is just as impossible for a wooden table, two feet square, to move a yard of its own accord, or to give an intelligent answer to an intelligent question, as for a granite mountain to move a mile, or to reply to our queries by courteous nods, is it not just conceivable that Providence may think it wiser to make use of wooden tables than granite mountains, for any mysterious end He may have in view?

That the singular phenomena which are now developing themselves around us are not, however, confined to saltatory wooden tables, my subsequent experience has, at least, amply demonstrated to me.

Shortly afterwards I left Spain. Of Count M——and his medium I heard little more. My indignation at his audacious desecration of the great names he had outraged, cured me of all desire to enlarge my experience on the subject of Spiritualism by cultivating their society.

Circumstances took me back to the North. Two years elapsed, which were spent in wandering over Tyrolian mountains and sojourning in German capitals. It might be presumed that the land of water sprites and mountain gnomes, of Undines, Lurleis, Rübzahl, Leonoras, and illuminati would have been specially adapted to illuminate my mind on this phantasmagoric topic. It proved otherwise, nevertheless. There are certainly some elements of the *Tudesque* nature which are incontestably antagonistic to that of their British collaterals. Any proportions whatever of beer, sauerkraut, bad tobacco, garlic, and other foul emanations seem to be compatible, in their cases, with the development of the bump of ideality, and the Olympic flights of their æsthetic faculties; witness the striking illustration of this peculiar feature of German idiosyncrasy, recorded by Lewis in his

interesting life of Goethe, wherein he narrates that Schiller could never satisfactorily call down inspiration except by inhaling the fetor of a drawer full of rotten apples, under his writing-desk.

Such, however, are not the accessories that my imagination requires. I have a decided predilection for violets and *eau de rose*; am apt to feel my soul dilate under the influence of azure skies, balmy breezes, and aromatic odours; am afflicted with a special aversion for garlic and tobacco fumes; and shiver cruelly at the chilling aspect of frost and snow.

Add to this my inherent disrespect for the little great, my absolute disregard for all the high-sounding titles whose hollow sonorousness seems chiefly destined to disguise the insignificance of those who bear them, my invincible contempt for all flunkeyism and servility, whether of home or foreign growth, and it may be easily conceived that the atmosphere of German courts and German *kneipe* did not prove particularly genial to my peculiar temperament.

Two things, however, did, to a great extent, reconcile me to the country and the people; viz., German erudition, and German literature. Into them therefore I plunged heart and soul, seeking compensation in the glowing imagery of German genius, and the profound mines of German thought, for the southern charms which I missed.

Profoundly immersed in these absorbing studies, I had little time and less thought to spare for spiritual investigation and meditation.

No wonder that the two years passed, rapid as a thought, till again I was free to follow the bent of my inclinations, and I steered my flight once more to my beloved South.

I was again in Venice. Venice, the city of my predilection. How I revelled once more in gliding about on the Canaletti, in wandering beneath the Procuratie, and feasting my eyes on that "treasure-heap of gold and precious stones," glorious St. Mark, in company with "The Stones of Venice," that most glowing inspiration of one of the grandest artistic thinkers of ancient or modern times.

I was at last in my element. Thought and inspiration flowed thick and fast into my soul. My days were spent in wandering about the little campi, in exploring all the mysterious penetralia of that most mysterious and beautiful of cities, in lingering among its churches and palaces, admiring their noble monuments and antique splendour, and drinking in the lofty creations and gorgeous colouring of Titian and Veronese.

My evenings passed scarcely less delightfully, in the society of Venetian literati, savants, artists, and composers,—many of them men of the past generation, and of advanced age, but still flashing with all that spirit and fire of sempiternal youth which, is the unquenchable privilege of genius. Of course, in such companionship, various abstract questions were brought on the *tapis* which do not generally find a place in the conversation of drawing-room butterflies, or in the *batons rompus* dialogues of quadrilles and waltzes. Spiritualism, which was again exciting attention in Italy, was, naturally, not excepted.

Among the narrow but chosen circle of my most intimate friends were a Russian gentleman and his wife. He, the possessor of a large fortune and high station, was essentially a man of the world, agreeable, clever, well-bred, and thoroughly *distingué*. She, the native of another country, was one of those rare and gifted beings endowed with an organization of the highest order, and conspicuous for intellectual power.

In her presence, on one of our artistic evenings, I narrated my brief and unsatisfactory experience of Spiritualism. She had never occupied herself with the subject, and holding it to be only a paltry *charlatanerie*, had scarcely given it a second thought. Hers, however, was one of those lucid minds which seizes at once upon the true pith and brunt of an idea, and grasps the whole bearing of a question at one glance.

"If what you saw is a fact, and appreciating, as I do, your intelligence and veracity, I can scarcely question it," she said to me the next day, "then be sure that there lies much more beneath it than meets vulgar eyes; much which is worthy of the deepest and the most profound investigation. By all means let us give it the fairest, the most impartial, and the most serious trial. I cannot conceive how you could thus lightly renounce the inquiry. Believing in your word as I do, and certain as I am of your sagacity, I should look upon myself as little better than a fool, were I to let such a mystery pass by me without endeavouring to elucidate it."

"For my part," said her husband, frankly, "you won't be angry with me, I humbly opine that the *attaché* must have thrown some glamour over you, or that you had just then an unusual fit of '*la berlue*,' for the days of miracles are past; and were I even to behold it myself, I should much sooner believe that I had mistaken an *ombre Chinoise*, or an optical delusion, for a physical fact, than that the laws of nature can be thus absurdly interverted in the nineteenth century, and for no better purpose than to amuse drawing-room idlers by the romantic evolutions of wooden tables."

Madame de N——laughed somewhat scornfully at the sapient speech. Such "*monstra horrenda*" as intellectual and literary females will occasionally perpetrate the enormity of deriding the dicta of the "lords of the creation" when they compromise their supremacy, as they occasionally do, by displaying a deficiency of logic and an overplus of arrogance; which, *par parenthèse*, may be the very reason why literary and intellectual females have been looked upon with such alarm and repugnance by their male rivals, from the days of Juvenal

to our own.

To return, however, to my theme. "You would singularly oblige me," continued Madame de N——, "if you can inform me what the laws of nature are; but as I have laboured under the conviction hitherto, that all that science has been able to ascertain on that extensive subject, is, as yet, of the most meagre and limited description, I am compelled to conclude that your reason for refusing to investigate the phenomena of intelligently-answering and self-moving articles of furniture is miserably illogical, and altogether irrelevant; and as for the absurdity of the purpose in view, I confess, that until I have cause to believe that Providence has taken you a little more into His confidence than at present, I can scarcely admit that you are a competent judge as to His ulterior aims."

"As for my opinion on the matter," said a learned and clever geologist who happened to be one of the party, "I look upon it as unworthy of consideration, because, evidently, as Professor Faraday and other men of noted abilities justly affirm, science cannot grapple with it."

It was my turn to interpose: "Excuse me," I said, "if, as I understand by the term grappling, you mean that science can neither explain the phenomena, nor subject it to chemical or analytical tests, nor trace it to its origin, etc., etc., it strikes me that such is precisely the position of science with respect to all the higher facts of physical and psychological phenomena. The province and attributes of science appear to me, hitherto, to have been, *nolens volens*, confined to ascertaining and affirming the positive existence of such facts, to observe their operation, and thence to deduce the laws and effects that are necessarily derived from them. Were it necessary for science to grapple with extraordinary phenomena in order to admit their existence, then I am afraid science would be obliged to deny the possibility of the planets being suspended in space, life and death, ultimate atoms, the existence of the soul, electricity, magnetism, and a host of other marvels of the same elevated class; for I am not aware that science has ever been able to explain to us the origin and nature of gravitation, or to do more than to verify its existence, and hence to observe its laws, and give it a name. Neither do I believe that the scalpel of the anatomist has yet discovered the principle of life, nor the seat of the soul; that the chemist has ever been able to analyse and to reveal the nature and origin of electricity and magnetism, or the essence, and even extension, of ultimate atoms, any more than the physiologist has yet been able to define the limits and the distinction between vegetable and animal life. I might prolong *ad infinitum* the list of existing phenomena with which science altogether fails to grapple, but which, nevertheless, it is constrained to admit, were not the above quite sufficient to demonstrate that in asserting the pretension that nothing should be accepted by intelligent minds except what it can analyse, dissect, and explain, science completely overlooks the limits of its faculties, and oversteps the province wherein they have been hitherto permitted to range. In a word, science places itself in a false position altogether, in starting from *a priori* arguments and surmises, to lay down theories and laws unsupported by facts and undemonstrable by logic, science returns to the fallacious and delusive system which was formerly the fertile source of so much obstinate error,—the system which Bacon's luminous intellect overthrew; and in basing on such ill-grounded and deceptive premises the negation of facts which have neither been seriously investigated nor logically or mathematically disproved, science retrogrades to the ignorance, folly, and presumption of the dark ages from which Bacon rescued it. As for the designs of the Omnipotent in the matter, I agree with Madame de N——, that it would be decidedly more philosophical, and considerably more prudent, to wait till it pleases Him to reveal, or till we are better able to fathom them, before we presume, with our finite knowledge and shallow wits, to question their wisdom, and to scoff at their ways. We should, at least, be certain then to be on the safe side."

"Let us leave academicians and professors to hug themselves in their self-conceit, and to pay its penalty again and again, as they have so often done before," said Madame de N—— "For my part, I have always endeavoured to follow the dictates of common sense, to ascertain and to conform to the principles of sound logic, and to investigate all things that lie within my reach, by the testimony of my own senses, and the light of my own brains. *Par conséquent*, as I have hitherto found this system particularly advantageous, I shall certainly not derogate from it in a question which, if there be anything in it at all, as from the mass of honourable and intelligent testimony in its favour, we have good reason to believe there must be, is decidedly more curious and interesting than any of the scientific and literary matters to which I have thought it worth while to devote a large proportion of my life."

Madame de N—— was one of those tenacious individuals who never lose sight of an aim when once they have decided that it is worthy of attainment, and who, in small no less than in great matters, adhere pertinaciously to any resolution which they have once maturely determined to carry out.

Six weeks had passed over since the preceding conversation. The sun of June was beginning to make the Riva dei Schiavoni rather hotter than was agreeable, even to such determined lovers of Venice as my friend and myself. Even the grand halls of Daniel's *piano nobile*, for they can hardly be termed rooms, according to the modern acceptance of the term, already felt oppressive to my friends. As for me, I was nearly roasted out of my humbler domicile a few yards lower down on the quay. I was meditating, therefore, to take refuge in some quiet

nook of the Padovano for the summer months, and revolving in my mind the expediency of seeking inspiration beneath the shelter of Petrarch's shade at Argua, or thereabouts, when my contemplated projects were put to flight by an unexpected proposal.

We were gliding luxuriously beneath the dark arch of the Rialto, *en tête à tête*, one lovely moonlight night, in Madame de N——'s gondola, when she suddenly startled me by the information that they had just taken a villa at Bellagio, on the lake of Como, for the summer months, and intended starting for Milan in three or four days.

I was beginning to express my sincere regret at the impending separation from one whose friendship and intellectual converse I so thoroughly appreciated, when she interrupted me.

"No; that forms no part of my anticipations. The fact is, I reckon on your accompanying us. The villa is large enough for ten; your society will be a great addition to our narrow circle. I know there are no particular reasons why you should give the preference to solitude and Petrarch; and, to say the truth, I want you absolutely, for I am determined to come at the bottom of these spiritual wonders, and I have arranged the whole plan admirably. Such matters cannot be investigated lightly or hastily. To obtain any satisfactory and conclusive evidence, either for or against questions so recondite and so contested, one must devote to them seriousness, leisure, and perseverance. I dare say you thought I had dismissed the whole from my thoughts as too dubious, mysterious, or troublesome to investigate. But that is not my nature. I think that whatever is worth knowing is worth studying, and I have been reflecting how to do it best. We might have easily got up a few *séances* with our friends here, but they would not have answered my purpose. We should have been *distrain*, disturbed, confused, and annoyed. Whether the experiments succeeded or not, they would have proved little or nothing either way. With spectators and co-operators dropping in and out,—frivolous, indifferent, or scoffing,—interrupting our trials, distracting our thoughts, and Massing our minds by their superficial observations, their baseless conjectures, and their puerile ridicule, they would have taken from our powers of concentration and volition, consequently from the magnetic force which, if Spiritualism be true at all, is, doubtless, one of the chief agents employed. Hence, had the trials failed, not having been made under the necessary conditions of success, the *fiasco* would prove nothing. On the other hand, if we succeeded, the same endless *pro* and *con* of reciprocal accusation and suspicion would likewise render them futile. I do not want to be wasting any time contending with the eternal 'You pushed it—No, I did not—Then Mr. So-and-so did—No, I did not—You did—Your fingers pressed it down—You jerked it—You lifted it up,' which, either spoken or thought, forms the *résumé* of all such experiments when essayed in the ordinary giddy way, and among miscellaneous groups. *Au bout du compie*, one remains no wiser after such discussions than before; and the knowledge one seeks, subject as it is to all sorts of questions and misgivings, remains in abeyance. If, as it appears, it is difficult or impossible to make these experiments alone, then, at least, one should select co-operators on whom one can absolutely depend, both as to seriousness, conscientiousness, integrity, and sense, and consecrate to them both the time and the grave and uninterrupted attention they exact. Such being my view of the case, it is this which I now propose to do: I have invited M. de M——also to form one of our party at Como. You know him; he is grave, earnest, sensible, thoroughly conscientious, and a perfect gentleman. My husband is perhaps the most worldly of the party; but he is intelligent, has a great deal too much sense and *savoir vivre* to indulge in vulgar and silly hoaxing on any subject, much less on serious and interesting questions; and he has quite enough curiosity to elucidate a matter which he finds I do not look upon as either puerile or childish, to summon the requisite patience to assist in the experiments. We shall, therefore, be four intelligent and earnest persons, who can fully depend upon each other; and we shall have four quiet months before us to devote, in retirement and leisure, to the trial. It will be, to say the least, a small loss to give our evenings to this in-quiry, instead of playing whist by way of an intellectual recreation, as we are in the habit of doing; and, at the expiration of the summer, we shall, at all events, know *à quoi nous en tenir* on the subject. What say you

"That the plan is excellent and judicious, but that there is one drawback which you have overlooked. You forget that unluckily I am not a medium. It is in vain that I have essayed. I have seen plates, glasses, all sorts of articles waltz under the fingers of my friends, but nothing would ever perform the smallest gyration under mine."

"It is a pity, no doubt, but never mind. The question stands thus: either these things are facts, or they are not. If the first, it is clear that such marvels can only take place by the permission and ordination of Providence, hence, for a wise and definite purpose. That purpose, to me at least, it is evident, must be the intention of proving to intelligent and sceptical minds that the spiritual world is no myth, and that it is in our power to realize the fact, and to communicate with its denizens, even in this corporeal condition. Starting from this reasonable hypothesis, we have fair grounds to conclude that God has decided that the age is mature for this greatest of all revelations to be divulged to mankind at large. Under these circumstances, it may be justly anticipated that to all those who seek information on the subject, not with the preconceived determination of

scoffing, and deterring others from personal investigation, but with the serious purpose of ascertaining its truth or falsehood, for their own guidance and the benefit of others; and who follow up that end with earnestness, sincerity, and perseverance, the light will be vouchsafed. Consequently, I am fully persuaded that if there is really anything in it, our four months' evenings will not be wasted on it in vain, however little medium power we may be gifted with. Moreover, if we find that we are too few, I shall take care to enlist two or three other persons subsequently, on whom we can depend.'

"*Soit*. I bow to your judgment. Logically speaking, no doubt your conclusions are correct."

Neither was I loath to be persuaded; for the doubt that I had perhaps cast aside an opening to a branch of knowledge more extensive and singular than I could suspect or conceive, had always hankered unpleasantly in the depths of my mind. What, if I were mistaken after all ! if I had been precipitous in my judgment, too presumptuous in my condemnation ! That there was positively *something* in it I, at least, knew. Others might fancy that I laboured under a deception or a delusion; but personally, *I* was certain that there had been no preparation, no trickery, no illusion in what I had seen. What then, if I had seen no more? Was not *one* indubitable fact as good as a thousand? The unknown agency which could produce that one impossibility might evidently carry its powers much farther still. So argued reason in the very teeth and in absolute defiance of all that scepticism could bring forward on the other side.

"Well, at least, there will be one point gained, if nothing else. *J'en aurai le cœur net*, at least. I shall not think it time lost if I succeed in silencing these captious cavillers within, for once and for ever,"

We started for Como the following week. We were no sooner installed in our villa, on the shores of the ever-lovely lake, than we inaugurated our *séances*.

Fortunately, our conjuring and necromantic appliances required neither time nor preparation. We sat down in the most prosaic fashion after dinner, at about seven o'clock, to a small *guéridon*, upon which we simply laid our hands, without forming any chain. It was a circular rosewood table, with an ornamental border, underneath it was of dentillated form, the teeth, or points, being turned downwards, and placed at regular intervals of three or four inches. A watch was laid beside us. A necessary precaution, for it is so wearisome to sit for any length of time concentrating one's mind upon an invocation in the effects of which neophytes can have no serious belief, that minutes are apt to appear hours. For one whole hour we persevered according to our resolve, managing to be tolerably silent during the time, and conscientiously refusing to give ourselves the benefit of a reprieve till the full sixty minutes had elapsed. The table gave no sign of animation whatever. Our first essay had turned out a decided failure.

"*Ma foi!* one thing is certain, at all events, that spiritual experiments are anything but entertaining!" said M. de N——.

"Did you find it particularly entertaining to learn the Italian verbs by heart, or to study the Rule of Three? For my part," continued Madame de N——, as we rose up from the obstinate *guéridon*, "I confess to having found it dreadfully dull work to study the rudiments of Latin and Greek, and even to draw from *la bosse*, but I am rather glad to have had the courage to brave the drudgery, now that I can read Homer and Sophocles, Virgil and Juvenal in the original, and that I can paint something better than eyes and noses. *Ergo*, I do not expect to obtain spiritual knowledge on easier terms than earthly science, and I shall esteem it cheaply purchased at any price, if I attain it."

To be brief, for four successive nights we repeated the trial without any better success; not the slightest symptoms betrayed any inclination of the table to respond to our aspirations or to our magnetising powers. At heart I despaired, and had already decided, according to the bent of my natural scepticism, that our experiments would assuredly end in a complete *fiasco*.

Not so, however, Madame de N——; her resolute mind, wholly unbiassed either way, was not to be thus easily turned aside from its well-meditated designs. "If we were to give it up now," she said, as on the fourth night I hinted something about the fruit-lessness of pursuing the matter without a medium, or some better prospect of success, "we should be exactly where we were before. The trial would be inconclusive. Spiritualists might fairly affirm that we are wholly incompetent to pronounce upon it, and we ourselves should be conscious that we had no just grounds to deny what we had so imperfectly and hastily essayed. I have resolved to give it an hour and a half every evening for ten nights. If we do not succeed by that time I shall then successively augment the number by the addition of two or three at a time, till we are twelve, and with those persons, whom I shall take care to select judiciously, and to keep in due order, as one always can with a fair proportion of dignity, tact, authority, and brains, I shall continue our experiments every second night, an hour and a half at a time, for two months. Then, and not till then, shall I consider that we have given Spiritualism a tolerably fair trial."

As she continued, I looked at the watch; a minute had elapsed beyond the hour.

"Let us give it an additional quarter to-night," said Madame de N——. Two or three minutes passed in silence. A slight creaking noise caught my ear. I observed upon it. M. de M—— and my friend had heard it too,

but it was so extremely faint as to have escaped M. de N——. Once, twice it was repeated, the second time so audibly that we all heard it.

"*Parole d'honneur*" exclaimed M. de N——. It strikes me that we are all making ourselves supremely ridiculous. Here we are, four sensible, grown-up, educated people, sitting for an hour, like four idiots, round an inanimate piece of wood, waiting for it to do what we know to be impossible, and hearkening for a crack or a creak, a most common-place occurrence, you must admit, in the idiosyncrasy of wood, as if the ominous sound were equivalent to the note of Astolfo's magic horn, to Armida's wand, or the trumpet of the destroying angel."

"Pardon me," returned his wife, "if we *knew* it to be impossible, there might be some point in your observation; but it is because we are in doubt on the subject that we are putting it to the proof. We are credibly informed, on excellent authority, that wood does move, and display volition and intelligence under certain circumstances. We *do* know that it does not possess these soul ingredients ill itself; consequently the inference is obvious, that if the fact be true, an invisible intelligence must be the originator of this volition and intelligence, since no cause can be inferior to the effect it produces.

"There can be no question more deeply interesting to the human soul than that of the possibility of communicating with incorporeal or spiritual beings; hence it is not quite so foolish as you opine to give one's self even a considerable amount of trouble to ascertain if articles of furniture ever do commit the incongruity of moving, apparently of their own accord."

"Hush!" interrupted M. de N——, "there it is again," as the creaking noise was repeated more loudly.

"I feel a strange vibration under my fingers," said de M——.

"They are asleep," answered M. de N——.

"Silence, all! it oscillates. I feel it distinctly, although the motion is so very slight as to be almost imperceptible. It is as if something were moving in the surface of the wood," said his wife.

"Bah! it is nothing but the pulsations in your fingers," retorted her incredulous *caro sposo*.

"I tell you it does oscillate; I am scrutinising all my sensations closely," said Madame de N——.

"I feel it, too," said M. de M——.

"So do I."

"You are all dreaming. I feel nothing. Ah, *sac à papier!*" cried M. de N——, who, like all Russians of rank, was thoroughly *Parisién*, "it *did* move that time, and no mistake."

The table had creaked and given a slight jerk to the right.

"You pushed it, M——."

"I most assuredly did not. We are all under a pledge to behave sensibly and honourably, and I am neither a child nor a trickster," returned M. de M——, angrily.

"I thought it was understood that our quiet and rational circle was to be free at least from this unmeaning and silly recrimination and suspicion," said Madame de N—— to her husband. "If it *does* move we shall no doubt obtain more satisfactory proof of it than little jerks and imperceptible oscillations. Till then let there be a truce to childish nonsense, which is unworthy of us all, no less than of the purpose we have in view."

As she spoke, the table began to move perceptibly, but apparently with great difficulty, from right to left, with that faint creaking, straining, jerking sound which no one can forget or mistake when they have once heard it. Twenty minutes elapsed in these evolutions. At last it moved slowly round in a circle, acquiring force rapidly. When its gyrations were decided, and appeared to suffer less obstruction, I, being the only person present who knew anything of the subject, took the speaking part upon myself, and addressed it.

"Cease to turn round."

It stopped suddenly.

"Can you answer my questions by means of the alphabet? If so, lift up your foot and give one rap on the floor for yes."

Up tilted the table, with a force and suddenness which took us all by surprise, and struck one stroke.

"Are you a spirit? If so, one knock."

It was given.

"Will you tell us your name? One rap for yes, two for no. Who you are? your history, if you are desirous to communicate with us?"

To these questions the affirmative was given.

I then commenced with the alphabet. The name spelt out was Mira.

"We do not know you."

A negative.

"Who are you?"

"A priestess of Thebes," was rapped out by the alphabet again. We looked at each other in surprise.

"Well, I hardly imagine we were any of us thinking of that," said Madame de N——. "Ask her how long since she lived."

"Will you tell?" One rap.

"Knock the number of years," I said. Two negative raps were returned.

"But you said you would tell us when you lived," I urged. Another affirmative.

"Perhaps it would be too slow to rap out the years," suggested the quick mind of Madame de N——. "Ask." Before I had time the table gave one affirmative rap.

"Ask her if she will answer by Olympiads; that will be quick," said Madame de N——. Instantly an affirmative was returned.

I put the question, and a number of raps were given, which placed the date at an Olympiad corresponding with the reign of Ptolemy Soter.

To make a long story short, an interminable list of questions was made and answered, giving us various particulars of the history of the *soi-disant* priestess: some of them amusing, and all singular. We did not find the time hang quite so heavy on our hands then, for not one of us thought of the waning hour till all of a sudden the *carcel* lamp gave one expiring flash, and left us in total darkness.

"Ah, *Sacriste!*" cried M. de N——, forgetting the proprieties in his sudden surprise; "that is pleasant, certainly."

"No matter," said his wife, quietly; "there are the matches and a *bougeoir* on the piano. Just go for them."

"I shall never find my way there in the dark, without upsetting something, I am such an awkward fellow; you go."

Madame de N——and I both burst out laughing. "I will go," said I, standing up. "No necessity," said M. de N——; "I have matches in my pocket."

"Ah, *sac á papier!* so have I; I quite forgot it in my confusion," exclaimed M. de N——, as the light being struck, he recovered his equanimity.

"It appears," said his wife, laughing again, "that the *esprit fort* of the party, *par excellence*, is the one who is most afraid of ghosts."

"I afraid!" cried M. de N——, indignantly; "*pour qui me prenez-vous*. You don't suppose that I believe for a moment that a priestess of Thebes has condescended to entertain herself and us by flying about within the four walls of your saloon for the last two or three hours."

"Far be it from me to surmise anything as to your subjective impressions on the point," returned his wife; "only, I beg to observe that, objectively, you look unusually pale, *mon cher*. But what hour is it?"

It was past four o'clock. We stood up in amaze. So absorbed had we been in astonishment and interest in the unexpected results of our experiment, that we had sat round the table, unconscious of the lapse of time, for no less than eight hours.

The next evening, as we took our usual row on the lake, the question was of course discussed.

"I am just as sceptical as ever!" said M. de N——.

"Excuse me; you should say that the sunlight has restored your scepticism to its original vigour," objected his wife. "But admitting that you are, how then do you account for the facts you witnessed?"

"I am not insinuating that any of the party purposely played tricks, pledged as we all are, on our honour, to abstain from any such folly, which, *du reste*, is only worthy of school-boys, grownup children, or vulgar fools; that suspicion of course is out of the question. But I make no doubt that, as the *savants* say, we all impress a certain motion on the table involuntarily by leaving our hands upon it so long."

"That, at all events, would be utterly inadequate to account for the rational and curious answers we received; for the alternations of one rap and two, as yes or no, no less than for the reckoning up of numbers, when numbers are asked, and the spelling out of long, intelligible phrases. Besides, how came it, if it is our volition and muscles which involuntarily move it, that for three evenings the table remained perfectly insensible to them? If the action were ours, it must be exercised as much at one time as another. But *à quoi bon* to argue these points at this early stage of our proceedings, *nous verrons*, later, when we are wiser, we may reason with more foundation."

This evening we sat down to our *guéridon* with feelings very different from the sort of listless resignation which M. de N——and I had betrayed in our countenances, if not in words, on the preceding night.

In something more than three quarters of an hour, the table moved and replied. The spirit who answered, however, absolutely refused to give his name, on the plea that as we did not know it, it could not interest us; and that, moreover, he had already borne several names,—a startling piece of information, for which we were quite unprepared. Various other questions were put, and replied to, none of a very high order; for, according to Madame de N——'s programme, we were reserving our inquiries on matters of importance till the facts were more clearly and incontestably established, and till we ourselves were more *au courant* of the method, and more familiar with the spiritual world, if indeed we stood upon its threshold.

The third evening after our success, the seventh of our experiments, the table moved in little more than half an hour. It was in vain, however, that we endeavoured to enter into a sensible conversation with the animating



power. By means of the alphabet, we extorted from it, after various negations, the answer that its name was Zulma, and that it was a native of Africa, but to no other question would it reply. In compensation the table danced, rocked to and fro, and knocked on the floor with a violence as yet unprecedented, and which could not have been caused by any one whose hands were on it without using an amount of pressure and propulsion which could not have escaped observation.

Seeing that we could get nothing rational out of it, I asked whether it would beat time to a tune I should hum. It stopped its fantastic evolutions to give one affirmative rap, and then beat accurate time to Schubert's Serenade, which I selected as being a difficult rhythm.

As it appeared more musically than conversationally inclined, I inquired whether it would go to the piano and play. It consented.

We stood up, pushed back our chairs, and laid the tips of our fingers very slightly on the table. Immediately it wheeled round, and gyrating on one of its legs, using each alternately as a pivot, it advanced to the piano. On arriving at it, it proved too low to reach the notes, and began knocking its edge with extreme violence against the projecting ledge beneath them, the piano being open. I wanted to seize the opportunity to obtain a certitude, and I insisted.

"The piano has notes that respond; I want to hear music," I said.

The *guéridon* swung back about a yard, pivoting on two of its legs. Not knowing what it was about to do, we all four watched its motions with the closest scrutiny. Determined to achieve conviction one way or the other, I never took my eyes off its legs, except to glance at the fingers of my companions, whose hands were all placed lightly on the top, and, at Madame de N——'s request, near the centre, so that no one could slip a thumb or a little finger under the edge unperceived. While we were thus watching it, it gave two or three uneasy jerks, and then one sudden spring *entirely off the floor*, lighting on the notes of the piano. Not a hand had touched it otherwise than on the top, and not a foot or knee had come within reach of it, facts of which I was positive, never having taken my eyes off it, in the full glare of the carcel lamp. But this was not all. Suddenly, using one of the teeth of its ornamented border, it dragged it down from the top to the bottom of the piano, sounding every single note from first to last as distinctly and perfectly as I could have done with a finger.

"Give us melody," I urged. Suddenly it pounced alternately on various notes in the treble, bass, and centre, sounding each with the same clear, distinct sonorousness as before. "Let us hear harmony," I asked again. Instantly five or six *perfect chords* of six or seven notes, *without one discordant tone* marring the harmony of a single chord, responded to my demand.

I shall not easily forget my feelings at that moment, nor the looks of my companions, to which I presume that my own formed an appropriate *pendant*.

De M—— was fairly aghast. The *esprit fort* was as white as a sheet, his hands trembling like an aspen leaf, while Madame de N——'s dark eyes had opened to twice their usual size, and her face became preternaturally pale.

The same sudden, irresistible conviction had burst upon all of us, that what we had seen and heard was an *absolute impossibility*, not to be accounted for by any other explanation save that of an invisible, intelligent agent. The table had sprung up upon the notes without any assistance whatever; of that we were all positive, for we had watched each other too narrowly to admit of a single motion having escaped the three pairs of Argus' eyes that must have instantly detected the operator. But there were impossibilities greater still. No one could have made the table sound every successive note, and alight clearly, loudly, and sonorously on the separate notes it had touched up and down, by pressing his fingers ever so intensely upon its surface. Lastly, to produce the perfect chords was in every way, and under every surmise, an absolute impossibility. The teeth of the table being placed at *regular* intervals of three or four inches, had one of us even taken it up bodily, and pressed it down by main force on the notes, instead of lightly touching it on the surface, the consequence must inevitably have been a crashing jumble of discordant sounds. It was beyond all question, in short, that harmonious chords could by no possibility have been produced by the table; consequently, the inference was no less incontestable, *i. e.*, that they must have been sounded by an invisible agency underneath it.

Another experiment was then tried. Madame de N—— took her guitar and held it on her lap, requesting the spirit to sound it. The table pivoted up to her, while we three were touching it so lightly on the top that we could see the light under each other's fingers.

The table then bent over, dug one of its teeth under the great silver string, and pulled it out forcibly with a loud twang, which rang through the room. This, though less extraordinary, since it might have been done by an individual lifting up the table in his arms, was no less impossible, under the circumstances, considering that we simply touched it on the top.

"This night's experiment is absolutely conclusive to me," said Madame de N——, in her decided, uncompromising way, as we sat down for rest at midnight, fairly exhausted by the evolutions of the table and our own emotions. "I am positive of two facts; first, that in what I have witnessed there was neither deceit nor

delusion of any sort whatever. Secondly, what is still more incontrovertible, that it *could not possibly* have been caused by any one present pressing down, jerking, or otherwise impelling the table. Hence, as I am entirely of opinion that a table is not, and never can be, a self-acting, still less, an intelligent agent; the only theory tenable to my mind is, that the marvels it has performed in our presence have been achieved by the volition and propulsion of an intelligent and invisible, consequently, an incorporeal agent. *Ergo*, as an incorporeal intelligence—call it what you please—is neither more or less than a spirit, I conclude irrevocably that spiritual force is the key of the enigma; and were all the *savants* and academics in Europe to endeavour to silence me, or to disprove the testimony of my senses, they would find it out of their power to prevent my asserting in their teeth, from this hour till the day of my death, that Spiritualism is *a fact*, and spiritual intercourse a possibility even in this world. You see," she concluded, turning to me with a smile, "the harmonious chords are the antigravitation leap to me."

I am not about to give a detailed account of all our subsequent *séances*. They were unremittingly pursued during our four months' sojourn at Bellagio, and the records that we kept of the sayings and doings of our spiritual visitants would fill a volume.

I can only narrate here a few of the more striking incidents, and sum up by a general *résumé* of the conclusions to which they led us. We soon discovered that the spirits were growing more familiar, and seemed to enjoy our society; for with every succeeding evening they made us wait their pleasure for a briefer interval, till ere long we liad but to place our hands on the table and to invoke them, when it immediately tilted up to inform us of their presence. It was evident that they expected our call at the usual hour, and were only awaiting it to answer.

This was very satisfactory at first, but we were not long before we began to aspire to higher things. As it may be supposed, we had innumerable questions to ask about the mysteries of the other world, life and death, spiritual pursuits, the higher spheres, and a host of unexplained phenomena which seem beyond the reach of science, unless spiritually illuminated. To the greater part of these we failed in obtaining any satisfactory answers. So long as we kept within the limits of ordinary topics the spirit who frequented our society, for it appeared to be always the same, was decidedly entertaining, and by no means deficient. He was amusing, *spirituel*, lively, and even given to jocularly. He was fond of having a jest at our expense, but he was certainly not malignant nor wickedly inclined.

Thus, for instance, he enjoyed frightening the *esprit fort* of the party, who could not bring himself to believe in spirits, but who, in more than one instance, betrayed the fact that he would just as soon not meet one in the dark. He would suddenly announce to us when we least expected it, that he was about to appear to us: a threat which made even me, who am not given to puerile terrors, feel rather nervous. On another occasion, M. de M——having been requested by a family in the neighbourhood who had heard of our proceedings, to call up the spirits for their benefit, he had coolly announced himself as the devil, to the infinite dismay of the party, who at heart believed that Satan was certainly at the bottom of the affair. He was irascible and impatient too, for he would scold us roundly, in words rapped out alphabetically, whenever we annoyed him by our discussions and disputes among ourselves, or by asking him questions he either would not or could not answer.

That he was not evil, however, we gathered from the fact that his counsels were never bad, and that he showed many traits of good feeling. Thus, on one occasion, he had declared that he would visit me alone in the night. My bedroom was in the furthest wing of the villa, overlooking the lake. I was particularly desirous of beholding a spirit, but never having experienced the effect of an apparition, I felt alarm at the thought that it might produce some dangerous shock upon the mental faculties. The idea had hardly entered my mind than he rapped out, "Do not fear. I shall not come." It was in vain, however, that we tried to obtain what we most wished to know. Various scraps of information we elicited, but none of a very high order, or of a satisfactory description, as we had no means of controlling the replies. Thus, on inquiring what was a comet, we were told that it "was a world in its expiring conflagration," an assertion I give for what it is worth, and of which the only value in my eyes was the evidence it afforded that the answer did not reflect our thoughts, inasmuch as both Madame de N——and I, who were alone at the table, held the converse and general opinion that they are worlds in embryo.

We were told that every one has a guardian angel, that the first way to progress in spiritual knowledge is to be good, and other common-places of the like nature, which somewhat aroused the spleen of Madame de N——and myself, as we both declared that we did not require spirits to communicate them. But whenever we sought to dive deeper, and "to soar higher, we were met by an evasion or a negation.

Once, the spirit replied, "I cannot tell; I must ask my masters."

I exclaimed, "What! are you a spirit, and yet ignorant of these things!"

"*Moi écolier*" (I a scholar), he replied in French, the language we habitually conversed in, as being familiar to us all.

*Apropos* of this curt answer and most of the others we received, I must here observe that we soon

discovered there was one striking distinction between spiritual and human communications; *i.e.*, the exceeding brevity of the former. Nothing could exceed the laconism they displayed on all occasions, for we never could exactly tell if one or more spirits were in the habit of coming.

Their object, it soon became evident, was that of making us comprehend their meaning with the least possible expenditure of time and words. A proceeding wherein, by the way, it strikes me that men, and still more, women, would do wisely to take a hint from the spirits. In the commencement they were tolerably sober and accurate; but by degrees, as they reckoned more and more on our confidence and intelligence, they grew daily more careless and audacious, till at last their orthography so far exceeded the limits of all poetical and spiritual license, that it would have made even a purist's hair stand on end. The first decided symptoms of these grammatical improprieties manifested themselves in the omission of all supererogatory letters. Thus *votes* was invariably called *vou*, *faire* spelled without the final *e*, every duplicate was left out, and indeed every syllable or letter meant that is not pronounced. Again, every conjunction, every word not indispensable to enable us to gather the sense of the phrase, was cut out no less unsparingly.

"This is certainly a curious language," I observed one evening, as in reply to what the spirit considered an impertinent interrogation, we received the graphic though ungrammatical reply, "*Vou stupid, moi pa dir.*"

"The spirits are quite right," replied Madame de N——. "Their object is clear. The alphabet is simply an intellectual telegraph; a means, not an end. Provided they can convey the sense to our minds, the mode is of no consequence. To adopt the most concise form is consistent with logic and common sense. What need to spend another half-hour in spelling out three or four additional words, and half a dozen superfluous letters, neither of which would add to the weight or luminousness of the idea they desire to transmit? Would it not be sheer waste of time?"

The spirit spontaneously gave an affirmative rap. "You see I have guessed right," said Madame de N——.

There was small cause for wonder if the spirits had grown impatient of our alphabetical system, for nothing could have been more wearisome. If it had been annoying from the outset, in the long run it became intolerable. Sometimes it took us half an hour to spell out a phrase of a few words, for among other drawbacks it was necessary to delay a few seconds upon each letter we called out, to ascertain clearly which was the one the rap was intended to designate. Mistakes, too, notwithstanding this precaution, were of frequent occurrence, in which case we had to recommence the word or the letter, occasionally two or three times.

It was in vain we endeavoured to abbreviate the process. We had numerous little tables made, of different sizes, to place on a larger table. I invented one to turn upon an axis, the letters being placed round the circumference, with a needle stretching from the centre to designate the letters. This, however, gave us more trouble than the alphabet, for the gyrations seldom stopped so short and accurately that the needle pointed exactly to the place intended.

The spirits, luckily, were more ingenious than we were. We had returned to the A B C again, and were methodically calling it out one evening, when the table tipped a number of times in succession with great rapidity. It was in vain we appealed to the spirit to be quiet, and to listen; every time it stopped for an instant, it was but to recommence the same *manège* more energetically than before. At last we were fairly nonplussed.

"What can it mean?" said I.

"I guess what it is," exclaimed Madame de N——, always of quick apprehension. "It finds our calling out the letters too slow, and it is rapping them out itself."

"Is that it?" I inquired. An affirmative was instantly returned. This, of course, hastened the operation; for, instead of waiting at each letter, they were rapped out as fast as we could repeat them, the raps stopping at the requisite letter.

But this was not all. The spirits were still dissatisfied at the tediousness and loss of time entailed by the spelling process, and soon they inaugurated, on their own account, a new system even more expeditious. Presently we found their answers becoming altogether unintelligible. We had previously commenced the system of writing down the letters rapped out, as in long sentences we had found it impossible to trust our memory to retain them accurately.

The first symptom of this new innovation presented itself in the form of a succession of consonants being given, of which it seemed impossible to make head or tail. We were trying the spirit in English, which, at our request, it had professed itself ready to speak.

A *u* had just been rapped out. The next letter given was an *R*. "This must be a mistake," said I; "I know of no English word that begins thus." A negative replied. "Then we are to go on?" "Yes."

We proceeded. The next letter given was a second *R*. "Are we right?" I asked. An affirmative. Thus we continued to spell out O N G.

"This is a new species of English; I think the spirit must be speaking Russian in your honour," said I to M. de N——.

"Is the phrase complete?" I asked. It was intended to be an answer to a question I had proposed. An

affirmative rap was given.

We examined the paper curiously.

"*Il se moque de nous*," said M. de N——, shrugging his shoulders.

"It is certainly sheer nonsense. What does *U R R O N G* mean?"

Madame de N——took it in her turn. "How dull you all

are!" she exclaimed suddenly; "cannot you see that it means, 'You are wrong'?"

"*C'est, ma foi! vrai!*" exclaimed M. de N——.

And so it was. After anticipating the American orthography, the spirits had forestalled Sir William Armstrong's strictures on the circumlocution of the English language, and had ingeniously struck out a phonetic system for themselves.

From that evening, wherever it was possible to do so, the sound of the letters was substituted for the correct spelling; a fact which, had any lingering doubt been possible, under the circumstances, in our minds, as to the spiritual authenticity of all the communications we received, must have set the question at rest in every sane and intelligent mind; for it was seldom now that we could form a guess as to the purport of the phrase rapped out till it was entirely written down, and constantly, even then, it had to be conned over and commented on by us all before the meaning was accurately defined, especially when the sentences were long.

"I begin to suspect," said I one evening, after we had been all puzzling in vain, for full ten minutes, over some hieroglyphics of the above description, more than usually enigmatical, "that I was rather severe on the German Professor. His omission of the second H in his name, and of the two letters of the participle past, appears to me a very venial sin now that I am familiarizing myself with spiritual orthography, and comprehend the motive."

"It looks very like teaching us a lesson that it is always unwise to be precipitate in our conclusions on matters we do not understand, I confess," replied Madame de N——.

So far our experience had certainly proved fruitful. It had enabled us to elucidate many moot points in the matter which could only be appreciated and understood by personal experiment. But in other respects it was far less satisfactory. We failed in obtaining answers on the questions that most interested us; we could produce no great or singular phenomena. We sought in vain to evoke the spirits with whom we most desired to communicate. To the first demand our spirits "pleaded ignorance. To the second, that a suitable medium was requisite. To the third, that they had no power to bring the spirits we wanted, and that they could only be induced to come of their own accord.

What was worse, was that we sought in vain to dismiss the spirit who had taken possession of our domicile. We invoked others; we ordered him peremptorily off: to all our objurgations he replied, with pertinacious indiscretion, that he liked our society too well to give it up so easily, and that if we sent him away we should repent it, for that he would let no others come in his place. We tried all sorts of experiments. We sat down two and two to different tables. At both we were answered, but the familiar spirit said that the new comers were friends of his; and, indeed, so it appeared, for they were evidently of his own calibre.

It was unquestionable that if our incorporeal visitors were not the black legs I had promised to defy, they were, to say the least, very mediocre authorities. But what was to be done? We had evidently brought around us a second-rate set, and it seemed as difficult to get rid of them in the spiritual as in the terrestrial world.

A few more striking incidents, nevertheless, varied, from time to time, the somewhat monotonous entertainment vouchsafed to us by our pertinacious persecutor. One evening, Madame de N——had gone to Como with M. de M——and after dinner her husband and I sat down to the *guéridon*. We had scarcely laid our hands upon it, when, as usual now, it tilted up. The preceding night our familiar spirit had chosen to take exception against my investigating turn, and had launched out in no measured terms against my various delinquencies towards him. I commenced, therefore, by asking him why he had been so severe upon me.

"*Pas moi*" was the answer given, minus the *s*. The conversation took place in French.

"You are not then the spirit who comes habitually?" I inquired.

"*Non de passage*" (on passage), replied the spirit in the usual laconic way.

Here was a chance; a new spirit, who had dropped in for a moment to take a peep at us, on his way, perhaps, to the moon or some other sphere. I seized the opportunity to question him on various points of which we had failed to obtain any solution. But the spirit was impatient, or had some pressing business on hand, for, after he had given me some curious replies, as I was proposing another question, he cut me short by rapping out decidedly, "*Je rn'en vais*" (I am going), interpreted by the hieroglyphics, *g, m, n, v*. If he were a stranger, he was clearly a disciple of the phonetic system, for he continued giving the sound of the letters, as pronounced in French, answering my inquiry why he was in such a hurry, and if he were fatigued. "Spirit (*esprit*) *san fatig*" "Why then do you want to go?" I persisted. "*De passage*," repeated the spirit with the same laconism, thus curtly giving us to understand that he was *en route*, and had no time to spare.

"One question more then before you go," I urged. "Is there any hope of evoking the spirits I aspire to call

down?" "*C diffidi*" (c'est difficile), answered the spirit.

"Difficult is not impossible," I persisted.

"*Rien n'est impossible à l'homme*" (nothing is impossible to man), was the startling reply. Here was glorious news indeed. I began to hope that we should succeed yet in making good our *entrée* to the *crème de la crème* of the spiritual world, according to my programme, notwithstanding our unpromising *début*.

Another time we had spent the day wandering about the beautiful grounds of the Villa Sermoneta, and Madame de N——, who was a great botanist, had discovered a rare wild flower in our promenade, and was, in the evening, anxiously endeavouring to class it.

Hence her husband and I had sat down alone to converse with the spirits, while she and M. de M—— were vainly poring over a large botanical work in search of the plant.

I was addressing a question to the spirit which it refused to answer, repeating several times "*A la table,*" while I interrupted it each time to reiterate my question.

"Let it speak; it has got something to say," interrupted Madame de N—— from the other end of the room.

I obeyed. "*A la table an complet*" rapped out the spirit, evidently displeased at being abandoned by two of the party.

"We will come directly," cried Madame de N——. "I wish you would ask the spirit," she added, laughing, "if it can tell me where to discover the plant, for we can neither find the index nor the genus, and I am afraid it is a hopeless research without spiritual aid."

The question was asked as a mere jest, for we had become quite familiar with our spiritual visitant, and were in the habit of treating him like a *ban enfant*, as, indeed, he appeared to be. Before I had time to put it, however, the spirit rapped out, "*Page huit, vol quatre.*"

The fourth volume was sought for. It was not on the table, and was found in the book-ease, and there at the eighth page, Madame de N—— discovered the missing index, and the name of the flower she sought.

We were all not a little amazed, for we had no very high opinion of the infallibility of our spiritual friend, and were altogether taken aback by his unexpected clairvoyance.

On the whole, however, to say the truth, our *séances* verged occasionally on the *ennuyeux*, between the spelling process, which we looked upon, especially Madame de N—— and I, as somewhat *infra dig.* for our scientific and literary brains, and the hieroglyphics, not omitting the contestations they engendered, and the perpetually recurring disputes among ourselves. For perfection being a desideratum not yet discovered in this sublunary sphere, even spiritualists are not always distinguished by concord. Indeed, in that respect, it cannot be denied that they are very nearly as bad as doctors. It would have been in the highest degree edifying to an impartial and disinterested auditor to have listened to our discussions. First and foremost, there being four volitions and four intelligences to satisfy, and only one unfortunate wooden table to respond, it was next to impossible ever to agree upon the interrogations we were desirous of putting to it. Each came to the *séance* armed with a batch of profound queries, the greater part of which one or other of the party pooh-poohed.

Another source of dissension was, that everyone wanted to be served first, well knowing that if not, he ran a considerable chance of not being served at all, like the unfortunate last arrival at a *table d'hôte*. Exterior courtesy was, it is true, not forgotten in our well-bred circle; but nevertheless those who were set aside, and there were always three of us in that condition, *au fond*, looked upon themselves as the victims of social *convénances*, and consequently gave way, as far as *savoir vivre* would permit, to the irascibility common to those who believe that they are decidedly ill-used individuals.

Add to this that every one laboured under the intimate conviction that the spirit came specially and mainly for them, and *par conséquent*, that, to a great extent, he was their property. Hence, we all thought that we were not alone victimised, but defrauded. In short, there was good cause to ask *où la vanité humaine va se nicher*; and I could not help thinking sometimes that we must have afforded rather an amusing comedy to our spiritual friends, considering too that they had the advantage over us of comparing the *ce qu'on dit, et ce qu'on pense*. To say the truth, I never could have realized the fact how next to impossible it is to get even two or three individuals to be of one mind, but for that four months' experience; Charles the Fifth's refractory clocks were a bagatelle to our anarchical dispositions. Neither were the spirits behindhand in the race. To vindicate apparently their quality of independent intelligences, they not unfrequently threw us some exciting little apple of discord which gave additional zest to the mild internecine warfare that prevailed among us, under cover of the most perfect *verniss de société*, although, occasionally, somewhat transparent. Now they would scold one person, or reprobate another, or lay the blame of their own shortcomings on the delinquencies of a third; reproaches always of a venial description, it must be admitted in their defence, but which, nevertheless, drew down the suppressed wrath of the remainder of the party on the luckless culprit.

They were somewhat unreasonable themselves too, for every now and then they would keep us for a couple of hours rapping out phrases which could only be classed with the far-famed "unknown tongues" of Irvingite celebrity. So absolutely unknown, indeed, that among the polyglot accomplishments of our *quatuor*, which,

being all four of different nationalities, and each of us pretty widely acquainted with foreign languages, happened to be rather extensive, no one succeeded in deciphering them. Even Madame de N——'s ingenious brains were baffled in the attempt, for on no principle, phonetic or otherwise, could even she discover their interpretation. These latter, however, were eccentricities fortunately of rare occurrence, or I am afraid that our patience would have been fairly *poussé à bout*.

Now and then, too, the spirit, or spirits, would reprove the whole party, by way, it appeared, of making no jealousies. Thus, on one occasion it rapped out spontaneously, before we had put any question, "Be more united, more harmonious among yourselves, more earnest, more pure in your aspirations, less disputatious, less antagonistic, less self-sufficient, more ambitious of spiritual than of temporal knowledge, more holy in your hearts, pray to God with loftier aims and more elevated desires, and you may yet attain the knowledge you seek, and communicate with those you invoke."

This was excellent advice, no doubt, but the difficulty was how to put it in practice. And I greatly fear that we felt it to be so difficult that we none of us made any very serious efforts to realize the spiritual programme.

Certain it is that our contentions were very slightly modified, and that our spiritual circle remained as mediocre as ever.

What seemed, moreover, particularly mortifying was, that symptoms were occasionally afforded us that some spiritual sage had dropped in, given us a look, thrown us a word of advice, or of higher knowledge, and then taken his leave with as little ceremony as he had come; apparently so little attracted by our company that he never returned. Such was the spirit *en route*, who had spoken to me. Hence, too, the admonition above quoted, and a few scattered fragments of the same description every now and then vouchsafed to us, which, it was evident, could not proceed from the same source as our daily communications.

Two or three incidents of a more peculiar description varied likewise the monotony of our habitual *conversazioni*. One evening, the *guéridon*, which now moved as easily under the hands of any two of the party as of the whole four, continued answering my questions when I remained alone at it, as the remainder had stood up to go to tea; and when I too followed them, it continued, to our great surprise, tipping and rapping out letters for a few seconds *wholly untouched*, and when no one was near it.

The day after, M. de M—— came down in great triumph, with a scrap of paper which, he informed us, had been written by his hand, impelled by the volition of the spirits. He had, he said, magnetized a pencil, then taken it in his hand, which had moved after some time, and written, independently of any volition or motion of his own, "*Il n'est pas encore temps d'écrire.*"

Subsequently, a still more singular fact occurred to myself. The spirit had repeated his threat three or four days previously of paying me a visit in my own room at night. I had paid no attention whatever to the promise, for he had so often reiterated it before, both to myself and the rest, that we no longer regarded it as anything more than a playful menace with which he was somewhat childishly fond of exciting our curiosity, or trying our nerves. The night, moreover, when he had promised to come had passed without any token, and I had dismissed the idea altogether from my mind.

I had gone to bed with a candle on the table beside me, which, having the bad habit of reading in bed, I had left lighted, having fallen asleep over my book. I awoke suddenly with a strong impression on my mind that I felt something lying on my shoulder. For a moment I fancied that my arm was asleep, but I was lying on the other side, so that could not be the case. Then I reflected and thought that it could only be a nightmare. All the time I was meditating these explanations I was wide awake, the candle being still burning, and I myself perfectly calm; when suddenly it struck me that I still continued to perceive the same weight resting on my shoulder. I lay perfectly still, scrutinizing my waking sensations. There was no mistake; I distinctly perceived that the pressure which I had felt, in what I had already decided to be a dream, was still there, unquestionably resting on my shoulder. For the nonce, I confess, that as the conviction forced itself upon me that the nameless something was still there, although I was positively awake, and my senses perfectly lucid, my heart, which up to that moment had been perfectly still, began to throb with a rapidity and violence which was anything but agreeable. Then, and not till then, the thing glided softly off my shoulder down to my elbow, where I distinctly felt it pass off.

Could it be that the spirit had at last kept his word, and paid me his long-threatened visit? I hesitated to believe it, but that something, whatever it was, had been resting on my shoulder, my senses incontestably assured me.

Somewhat afraid of being laughed at, or suspected of an hallucination, I kept my own counsel, and made no allusion to my nocturnal visitant, till, on the following evening, my friends being at the table, where I had not yet joined them, I asked with apparent indifference why he had not kept his word of paying me a visit.

"I did," replied the spirit, under the hands of Madame de N—— and her husband. "*I visited you last night in bed.*"

To say the least, here was something more than coincidence. Two nights after, the *esprit fort* was favoured

with a similar distinction, which, even by his own account of it, he did not appear to have relished.

We were not behindhand, meanwhile, in endeavouring to progress, although the results did not correspond to our efforts. We sent to Paris for the celebrated works published by the spiritual societies which have long been exercising their *propaganda* there—to some purpose, it would seem, for spiritualists are now reckoned by thousands throughout France, and already number among their ranks many of the most distinguished names in literature and art.

I likewise wrote to the celebrated Judge Edmonds, in New York, and in due time received from him, with his usual disinterested courtesy and supreme philanthropy, replies of the most interesting nature, with some of his works upon the subject, wherein, what struck me far more even than the wonders he narrated, were the luminous and lucid reasoning faculties, and the transcendent intellectual power of the mind that bore witness to them.

The "*Livre des Mediums*" and the "*Livre des Esprits*," the first being the manual of neophytes, and the second the *résumé* of the doctrine taught by the spirits, both edited by Alan Kardec, the director of the "*Revue Spirite*" of Paris, were the most important of the French books we received, among which was likewise a famous work of the well-known Marquis de Mirville.

By the manual we learned that our *guéridon* was a telegraph of the most primitive description, and that our more advanced *confrères* had altogether discarded such a clumsy and unsatisfactory contrivance; besides a vast deal more of practical details, and information upon the subject. In the doctrine, curious and striking as it was, I should have felt a much deeper interest had not our experience of spiritual lucidity and voraciousness been so very unsatisfactory.

As for the Marquis de Mirville's work, it amused us all in the highest degree. The author, talented, and erudite, but an ultramontanist *enragé*, having gone deep into Spiritualism on his own account, and having verified the phenomena by incontestable evidence, deeply imbued with Romanist dogmas, prejudices, and narrow-mindedness, and altogether under the thumb of his confessor, brings to bear upon the subject a vast mass of extremely interesting information and evidence, traditionary, historical, and contemporaneous, all tending to prove, by the strongest testimony, and the most circumstantial demonstration, the existence of spiritual intercourse, uninterruptedly, through every age up to the present day; he finally sums up the total by assuring his readers that the whole is diabolical, and that the arch-fiend is at the bottom of every spiritual phenomenon.

"I must say," observed Madame de N——, as we were rowing one morning towards the Villa Sommariva late in October, that loveliest of all months in the year in Italy, "that if Satan is the originator of all these spiritual wonders, he is a very *pauvre diable* after all. If he has really turned saint in his old age, and taken to preaching holiness, pure aspirations, lofty morality, heavenly aims, and Christian fraternity, I am afraid that his house, thus divided against itself, has a very small chance of standing."

We disembarked at the Villa, and after admiring for the twentieth time the exquisite canovas and other precious works of art which decorate the rooms of the Casino, and having culled, *con licenza*, a few of the rare flowers in which my friend took especial delight, we wandered out into the restricted but romantic grounds, and promenaded up and down on the terrace which overlooks the lake, and commands such an extensive view of its lovely scenery.

"Our four months *villeggiatura* is drawing to a close," she ex-claimed, after a pause, glancing at the fallen leaves and reddening hues of the rich foliage around.

"It is indeed; alas ! that hours so pleasant should ever terminate, or that companionship so genial should ever be severed ! but *ainsiva le monde*; time speeds on, heedless of our desires either to hasten or to stay his flight, and man must resign himself to what *Dieu dispose*."

"One consideration ought to console us at all events, that it has not been four months thrown away."

"Certainly not, in one respect. I never look upon time as wasted if it is spent either usefully, instructively, or agreeably; failing to achieve at least one of my three *sine quâ nons*, I do. If, however, you are alluding to our spiritual investigations, I confess that I do not view them with quite as much complacency."

"*Pourquoi pas?*"

"They have fallen short of my expectations. After our first success, I was sanguine of our arriving at less trivial and fruitless results. You must admit that they are unsatisfactory."

"That remains to be seen."

"*Comment done*, are you satisfied?"

"Certainly. Far more than I had hoped; for, *entre nous*, I had no belief in our success. What you narrated to us seemed to me so impossible that I felt convinced some trick, some delusion must have misled your clear senses. Nevertheless, I was determined to discover the truth, for the *doubt* alone *my* mind could not endure without elucidation. I am amply rewarded. To have seen what we have seen, heard what we have heard, and ascertained, beyond all doubt, what we have ascertained, is worth, in my eyes, all the acquirements I have

achieved, and far surpasses the science I ever hoped to attain."

"No doubt it is strange and marvellous to have ascertained that it *is* possible for man to commune with the spiritual world, and to have established the fact on evidence which, to ourselves, at least, is altogether unquestionable; but *cui bono*? If all that we have gained by it is to have spent about one hundred and twenty evenings as unprofitably as we have done in spelling out broken phrases, platitudes, and common-places, which we might have enjoyed with a much less sacrifice of time and trouble, in the edifying, though somewhat hackneyed, eloquence of the Bible Society, and in frequenting the society of individuals who certainly had no better claim to our indulgence than the accident of being somewhat less heavily weighted for the time being."

"If that were all indeed, you would be justifiable in quarrelling with the spirits; but I altogether deny your postulate. Is it nothing to have obtained a mathematical certitude on that great *vexata questio*, the immortality of the soul, and the positive existence of incorporeal entities? To me, at least, it is everything. Thence alone does logic unavoidably deduce all that I have most intensely longed to know, and most supremely aspired to realize. What if the spirits we have been able to attract are puerile or insignificant, if *they* exist incorporeally, who shall contest that space must be peopled with beings infinitely purer, loftier, more sublime. If this be true, does not the indefinite perfectibility of the human soul ensue as the inevitable sequence; for what logical mind can doubt that to have attained that glorious pre-eminence, they must have earned it by successive phases of trial and progressive development? Do not all the laws of analogy, the clearest of all logical and philosophical guides, point to the providential ordination that no intellectual or spiritual pre-eminence can be attained otherwise than by self-sacrifice and self-exertion? or can any other law be compatible with Divine justice, wisdom, and benevolence? Hence, are we not fully justified in concluding that it depends upon ourselves to attain the highest eminence of spiritual supremacy and beatitude?"

"Admitting all this, what is there novel in the information? Has not every preacher that ever held forth from the pulpit, and almost every philosopher of repute, repeated the same *lieux communs* to satiety? What then have we gained by spiritual intercourse, if this is all that we learn by it? Are there not hundreds and thousands of those who call themselves good Christians in the world who believe as much as this?"

"The very word in common use, which you have just employed, is the answer to your interrogation. Pray what is the genuine interpretation of the word belief? What expression do you make use of when anything is demonstrated beyond all question to your mind? Do you say you believe it? As Christians honestly say they *believe* in God, in the Divinity of Christ, in immortality, etc., do you say of the friend or lover, of whose heart you are as sure as of your own, that you *believe* they love you? Do you not say unhesitatingly that you are certain, you are convinced of it? Would you say that you believe you see the sun in the heavens? What else, in a word, does belief mean other than an aspiration and a trust, qualified by a doubt? And can you assert to me that where there is room for a doubt, darkness and desolation do not sadden all the consolation of faith, and dim all the glory of hope? How comes it that the Christians of modern times mourn and weep, as if their losses and separations were to be eternal? Was it thus that the ancient martyrs went to the stake, or that they be held their friends and their beloved ones fall beneath the headsman's knife? Did not their countenances beam with joy, and their lips resound with hymns of bliss? How came it that their faith was of such a different order, and produced such converse effects, to the faith of modern times? How, except that their faith was *not belief*, but certitude derived from the demonstrative evidence of spiritual intercourse; a fact which, now that I know it to be possible, I no longer question, experiencing, as I do, that *it* alone has power to impress absolute conviction on the human mind?"

"It strikes me that, on the strength of the mere demonstration of spiritual existence, you assume a good deal more than is warranted by the premises," I replied. "Admitting the fact of spirits and spiritual intercourse being a reality instead of a fiction, which of course, after the personal evidence I have received, I can no longer doubt, to what does it all amount? We have discoursed with incorporeal intelligences, consequently with spirits: *Soit!* But does that prove anything more than the existence of intelligent essences under conditions differing from ours? What proofs have we obtained that they have ever been men like ourselves, or that we shall ever become like them? Consequently, how is it thereby demonstrated to us that our souls are immortal, or, if immortal, that they retain their memory and identity in the future phases of existence? Without memory and identity, what becomes of individuality? and without individuality, what is immortality but a mystification, *pur et simple*, disguise it as you will? If we neither retain our inward self-consciousness, our affections, nor our specialties of intellect and inclinations, what then remains of our intimate self? Our bodies, we know, we leave behind; if we do not retain our minds, what then do we retain? In what, pray, consists the individuality which distinguishes one mind from another, if not in the peculiar bent of its affections, sympathies, aspirations, and capacities? Deprive us of these special characteristics, and you fuse every human soul into one. Resuscitate us spiritually without these individual specialties, or with different ones, and to another body you give another mind. In what, pray, does this differ from creating a new being altogether? Unless it be for the purpose of economizing the spiritual essence, or fluid, or intelligence, or whatever it may be, that constitutes the soul. I can conceive no



other reason why God should not suffer us to perish altogether, and replace us by other generations; for, as far as at least as we are concerned, it is incontestable that the results would be absolutely identical to us. And as for the consolation, what sympathy or interest can independent and incorporeal essences feel for us, if there is no tie of remembrance, of affection, of a common humanity between us? Can they understand our feelings, or make allowances for our weaknesses and our follies, if they have never shared them? And if they can neither comprehend, nor sympathise with, nor compassionate us, what species of consolation can their intercourse afford us? Fancy a seraph, who had never known what it was to be subject to the conditions of humanity, beholding human hearts and human minds, with all the failings, shortcomings, and pettinesses which deteriorate even the highest characters and the loftiest ambitions; can you conceive his contemplating us with any other feelings than contempt and repugnance, unless indeed he has gone through the same educating process, and remembering that once he himself was no less imperfect, should qualify his scorn? On the other hand, what consolation would it afford to the profound attachments of elevated natures, if a thousand seraphs, cold, bright, unsympathising, foreign to their souls, were to gather round them, if the lost one, whose presence and whose love nothing can replace, is not restored to their breaking hearts? Ask the bereaved and the despairing, even among the gifted few, which would cause them the greater rapture,—the companionship of all the great and the glorious who have preceded us, or the restoration of their second self? What consolation then could even seraphs afford us, if they are not our own seraphs? And how does intercourse with the spiritual world afford us any proof of the benevolence, the providence, and the love of the great Creator, if there is no more to be learned by it than we have learned?"

"It is as I guessed," replied Madame de N——. "With confirmed, because reasoned, Scepticism, it is ever thus. If it be driven out of one intrenchment, it is but to take its stand in the next. I have gone through all its phases, and I know them well. The question of fact is decided. *There* you are beaten; and now you take refuge in the *cui bono*. Let us see now what ground you have to stand upon there. Logically speaking, you would be right, were the premises on which you base your conclusions, correct; but if we examine them with less prejudiced eyes, and a less superficial glance than you have done, I think we shall find that they are completely false. *D'abord*, your starting-point, upon which the entire argument depends, is, that the spirits with whom we have communed are entities of a different nature from ours, with whose existence and conditions we have nothing in common, except our intelligence. Hence, that the dead do not return, or that if they did, we have no means of verifying their identity. This is the clear inference of your primary postulate; for were it otherwise,—if the dead do return, and can certify their individuality to the living, the whole of your chain of reasoning falls to the ground. You must admit that?"

"Undoubtedly."

"Secondly, you affirm that there is nothing worth knowing to be acquired by spiritual intercourse; nothing more, in fact, than one can learn by associating with mediocre men, beyond the bare fact of their existence, and the objectless possibility of communicating with them. Whereupon you base your proposition, *cui bono*. Thirdly, you state that we have thrown away our time, and are none the wiser nor the better at the end of our four months than we were before. Excuse me if I prove to you, as I am about to do, that you never showed yourself a poorer logician than in the present instance; except when you decided that the spirits could not be spirits because they chose to pass themselves off for entities your reason justly told you they could not be;—and let me console your discomfiture beforehand, by assuring you that I am quite aware that now, as formerly, it is only prejudice and passion which have had power so to obscure your logical brains as to prevent your being the first to see through the flimsiness of the fallacies you have advanced. To commence in due order: your two first premises are simple hypotheses, wholly unsupported by logical demonstration, or evidential fact; consequently, built altogether in air, and possessed of no intrinsic weight whatever."

"Pardon me ! not so," I interposed, somewhat nettled; for having always, I must confess, entertained a rather high estimation of my bump of logic, I felt this direct and cutting attack upon it to be decidedly insulting.

"Let me proceed; you can reply when I have finished," continued Madame de N——, who, like most literary and logical females, was altogether intolerant of interruptions, although by no means sparing of them to others; and decidedly given to running on. To which, as a saving clause, however, it should be added, that she generally ran on to some better purpose than descanting on the delinquencies of the menial tribe, on babies cutting their teeth, or on the flirtations and *ménages* of her neighbours.

"I repeat, then, that your two first postulates are ungrounded surmises; and the third is worse; for it is demonstrably false. As for the dead not returning, and the impossibility of identifying the spirits who do come, the utmost that we are justified in asserting upon that score is, that *we* have not succeeded in ascertaining the possibility of either desideratum—a fact which merely leaves the matter open to question with us; and which in no way negatives or disproves the contrary assertions of more advanced spiritualists. Your second proposition I shall refute under the head of the third. We have thrown away our time, you say, and are none the wiser than before. Let us see if this be true. Intelligent persons are generally characterised by directing their aims in life to

definite ends, and employing, in order to attain them, the most plausible and sagacious means. If the result corresponds to the original aim, and to the just measure of the means employed for achieving it, surely they have no reason to complain. Suppose, for instance, that you have resolved to learn German or Greek, and that, as a rational being, you make up your mind to devote to the acquirement the necessary time and study. If you succeed in achieving either of these aims, in the measure of the leisure time and attention you have consecrated to it, can you reasonably think yourself ill used that what was barely sufficient to initiate you into the rudiments of the language should not have enabled you to analyse Kant and to dissect Hegel, or have rendered you a profound Hellenic philologist? Take another example. Imagine a clever man setting out in life, with the determined purpose of making a fortune. He succeeds. Has he any right to complain at the last if he has done no more? He discovers that there are intellectual enjoyments of a higher nature than riches, but he has not taken the proper road to attain them. "Whose fault is it if he has only gained what he sought?"

"Apply the moral, and you will see that it upsets your proposition altogether. What was our definite aim in undertaking these experiments? Was it not simply and solely to ascertain if the existence of spiritual beings, and the possibility of their intercourse with man, could be evidentially demonstrated or not? As for any ulterior inquiries into the subject, they were not in the least calculated in our program me. Have we not fully attained the purpose we had in view? How then shall any one say that he has lost his time if he has achieved the end to which he consecrated it?"

"But" I interrupted.

"There are no buts whatever in the case. The means I adopted were only adequate to the aim proposed. Had higher ones been the ultimate purpose, I should have resorted to others better adapted to attain them."

"You cannot deny that it is both unaccountable and discouraging that we should have so signally failed in our attempts to obtain any loftier knowledge."

"If you had meditated the subject more deeply and dispassionately, you would have discerned, as I do, that it is neither the one nor the other. In the first place, before it ought to discourage us, it should be unaccountable; this it is not. There are two sides to every question. To form a reasonable judgment it is indispensable therefore to scrutinize the opposite side as impartially as our own. This you have not done. You have denied the spirits a hearing altogether, and you have only examined their cause from your own point of view. I will be the spiritual advocate, and we will see who will have the best of the argument, as far as logic is concerned. Your inculcation amounts to this: that we, being gifted with intellectual faculties of a high order, spirits of the same class ought to have responded to us, and that their not having done so implies either that they were powerless to hear or to favour us; consequently, that spiritual intercourse is worthless for any purpose of consolation or enlightenment; hence, void of all wise or satisfactory aims. To assume all this, it must first be premised that we ourselves were not deficient in any of the conditions requisite to attract them."

"There is truth in what you say, no doubt," I replied, as soon as I could get in a word; "but nevertheless I am at a loss to conceive any reasonable grounds why, having attained our first aim, the verification of the fact, the spirits should have so resolutely withheld from us that higher knowledge we were so anxious to acquire, unless indeed it be that they had nothing to tell which could concern or interest us. Why, too, should all those we invoked have so obstinately abstained from hearkening to us. We are surely as worthy or worthier of the favour as numbers of those who profess to obtain it. To me, I confess that the fruitlessness of our efforts in recalling them affords the strongest presumptive evidence that either the dead do not hear, or that they cannot come."

"*Nous y voila.*" I knew that was the sore point. "Others pretend to recall the spirits of the beloved, the great, and the famed; and *we* have tried, and failed. You, like me, feeling yourself to be considerably above the level of *le commun des mortels*, cannot understand why the favour should be denied to you, of all others, except on the score of impossibility. *Entre nous*, I have been harassed with the same doubts, and was very near arriving at the same conclusions, only I have one advantage over you, I am less hasty. There was a fault somewhere, that was clear to me, but there was another side to the question. Let us now see what the spirits have to advance in self defence on this score." Here Madame de N—— drew a small memorandum book from her pocket. "I have been, for the last few days, looking over our spiritual archives, and extracting from them all the hints of any importance that we have derived at intervals from these communications, in order to collect the gleanings of information scattered among them, and my impression of the sum total. Here, then, is their reply to the first clause.

"You remember that one evening, when you were specially indignant against their pleas of ignorance and subordination, you asked them, angrily, why those came whom we did not want, while the ones we did invoke, kept away. 'We come because we choose, and those you call abstain because they do not choose,' was the answer. 'Why do *you* not bring them then, when we order you?' was your *trenchant* reply, somewhat despotically worded, it must be confessed. 'We cannot compel them,' quoth the accused. 'Spirits are free, like men. You may at least presume *that they are not worse off.*' I ask you, who was the more logical there, the

spirits or you? Is it indeed presumable that superior beings should be deprived of men's most godlike privilege—freedom; that we should be left free and independent, and spiritual intelligences be enslaved? or does logic admit that inferiors should have the supremacy over superiors?

"Establishing the primary postulate, that spirits must be, at the least, as free as men, what motives does logic indicate as the only sufficient inducements to persuade spirits of any degree to obey our invocations? It is clear that spirits of a low and mediocre order may have many and various reasons for so doing. Being of an inferior class, they may have many different motives in view. They may be fond of society, and be banished from it in the spiritual world,—a conjecture logically presumable; for since it appears, as we have occasion to know, that spiritual beings have power to read the mind, we may be sure that evil ones are not received among the purer and loftier circles of spiritual society. They cannot have many resources among themselves, for they must inevitably hate each other,—the necessary consequence of evil deeds and evil minds shown undisguised. With men they can pass themselves off for what they are not; with spirits they cannot. They are well received in the one case; despised and kicked out in the other. Excellent reasons, even in a temporal point of view, for frequenting human society in preference. Secondly, they are frivolous, puerile, ill disposed, and ignorant. To them, therefore, there is some entertainment in mystifying the weak and foolish, and in deceiving and leading them astray. They feel vanity, like presumptuous men, in passing themselves off for *savants* and sages on those who fail to discern their want of knowledge and intelligence. They are exiles and pariahs in the spiritual world: they are received as counsellors and bosom friends in ours. Are not these reasons amply sufficient to account, on general grounds, for their easy frequentation of our society? As for the high and glorious spirits, however, the case is diametrically the converse. Their time is fully occupied in the acquisition of science and skill. They are surrounded by adored friends and intellectual companionship of the most incomparably delightful description. They are welcomed wherever they go by every superior being. They are in the enjoyment of a bliss so supreme that nothing can picture it, and so exquisite that every moment is worth a century of earthly enjoyments, and if otherwise disposed of, seems a century lost. What possible motive, then, can induce them to forego the society of their spiritual companions, and to condescend to listen to men, unless it be a motive of duty, lofty benevolence, or affection? Say, for instance, that it is God's will that this new revelation should be divulged among men. The inferior spirits, like every other existing thing, can be turned into useful instruments in God's hand, even by their own impulses, for the mere purpose of convincing sceptics of the fact of a spiritual agency originating the physical phenomena they witness. Their ministry is amply sufficient to lift a piece of wood, or perform any other antic in defiance of the recognised laws of inert matter. The spirit of the last clown who departed this life at Astley's or the hippodrome, is fully adequate to this. To communicate inspiration of a high order he is evidently unfit, since it is beyond his knowledge and his capacities. For this latter purpose, manifestly only those spirits can be selected who are themselves high in the sphere of spiritual intelligence; and who, cognisant of God's intentions, anxious to testify their gratitude to Him for His ineffable love and unbounded generosity to themselves, have no greater desire than to make themselves useful in any way that may conduce to the accomplishment of His providential designs. With this view, therefore, it is quite conceivable that they may condescend to communicate their knowledge and inspiration to minds of a lofty description, gifted with superior natural capacities; hence, capable of appreciating the inspirations thus received, and of bringing them to full fruition, both for their own benefit, and in order to transmit them to the world at large, with the authority of genius and the persuasive eloquence of indisputable fame. They may likewise be attracted by intense intellectual and pure aspirations, and feel pleasure in educating and exalting souls enthusiastically ambitious of intellectual advancement and spiritual light. Or they may be recalled by profound personal attachments, and the supreme desire to comfort and sustain the sinking hearts of the bereaved ones who mourn them with an affliction which nothing but their companionship can restore to happiness and hope. Beyond these three just and sufficient motives, there are none, logically conceivable, which can authorize us to presume that beings of a high spiritual hierarchy should consent to obey our invocations.

"It now remains to be seen if under any one of these three heads we had a right to expect that they should come to us. As for the first, that could have been occasioned only by the presupposition that we were placed in the most favourable conditions for receiving spiritual light of a high order; that we were capable of, and disposed to undertake, a spiritual apostolacy with perseverance and self-sacrifice; that we deserved the supreme boon of Divine inspiration, at least by the soaring, ardent, disinterested, and sublime nature of our aspirations; and that the constancy, unworldliness, and resolution by which they were sustained, rendered us not unworthy, or unapt to receive the loftiest of all earthly honours, that of being selected as a fitting instrument to transmit the Omnipo-tent's sublime revelations. Frankly speaking, do you think that any of us can lay claim to be looked upon in that light, even in our own partial eyes? Have you forgotten the spiritual admonition we received? Were we not antagonistic and disunited? Are our warmest aspirations of the most exalted, pure, and disinterested nature? If we had our choice between spiritual light and temporal aggrandizement, which should we

spontaneously select? Are our minds so wholly free from worldliness, vanity, earthly lusts, egotism, and social frivolity; are we so philanthropic, so energetic, so determined, that we should be chosen for propagandists of the greatest truths ever divulged to humanity? Pretty apostles indeed we should make; who should be far too pusillanimous to brave, in the promulgation of the glorious truth, not, indeed, the fagot, the axe, and the rack, but the paltry annoyance of being ridiculed by the ignorance and folly of the shallow, self-sufficient minds we justly scorn.

"On that score you certainly must admit that the loftier entities have given proof of their judiciousness in not obeying us. Would it not have been edifying for a seraph or an archangel to have assisted at our nightly discussions; to have been assailed by M. de M——, to have had his celestial wisdom questioned by the puerile skepticism of a superficial *homme du monde* or even, *entre nous*, to have humbly awaited our good pleasure, till you and I had settled our little squabbles as to which should speak first and most, and what was best worth asking him? We are not precisely of the stuff of which apostles and martyrs, or even prophets are made, that is quite clear; neither were we in the temper or the conditions which may be supposed to befit men for the reception of Divine inspiration. On the first count, therefore, you cannot but avow that the spiritual world deserves an honourable acquittal. As for the second, it may be dismissed in a few words. Purposes of lofty benevolence there could have been none in our case. We are none of us suffering under the weight of any intolerable calamity; we are not sufficiently benighted to precipitate ourselves head foremost into the dismal chaos of materialism; and we are none of us sufficiently philanthropic to go about devoting our lives to the enlightenment or consolation of our neighbours. There only remains therefore the third reason, of personal attachment."

"There I have you," I exclaimed, slightly crest-fallen at having had the worst of the argument hitherto, which it was undeniable that I had. "You will not find it quite so easy to get out of that."

"*Pazienza*; we shall see. Let us first establish our premises. I presume you will admit that for the spirits of our beloved lost ones to come at our bidding, two conditions are necessary; firstly, that they should possess the power of returning; secondly, that they should continue to feel a profound attachment for us. The two conditions combined imply the evident inference that they have doubtless returned even when we little dreamt of calling them, and have in all probability kept a pretty close watch upon us when we little suspected it. Thirdly, in order for them to become spirits of a high order immediately on quitting this life, they must have been very remarkable and lofty exceptions in this world. Now such individuals are very rare in social or family connections. Have you been so fortunate as to have discovered any such persons among your deceased friends to invoke?"

I reflected. "I had one relation of a high order," I said, "but I cannot say that I have very persistingly or earnestly invoked her. I was bent on various other things, and I was rather desultory and versatile in my appeals."

"Then you certainly have no reason to wonder if she did not come. For as it is evidently by magnetic attraction that the message is conveyed and responded to, it is clear that without the most complete, intense, and persistent concentration of volition and aspiration, the magnetism is non-existent. You, at least, have no right to complain if the spirit of your relative neither heard you nor came. Now we will see what is to be said on my side. I had a friend to whom I was deeply attached, and whose love for me was no less intense. We had, in short, been engaged to each other early in life. He was killed suddenly, in the prime of youth, and at the zenith of our mutual passion. I mourned him with inexpressible grief. For several years my despair was profound and hopeless. But I was still very young. I could not bear the fearful burden of such woe. I was impatient of suffering; I sought to shake it off; to crush it out of my heart by frivolity and gaiety. I went into society. I struggled to be gay. I sought to be attractive. I was surrounded by a host of empty flatterers who thought me charming, and whom I despised, but whose admiration I coveted as a tribute to my powers of fascination. I found no happiness, but such gratification as can be derived from satisfied self-love. At last I chose one out of the herd who united to the manners and distinction of a high-bred man, those advantages of rank and fortune which sum up the height of feminine ambition. My first love was the spirit of all others I sought to invoke. Superior in intellect and heart to all that I had seen among men, I knew that, sublime on earth, he could only be sublimer still in the spiritual world. Ardently and passionately I invoked him."

"You did, and he never came!" I exclaimed. "Surely that is a stronger argument on *my* side than any other."

"I thought so too, at first," said Madame de N——; "but on reflection I began to see that perhaps even there too the fault lay with me, rather than with the spirits. Had I deserved that he should return at my call? had I kept his memory sacred, his love inviolate in the sanctuary of my heart, as love should ever be kept? Was the ball-room belle, the flirt of cosmopolite triumphs, the devoted bride he had left behind? Could such love as ours bear such desecration? I felt that it could not. Had I so acted, to his knowledge, during his earthly life, I knew that he would have renounced me without hesitation, had his heart been broken by the effort. If then he had been watching me with eyes no less keen, with feelings perhaps even more scornful and more intense, from his

spiritual eminence, how could I wonder if he disdained to answer the wife of another man?"

I was silent for a moment. "You are right," I said at last. "He might refuse to hear. I should myself, in such a case; as mine is a stern and unforgiving nature. He might have been more merciful. If his deeper love were fled, he might have come to comfort you with his friendship, to illumine you by his counsels."

"I thought of that too; though that would not have been merciful but cruel. The mere idea of communicating with him, and finding him altered, caused me a paroxysm of anguish. Would it have been kind or wise then for him to have come, if his doing so could arouse feelings to which his heart could no longer respond, and awaken regrets which would he henceforth fruitless?"

I was silent again. I began to perceive that the spirits and Madame de N——had decidedly the best of the argument.

"You see, then, that on every one of the three counts of indictment you have brought against the higher entities you have no ground to stand on. Let us now examine if there is any more truth in your assertion that we have learned nothing from the spirits who did come. In the first place, when we asked what was the way to attain to spiritual light and spiritual bliss, they repeatedly told us to be good, and once they said to you, 'Be a Christian.' You call these counsels platitudes, on the strength of their not being novel. But if that is the road, was it requisite that they should have told us falsehoods or fallacies in order to be original. Again, might there not be some wisdom in the application? Your god is intellect, you do not require any incitement to cultivate that; but I believe that in your eyes goodness is a very secondary consideration to talent or genius. I ask you is it altogether improbable that the reply in question was addressed to you with a view to the *apropos*? Again, we were informed that 'nothing is impossible to man.' You must admit *that* to be a very suggestive hint, and one that opens a wider field for speculation and inquiry than many a ponderous folio. We were informed too, frankly, lucidly, and logically, what are the obstacles that have prevented our attaining to higher knowledges, and the proper means to surmount them, whenever we choose to resort to them, besides various minor items which I forbear to enumerate. It appears, then, that even in our incomplete and ill-organized attempts three great lights have been afforded us. An infallible moral rule, backed by the evidence of spiritual authority; a glimpse of the glory that is in store for those who fulfill the conditions by which it is attainable; and an explicit, logical explanation of what those conditions are. It strikes me that to tyros like ourselves, no more important items of information could have been vouchsafed. Hence, it is entirely erroneous to assert that we have learned little. Let us not then be thus ungrateful to Providence for the supreme boon He has vouchsafed to us; incontrovertible evidence of the most sublime and suggestive truth that has ever been revealed to humanity, the actual existence of the spiritual world, and the possibility of holding intercourse with incorporeal entities. Neither let us presumptuously insult His bounty and omniscience by opposing our finite judgment and ignorance in contradiction to His supreme wisdom.

"The question of fact was and must be the first to establish. That we have succeeded in ascertaining by tangible demonstration. Who can be so absurd or so illogical as to assume that, the phenomena once proved, they can be supposed to emanate from any other source than His providential will? and who then shall be so arrogant or so insane as to assert or believe that, proceeding from *His* will, they can be either trivial, unmeaning, or void of supreme wisdom and sublime ends, like all that He ordains? Even in our case, be sure that the evidence will not be thrown away, and that it can only be our own fault if it does not bring forth good fruit in due time, and sub serve some beneficent and lofty purposes. Let us then beware how we willfully close our eyes to the ray of celestial light that has beamed on them when we least expected it. For, no doubt, it depends in a great measure on ourselves, to turn the great knowledge to a good account. Such is the general law. In all things human and Divine, man is ordained to be the originator of His own exaltation or his own abasement.

"The omnipotent Creator spreads the glorious banquet before him. He gives him the senses and the power to enjoy it. He throws open to him the gate of celestial felicity. He invites him to behold its splendour, and to enter; but he leaves him free to select his own path, to profit or to squander; to open his eyes, or willfully to close them; to cross the open threshold, or to turn back from its portal; to reject or to embrace the felicity that he magnanimously proffers to him. Such have ever been the just and wise conditions of all revelation, of all progress, of all Divine gifts. It is only weak, foolish, interested man who distributes unearned rewards, and showers undeserved honours on the insignificant, the trivial, the base, and the vulgar-minded. God does not thus select His favourites. He cares not whether they are born in the purple or the sheep-skin, in the palace or the manger. He looks not to what they wear without, but to what they bear within. The paltry soul concealed beneath the royal ermine has no charms for Him. The cruel heart and feeble intellect disguised by a red or blue ribbon and an imperial or royal tiara are an abomination in His sight. Hence, He has cursed royalty with incapacity, short-sightedness, and egotism,—three cardinal sins which have condemned it irremissibly to extinction, in the course of advancing humanity. His sovereigns are the kings of mind; His peers and princes are the pioneers of art and science; His chosen ones are the pure, the good, the unselfish, the high-minded, the

intellectual. His ministers and children are the disinterested, the earnest, the enthusiastic, the lofty aspirers to heavenly light and to spiritual glory; and it is they whom He has destined to precede all others in the march of intellect and the progress of revelation, as being those who best deserve it, and who are alone adapted to receive the light, and to fecundate the seed. It behoves us then to cast from us, in considering these weighty things, all puerility, shallow cavils, and ill-timed worldliness," concluded Madame de N——, "for that one or other of our party is predestined to be an instrument in God's hand I have long felt an unaccountable but intimate presentiment. Were I in doubt on the point, a curious circumstance that I have just discovered would have set the doubt at rest. You remember the name that was given to us first by the spirits?"

"Yes," I said, "it was an uncommon one, Mira."

"It is the Greek word for destiny or fate, an idea which never struck me till the other day, when I was deeply pondering the events of this eventful summer. Evidently a *nom de guerre* so suggestive was not adopted as the inaugurator of our spiritual experiments without a definite purpose. If you meditate seriously the whole chain of circumstances, you will perceive likewise, as I do, that they are providential. You had arrived at a period in your life when you had got sick of what is so inaptly designated by the misnomer of the "gay world," for according to my view, and my experience of it has been tolerably extensive and cosmopolite, I decidedly dub it the "dull world." I had been forcibly withdrawn from its vortex by the delicate state of my eyes, and my fear of injuring them by strong lights and hot rooms. "We were thrown together by an unforeseen chance. We became, through intellectual sympathy, and particularly favourable circumstances, far more intimate than casual acquaintances hardly ever have a chance of being, in the ordinary run of society. We were thus enabled thoroughly to understand, and mutually to appreciate, the nature and the power of each other's intellectual faculties; consequently, to attach great weight to each other's judgment. Both of us had found out the secret, to our cost, that the utmost this world can afford of temporal pleasures, falls short of our ambition and our soul requirements. Both of us were ripe, therefore, for loftier aspirations and sub lime hopes. We were sufficiently unshackled to dispose of four months' time in retirement together, according to our taste, a difficult combination for three independent individuals (for *salon* mundane conventionalities, my husband and myself, of course, reckon as one). Observe, too, the peculiar nature of the evidence we have received. Half the persons whom chance or idle curiosity brings in contact with these phenomena see nothing that is absolutely convincing. They behold tables turning and tipping, people writing and drawing, they say, under spiritual influence, which no one but themselves can avouch, etc., etc., and they remain not much the wiser or the brighter than they were before. But how different is it with those whose intellects, whose genuine desire of ascertaining the truth, and whose capacity for receiving the light, render them worthy of the special interposition of Providence to convince them! Take your case and mine, for instance. What is the first evidence you receive? Things are told you which you are positive the medium does not know, consequently, cannot suggest. Lest you should explain them by mesmeric clairvoyance, a strange woman is brought in, and a deceased friend of hers, called up, or named, whom neither of the others present can by any possibility have heard of, and of whom she herself is *not* thinking. Thirdly, one of the rarer and still more extraordinary physical phenomena is presented to you. The table leaps clean off the floor *untouched*; and in order that *no doubt* may haunt your mind, and impair the force of the evidence, it *continues* its oscillations from *right to left* for several seconds, *after* it is left untouched, in order that its subsequent leap in the *opposite* direction should not be attributed by you to any impulsion given by the medium; hence, that you may be irresistibly led to conclude that an invisible and intelligent agency is the originator of the volition, the intelligence, and the apparent impossibility you have witnessed.

"What then is the demonstration afforded to induce supreme conviction in another mind, whose judgment and intellect you value; hence to convert your hesitating and rebellious Scepticism into irresistible conviction, when you *first* take the trouble to seek information with some earnestness? *D'abord*, we succeed after a much briefer trial than with our small numbers and lack of medium force we could have hoped. The third night afterwards the table leaps off the floor—another impossibility. But observe, in this instance it was not untouched. Our hands were on it. Such critical minds as ours would therefore, in course of time, have suggested that perhaps some foot or finger contrived to give it a helping lift, unobserved. Hence, the leap being subject to a future doubt, the harmonious chords are struck, which we *know* the table could not possibly have produced by any pressure or impulsion of ours. An absolute impossibility, therefore, *solely explicable* by the agency of an invisible intelligence. Hence, supreme conviction again. For my part, the band of God is clear to me throughout the entire chain; and as I always reason by analogy, and on logical premises, I am thereby convinced that there is no one whose sincere interest in the futurity of the soul, whose intellect and aspirations are worthy of the supreme illumination, and who seeks the truth with earnestness and perseverance, who will not be conducted to its attainment by the same providential guidance and assistance. Nay, I feel certain, that there are no sincere, deserving, and lofty spiritualists but who, if they consult their remembrance, and ponder on the mode in which the great revelation was brought before them, will recognise that destiny led them on in the same unforeseen

and providential manner to the proffered light. Whether it is one or both of us who are predestined to the supreme honour of being numbered among the Almighty's chosen ones, I know not; but this I *do* know, that could there be such a thing as chance in the world—an empty word which has no meaning to my brains—such a train of providential circumstances, conducing to a definite result, can never be classed under that head. Time will show whether I am right or wrong; but of one thing we and every one may be certain, that to whomsoever a gleam of light is manifested, and the appointed path thrown open, that one will pay the penalty of folly and worldliness, or reap the supreme rewards of spiritual knowledge and heavenly love, accordingly as he blindly rejects or nobly welcomes the Divine boon."

Winter was approaching. I resolved on going farther south, to one of my sojourns of predilection, beautiful Naples.

My friends and I parted. They were bound for Rome.

It was one of those lovely November days which shame the fogs of London and the sleet of Paris. I was enjoying one of my solitary but delightful strolls through the ins and outs of Pompeii. I was groping about in my usual desultory way, and had just taken out my sketch-book in order to etch off some graceful frescos in a ruined atrium, when a sudden exclamation in French arrested my attention.

"*Quelle chance!* I have been hunting you out all over Naples, like a needle in a bundle of hay."

The voice seemed not unknown. I turned. It was indeed a curious chance. The speaker was a Turkish ambassador, one of the Porte's most distinguished diplomatists. I had known him intimately during my residence in the Levant, where I had taken letters of introduction to him. He happened to be a man of lofty intellectual powers; remarkable for an erudition and an education acquired in France, which had happily developed all the brilliant faculties of a mind, exceptional everywhere, but particularly so in the East. Hence we had become great cronies.

Not unmindful of the merry *beaux esprits* on the western side of the Channel, I must here interpolate a parenthesis on their behoof.

"What a specially fortunate individual this anonymous authority must be!" exclaim the gentlemen of parachute and dyspeptic causticity. "Every person who comes in contact with this favoured *incognito* is gifted with lofty intellectual faculties and shining talents. The receipt would really be worth knowing." Anticipating their curiosity on this score, I here beg to offer it to them. My secret is of the simplest description, wholly devoid of any sorcery or unholy arts whatever. It has but one drawback, *i. e.*, that it does not depend on every one to put it in practice. In a word, I hold the Italian axiom, *Meglio solo che mal' accompagnato*; consequently, I scrupulously avoid cultivating the acquaintance of any but intellectual and superior minds. These I make it a point to pick out whenever I find them; and as my sympathy is generally reciprocated, it is seldom that my advances are not met half-way. It is this latter part of the receipt which renders it easier in theory than practice, and which compels me to decline guaranteeing success to the witty critics in question, should they feel any lurking desire to make the essay.

To return to my Moslem sympathy. He was quite of the "right sort," according to my peculiar view of mankind; consequently, the pleasure caused by our unexpected meeting was mutual. It was greatly enhanced, moreover, by learning that he had taken a villa on the Strada Nuova, and proposed remaining two or three months in Naples, to recruit for his next diplomatic campaign against ministerial *finesses*, and autocratic covetousness and duplicity.

As for myself, it was no wonder he had not been able to discover my whereabouts, for, with my usual odd propensities, I had niched myself in the most out-of-the-way place imaginable, a quarter so wholly unfrequented by foreign visitors, as to be almost unknown to the majority of my gregarious compatriots. I allude to the Pizzo Falcone. Here, in the fine street of the Monte di Dio, the *place royale* of Naples, which formerly, like the now-deserted Quartier du Marais of Paris, was the aristocratic quarter of the *noblesse de robe et d'épée*, I had ensconced myself in the *piano nobile* of a fine old house, not far from the Duchess of Noja's magnificent palace. My inducements for so doing were manifold,—being quiet, large rooms, an open terrace and pretty garden, commanding a magnificent view of the Vomero, Posilipo, and the exquisite bay, and last, not least, segregation from the commonplace tribe of migratory English, who every winter throng the Chiaja, the Chiatamone, and the Mergellina, and turn the alleys of the Villa Reale into a Kensington Gardens or Hyde Park Lane.

"You will sup with me to-night," said the ambassador, as, after chatting for some moments, we turned down the Street of Tombs. "I expect a Greek lady and her husband who are *en route* for Paris. She is the *belle* of Syra *par excellence*. Such a lovely creature! a perfect *odalisque! la volupté incarnée!* She alone is worth coming to look at. I will take no refusal."

"*Ma foi! ce n'est pas de refus,*" I replied, "I have preserved too pleasant a recollection of our evenings in your beautiful yah, on the Bosphorus, not to feel the prospect of renovating the souvenirs of Candilly positively exciting."

"I am sorry I cannot send my *caïque* for you, as at Stamboul, but, *faute de mieux*, my carnage will be at your door at the Aksham, as of yore. *C'est convenu*—is it not so?"

"As you please," I replied, as he handed me into my carriage.

It was a lovely site where the villa stood to which I drove that evening, at the Ave Maria, not very far from the well-known Villa Matilde. It stood on the summit of a cliff overlooking the Gulf; facing the mountains of Sorrento and Massa, surrounded by wild, romantic grounds descending the face of the precipice.

The supper was gay, as suppers always are when every gastronomic luxury is enhanced by the brilliancy of *genuine*, not spurious wit, more sparkling than the champagne; and the responsive flow of sympathising minds more harmonious than Bellini's melting strains.

"I have not yet inquired what you have been about since we met last," said the Bay, as we strolled out into the grounds after supper, to enjoy the moonlight, I will not say the fresco, for it was a sultry, scirocco night. "Something uncommon, I make no doubt, for I have never met with a more eccentric orbit than yours."

"For once you have made a hit," I replied, somewhat saucily; "I have been dabbling in nothing less than the black art."

"That becomes interesting. Pray tell me all about it; I have always had the greatest desire to make a personal acquaintance with Sheitan. It is near the witching midnight hour too; just the very nick of time."

I briefly resumed the narrative of my first experiment in Paris.

The ambassador listened incredulously. "Surely," he said at last, "you do not take all these *contes bleus* seriously."

"That one portion of the story is no *conte bleu*, I at least can guarantee," interrupted the Greek lady, Madame D——; "for it was I, the rings of whose bracelet the spirit counted at the Russian Embassy in Stockholm; and for the correctness of the *attaché's* version of the *séance*, I can vouch."

Here was a curious coincidence. The Bay was surprised no less than myself. "Shall we try?" he said.

No one objected, and we sat down to a large tea-table in the saloon. We were six; a foreign officer in the Turkish service, and the usual Greek secretary, being of the party.

In a few minutes the table moved, as I had expected. To make a long story short, the ordinary process was gone through. A spirit announced himself as a Turkish pacha, a deceased friend of the foreign officer, and various curious answers were rapped out.

"This is strange, certainly," observed the ambassador, as we stood up at last, after a *séance* of two hours; "but nevertheless, my incredulity is very far from being vanquished yet. It would require much more to convince me."

"*Je le crois bien*," exclaimed the Greek secretary. "It was I who moved the table the whole time."

I looked at him with indignant surprise, being perfectly certain that he was telling a falsehood, by way of one of those vulgar hoaxes in which common-place minds take so much delight. I had been narrowly scrutinizing every one during the whole *séance*, and I knew positively that a table so large and heavy could not possibly have tipped up, rapped, and turned in such a manner, under the fingers of any one person, without efforts being made which could not escape our eyes.

The ambassador turned on his heel, looking too as black as thunder. "You may have thought it very good fun to have been amusing yourself at the expense of the whole party for the last two hours," he observed; "but I have never been accustomed to be made a fool of, and least of all am I disposed to suffer it in my own house."

The first experiment had been unfortunate, and I was not surprised that from that evening the Bay's unbelief was more rooted than ever. Indeed, he scarcely ever saw me during the next three weeks without railing at my credulity and chimeras,—an attack upon my brains which, although I could have endured with exemplary equanimity, had it proceeded from logicians and philosophers of the calibre of the parachute punsters aforesaid, from a mind like the Bay's I felt to be decidedly exasperating. He endeavoured too, like other kind friends, to induce me to reject the evidence of my senses, till at last he made me downright cross at his persistence, although, after the paltry lie told by his secretary, I was scarcely surprised at it. Neither was the ambassador's an uncommon case, for many a scepticism has been confirmed by a similarly false and foolish boast.

Thus badgered and provoked, I resolved on convincing him in sheer self-defence. But how? for, alas! I was no medium, and there was small hope of inducing him to exercise his patience in the matter.

Providence, however, had resolved that I should accomplish my purpose when I had well-nigh renounced it. I had not forgotten my friend Madame de N——'s admonition, nor, to say the truth, notwithstanding my discontent with the result of my investigations, had I the slightest desire to give up the study, now that spiritual intercourse was established as a positive fact in my mind. Hence I had already enlisted one or two acquaintances as my co-operators, amongst others the foreign officer I had met at the ambassador's. He took a decided interest in establishing the fact, and thus he became one of my most assiduous *habitués*.

One evening, I was trying to call my friends the spirits, alone with the officer, when the Bay dropped in. For a wonder, I succeeded in inducing him to join us. We were employing a very small table, about a foot in



diameter, placed upon a larger one. He laid his fingers on it with us. Presently it turned, tipped up, and rapped. The Bay smiled, and looked at us both suspiciously. I interrogated the spirit if it would employ some method which might convince him. It consented.

"What means will you resort to?" I asked.

"I will speak Arabic to him," replied the spirit.

"Oh, *ma foil!* if it does that, I shall be convinced," replied the ambassador, who, being well acquainted with both the officer and myself, was perfectly certain that neither of us could write a word of Arabic.

The spirit began, the Bay himself calling out the letters, while, as if expressly in order to add to his security, it was no longer the little table on which our fingers were laid, but the larger one underneath, which no one was touching, that rapped.

A conversation of nearly two hours ensued, in the course of which the spirit informed the ambassador of numerous particulars concerning himself, and promised him some political information on matters of importance, if he continued to consult him and the spiritual world; the whole taking place in Arabic.

I had obtained my *revanche* indeed. Like all people of a high order of intelligence, once convinced of the marvellous fact, the ambassador was almost wild upon the subject. He coincided in the opinion of Madame de N——, that all which science has ever attained is a trifle to this wondrous revelation. I should have feared that he would have gone mad about it, as it is erroneously said so many have done, except that I knew this to be the result upon weak, not upon strong brains. His excitement and interest were unbounded. He pursued it from morning to night. The officer and the Greek secretary were in perpetual requisition. Often he would send for the former at midnight, or any hour, no matter how undue. Even over the secretary I triumphed, for he was at last compelled to confess that he was not responsible for the moving of the table in the first instance.

Curious and interesting particulars of all kinds were afforded to the ambassador concerning the Turkish Empire and other matters. Several of the most renowned padishas of the Ottoman dynasty announced themselves, and desired advice and information to be transmitted to their reigning descendant. I am not about to give these details, as they do not enter into the limits which I have prescribed to myself, of only narrating my own experience. One fact, however, is worth mentioning, for the benefit of those who may be subjected to similar charades, namely, that the spirits having persisted on several occasions in rapping out nothing but consonants, of which no sense could be made, it was ultimately discovered that these were the initial letters of words of which the remainder was accurately filled up on the following evening.

On one occasion, too, the Bay informed me that the spirit of Theodosius the Great had informed him that he was the slave of his passions, a fact he indignantly denied, whereupon the table had commenced shaking violently to and fro for five or ten minutes. On inquiring what it meant, the spirit had replied that it was laughing. I could not avoid following its example, for it had decidedly hit home, inasmuch as, if the ambassador had a weakness, it was decidedly one of Turkish growth.

Meanwhile I pursued my own researches, though somewhat un-successfully, for I was now dependent upon casual co-operators, and obliged to content myself with irregular attempts, *à la grâce de Dieu*, as chance served.

On one of these occasions, the officer having dropped in, we had sat down to a small oval table in my drawing-room. Half an hour passed without success. It was clear that our number was insufficient, or rather, that the magnetic force was not powerful enough, neither of us being known mediums.

I sent to the mistress of the house, and requested the favour of one of the family coming upstairs for a short time, mentioning that we were trying an experiment, and that a third person was requisite; I forbore to say for what. The landlord was a Jewish merchant, whose family consisted of a wife and children, and two sisters of his, all residing in the house. They sent up the eldest daughter, a child of twelve years old, probably none of the rest liking to be disturbed, or to appear *en déshabillé*. She was a pale, dark-eyed, Jewish-looking girl, tall, and intelligent for her age, but of a sulky and unpleasant temper.

I desired her to sit down and lay her hands on the table, without giving her any explanation of my reasons, first, because she would have been incapable of understanding them; secondly, for fear of frightening her away at the mere name of ghosts or spirits. She obeyed, giggling.

In little more than five minutes now, the table, so immovable before, began to turn, and then rapped.

To my inquiry, the spirit replied that its name was Rachel, and that it was a relative of the child. I questioned her. She knew nothing of any deceased relative of that name. I went and called up one of the aunts. She immediately informed me that there was a little sister of that name, who had died in childhood, twenty years previously. We continued questioning the spirit. It gave various messages to its relations and parents, etc. I had guessed immediately that the child must be a strong medium, and made various inquiries on the subject. The replies far surpassed even what I hoped. The spirit declared that the girl was a medium of the highest order; that her magnetic faculties would be rapidly developed; that she would soon be able to write and draw, under spiritual influence, and that she would eventually see the spirits, and be able to produce the strongest spiritual

phenomena.

Here was a discovery! The very desideratum of all others I should have sought, had I known where to find it. I then inquired if any other spirits were present and desired to communicate with us. Another replied, who gave his name as David. The aunt immediately stated this to be the name of an uncle of theirs who had died two years previously.

"Is there anything you wish to say?" I asked.—"Yes," was the reply, "to tell my wife not to marry again."

"But she is married," exclaimed the aunt.

"Did you not know this?" I asked in surprise.—"I learn it for the first time," replied the spirit; a curious admission, which I give as I received it, without pretending to explain the enigma. The spirit then requested that his wife and children might be summoned to speak to him that evening, and we raised the *séance*.

Here indeed was an answer to my query, as to whether the dead returned. Neither the officer nor I had ever known or heard of a single one of the relations of this obscure Jewish family. I began to think that Madame de N——was right, and that the spirits were really destined to solve a few problems for me which I had never hoped to fathom on this side of the grave.

That evening the widow of the deceased uncle was sent for, and the girl and I sat down to the table with one of his sons. Immediately the spirit answered, and addressed himself to his wife. Requesting likewise that his second son, a boy of fourteen, should also come to the table, which at last he was induced to do. As for the widow, after a brief interchange of messages, she burst into an hysterical fit of weeping, and had to be taken downstairs where she fainted. Subsequently, as I inquired if other spirits wished to communicate, about a dozen different names were given, all unknown to me, but which the family who, on this occasion, were all present, recognised as their deceased relatives, grandfathers, grandmothers, uncles, aunts, brothers, sisters, etc., etc. It appeared that the entire family of spirits had taken rendezvous in my drawing-room, and the *séance* was not ended till midnight.

I need not describe the stupor of the terrestrial portion of the family. They had never heard of Spiritualism under any form in their lives, yet they could not impute any trickery to me, knowing that I was wholly ignorant of everything concerning them. As for the daughter, deceit was out of the question with her, for the child could not have known how to imitate what she had never heard of or seen. Neither could she have eluded my vigilance and the precautions I took in placing her hands.

But this was only the *début*. The girl's medium powers were not destined to rest upon such slender evidence, nor was I inclined to let the golden opportunity slip, of beholding some of the more marvellous phenomena which as yet I only knew by hearsay.

The next evening we recommenced; no one being present this time except two friends of my own—the wife of an English naval officer, and an English clergyman. We sat down to the table, when I laid a paper before the child, put a pencil in her hand, and desired her to leave it motionless till she felt it impelled by a will not her own.

Presently, to our great surprise, her head fell back upon her shoulder, her face being averted. We spoke to her; she did not hear; she was in a trance. In about ten minutes her hand moved, and began to write a few words, purporting that it was enough for that evening, and we must let the girl repose. We then tried to arouse her; but it was in vain that we essayed all the approved demagnetizing methods. Half an hour elapsed before our united efforts succeeded in recalling the child to herself.

The next attempt took place the following morning, in the presence of the mother and aunt. Again the child fell into a trance, when, to my astonishment, she commenced passing her hands down her own face, shoulders, and limbs, with a number of strange gestures, which induced the two women to inquire what she was doing, but which I recognised as magnetic passes; a fact sufficiently curious of itself alone, for neither the child nor the parents had ever heard even the name of magnetism, much less suspected what it meant.

I must forbear to narrate every subsequent *séance* in the order that they took place, as they were of daily repetition during a period of several months. I can only therefore enter into details concerning the more extraordinary phenomena which came to pass during this interval. With every succeeding trial the child's powers seemed to be developing themselves. Soon, various other spirits announced themselves, not belonging to the family; amongst these strangers, the most constant was a young physician who had been killed suddenly; a friend of theirs, who presented himself on all occasions, with the entreaty that they would invite his brother to be present, with whom he was eagerly desirous of communicating. It was perpetually the same entreaty, urged in the most moving manner. On one occasion the table wheeled round and walked across the room, when we least expected it, to the mistress of the house, on whose knees it bent over, rapping out its supplications to her to ask his brother to come there. This the family could not be prevailed on to do, for they were not acquainted with him, and were loath to expose themselves to unbelief and ridicule.

Another time I came home and found them at the table; and on inquiring what had taken place, I was told, nothing of any consequence, only an unknown spirit had come, who had given a curious name they had never

heard,—"*Cavour*," and they had refused to speak to him. Great was my distress and indignation at their ignorance and stupidity,

It should be remembered that the scene did *not* lie in Naples, or probably *Cavour* would not have met with this affront.

for if there had been a spirit *par excellence*, with whom I should have wished to communicate, the great minister, then recently deceased, was the one to whom my *Italianissimi* propensities pointed the first. The mischief however, was done, and my only remedy was to insure a more courteous reception for him another time.

At last, one evening, it appeared that something more striking than usual was impending, for after an unusually long *séance*, the spirits refused to allow us to retire at the wonted hour. It was near twelve o'clock, and we were all very much tired. The child was sulky, and begged hard to be allowed to go to bed, but the spirits insisted upon retaining us. We were three at the table—the child, a cousin of the family, and myself. Presently it moved towards the door, where we followed it, slightly touching it on the surface with our hands. Before the angle of the door it commenced making several low inclinations, dipping down so far on one side that I expected it to fall over.

"What can it mean?" said I.

"It is saluting the name of God," replied the master of the house, pointing out to me a little tablet inscribed with the names and attributes of Jehovah, which in the houses of strict Jews is suspended in every doorway. The table now went down the stairs, pivoting upon its three legs, and performing the same evolution on every landing-place, before the tablets, till it came to the hall door. But the most curious part of the performance was its returning upstairs. It refused to be carried up, as we proposed, and insisted on ascending as it had descended. This is accomplished by pivoting round, lifting up and placing the alternate foot on the step above. When it came to the angle, however, this manoeuvre was no longer possible, for it happened that the stairs were too narrow to enable it to take the necessary swing. After making several ineffectual efforts therefore, it took a couple of strong jerking bounds, and, at the second, lighted on the upper step. Here was an antigravitation impossibility again, for the only persons near the table were the cousin and the child, who stood on the steps above it, barely touching it on the top with the tips of their fingers, whereas I was on the lower steps, holding a light close to it, in order to verify the facts. This leap the table repeated at every successive landing-place, but always with a considerable effort, till we reached the last storey. By this time it was one o'clock. The family, accustomed to early hours, were completely worn out, and earnestly entreated to be allowed to postpone the remainder of the *séance* to the following night. No, the spirits would not hear of it. At last they said they wanted *bujo* (darkness). This was curious, for I was the only one of the party who knew this to be one of the conditions generally exacted for the production of the higher physical phenomena. We took the table into my bed-chamber, it being the only room of my apartments that could boast of shutters. We sat round it, and extinguished the light. Presently it tipped up violently and turned over on its side. We now were four—the cousin, the aunt, the girl, and myself. We felt the table slipping from us. We lit the candle, and perceived that it had thrust its legs under the bed, resting on its side, with the top facing us. It began rapping out with the edge of the leaf, on the floor, "darkness." We crouched down in a row before it, touching it with the tips of our fingers, and put out the light. In a few minutes strong raps were heard *behind* the table, as if with knuckles. Then the sound varied, and became metallic, growing louder and louder till it vibrated through the room, like a small gong beating time in various modes. Again other sounds of a different nature were heard, till at last it rapped out to us to light the candle and lift it up.

We obeyed. What primitive simplicity! cry the wits. How easy for the medium, or the cousin, or any one, to have struck upon the table in the dark with a key or anything else of the like description. But to this I beg leave to demur. All these and similar explanations are in the highest degree satisfactory to the public who have not been jocularly, orally, or tangibly witnesses to the phenomena referred to, but to these latter pertinacious and wrong-headed individuals they altogether fall short of the mark. Thus, for instance, I who had been a witness to the whole, knew that no preparation could have been made for the occasion, the whole having been improvised, and altogether unforeseen. I knew likewise what extreme difficulty I had had in inducing the weary manipulators to obey the injunctions of the spirits, and that nothing but my extreme urgency and pertinacity had prevailed over the somnolent propensities of the rest of the party. Though I could not see, the clearness of the rest of my senses was by no means impaired. It seems to be universally assumed by critics in such matters, that when people cannot make use of their eyes, all their other organs of sense become unaccountably obtuse in the same ratio; whereas it is the converse which is actually the case. Thus if I could not see, I could both here and feel with the utmost nicety. I kept one of my hands moreover on those of the medium, who was next to me during the whole time, while I scrutinized every sound with the sharpness of Fine-ear in the fairy tale. Hence I could perfectly discriminate that the greater part of these sounds were produced on the *back* of the table, on the side next to me; and of the other two persons touching the table neither could have moved or stretched round

the back of the table, under the bed, without making such motions as I must have both felt and heard. Several of the strangest noises too were evidently not produced on the table at all. They were clearly such as, by natural means, could only be produced by metal on metal; and they unquestionably resounded from under the bed. All these and such-like minor details, in reality constitute the demonstrative evidence that witnesses cannot resist; but they are swept away with a single stroke of their dashing pens, by the aforesaid critics! and consequently a totally false impression of the facts is conveyed to the mind of non-witnesses.

I was not destined, however, to be compelled to trust to my auricular faculties alone, for it appeared decidedly ordained that every species of demonstration should be afforded to me successively. On this night, when we had obediently restored the table to its normal situation, and reseated ourselves round it, we were again desired to extinguish the light, and were then informed that the medium was about to behold the spirits. A silence ensued, for the impression at such moments is solemn in the extreme, on all superior minds; and even the more frivolous and worldly are awe-struck, at least for the time being, and are seldom inclined to be talkative or facetious till the light of the sun has remounted their disturbed equilibrium.

After a pause of a few minutes, the table rapped out the word "now." A moment after, the girl screamed out, "Oh! I see them! I see them! they are coming towards me. Let me go! let me go! I am frightened,—I cannot bear it," and so on; a succession of exclamations of surprise and alarm, poured out in accents of passionate terror and dismay. It was with the utmost difficulty that we succeeded in holding her clown, and soothing her into a little calm and courage, for the child appeared stricken with a panic terror, and wanted every moment to rush out of the room. This was the more provoking, inasmuch as one of the strange features I had remarked from the first in the girl's medium ship was her remarkable self-possession. From the first moment when she had been thus fortuitously brought into contact with the spiritual world, she seemed to have understood and accepted it as a matter of course, and to find it as easy and natural to familiarize herself with spirits as with human beings. Now, however, when she beheld them for the first time, she manifested intense terror, to such an extent that it was with difficulty and only imperfectly and at intervals that we could extract from her what she saw.

Supreme was my desire of beholding, at last with her eyes, what escaped my own. "Where do you see them, and what are they like?" I urged, in the intervals of her broken exclamations, and entreaties to be set free.

"There is a great light on the wall, at the back of the bed; I see them there," she replied. "They are all in white; they have long flowing robes, and golden crowns on their heads. They are coming towards me. Oh, do not let them come near me ! Keep them back; keep them back. They want to place a crown on my head. Oh, do not let them touch me !" shrieked the girl, in accents of such extreme alarm that I feared she would have gone into a fit, or, at the least, have burst away from us forcibly. "Oh, they are gone back again," she said, recovering.

"But what are they like? Do you see what they are? who they are? Describe them to us," I insisted.

"Yes, I know them. There are angels crowned with glory. And there are virgins carrying golden lamps. Oh! they are pouring oil into the lamps," she cried out suddenly. "They are very beautiful, they are all light; they have long, floating veils. They come and go, and now there are two more—two others. Oh, I see! I know them! It is Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary!"

"Are you sure?" I asked, surprised and incredulous.

"Quite sure. It *is* them. I see their names written in letters of light upon their foreheads. Oh, I am not mistaken! it *is* them! Ah, they are coming towards me with golden crowns in their hands. Oh, don't come near! don't touch me!" she screamed again with renewed terror.

The scene continued for another hour, in alternations of dismay and amaze on the part of the child, and descriptions of what she saw, of the same nature, given in the same fragmentary and incomplete way as the above. As for the other actors in this extraordinary episode of real life, we none of us beheld anything, except the aunt, who declared that at the first moment when the child screamed out that she saw the spirits she had beheld a sudden light dart up from the table, and ascend to the ceiling like a cloud of vapour.

Many were the discussions raised by, and the conjectures mooted on, the events of that night. The following day the parents called me into consultation, to inquire whether I thought it possible the child could have been acting a comedy, for they observed, not unnaturally, that what she had described were all Bible scenes, which she might have known. I perceived that the vision of Jesus Christ and the Virgin had proved exceedingly unpalatable and suspicious to Jewish religionists fanatically attached to their creed, as this family was. I could only reply that had they witnessed the child's ebullitions of irresistible terror, and the extreme difficulty we had experienced in inducing her to remain, they would hardly have called in question the genuineness of her impressions, for it would have been scarcely less marvellous for an ignorant child of twelve years old to have acted such a part to the life, so as to deceive the most sagacious, than for her to have beheld the spirits.

"How would Madame de N——reason on the subject?" I meditated. "She would resolve it under all points

of view in her mind,' I said to myself, "till she arrived at a solution of the problem logically demonstrable."

"Let me see to what conclusions this philosophical method leads me," I continued. "First, is there any presumable motive which could, on the present occasion, induce an entity of so high an order as Christ to have presented himself last night to this obscure, and by no means high-minded or interesting Jewish child? The family are far too fanatical, worldly, and ignorant to be susceptible of conversion, or suitable for purposes of propagandism, and the child herself is too young and far too apathetical and indifferent on the topic of religion, to be capable of receiving any deep or durable impressions concerning it. The first two motives therefore being wanting, what remains? The next cause for the production of spiritual phenomena is to induce a conviction of the reality of spiritual communion in the minds of men. Query—how far would the apparition of Christ and the Virgin Mary conduce to that effect in the present instance?" I reflected. "The medium powers of the child enabling her to behold spiritual beings, whom the lack of higher spiritual perceptions on our part rendered invisible to our sight, what might best convey to the minds of the witnesses present, the assurance that the girl did actually see what they failed to distinguish? Clearly, no method could be so effectual as to make her behold beings of whom it was altogether improbable she should spontaneously think, and next to impossible that she should invent. What names then were the least likely of all others to occur to a Jewish child, brought up in the strictest Hebrew observances and belief? and who were the spirits reason pointed out as those, of all others, it was most improbable she should imagine or invent, as appearing to her in beatitude and glory? Clearly the last of all were Christ and his mother, so anathematized and condemned in her creed." Here, then, was the explanation at once, lucid, logical, and providential. The spirits had thus appeared to her, in order that we might clearly apprehend that there was no fiction on the child's part. Here, then, was conviction impressed on my mind by another ingenious form of demonstration.

Decidedly I began to think that the hand of Providence was not altogether inactive behind the scenes.

From that night forward wonders began to crowd upon us thicker and thicker. I must relate a few of the more remarkable. One evening we had been forewarned by the spirits that we might expect things of higher import than the ordinary conversations. Two or three friends of the family had therefore been invited to assist. We sat down, seven of us, round a circular table, which just admitted that number. A candle was placed on the table, and a box of matches, in order that a light might be struck without any one leaving the table.

I must premise that the drawing-room was furnished in the usual meagre manner common to foreign houses of the ordinary class. The furniture consisted of two tables, a sofa, and stuffed chairs; nor was there any article behind or within which a person could have been concealed, or I should have examined it. The room had but one door, opening on the stairs; this was duly locked, no one being allowed to remain in the room besides the seven persons seated at the table, whose hands were all held alternately by their neighbours, while our chairs were so closely packed that no one of the party could have moved without causing a stir and a noise, which must inevitably have been both heard and felt by the others. I sat next to the girl, holding one of her hands in mine; the person on the other side, a respectable merchant of the city, held the other hand. In a few minutes a hair-pin was dashed on the table, then a second and a third, up to seven or eight.

"The spirits are unplaiting my hair,' said the child. After a few moments more, I received two or three drops of water in my face; then another person announced the same fact; then a third, and so on, till everyone had been sprinkled in turn. The table now rapped out "light." We obeyed, and then to our amazement we perceived that the girl's hair was all stuck full of flowers; and whereas we had all seen it, when we sat clown, rolled round her head in one large plait, it was now let clown her back in a number of small tresses. But where did the flowers come from? that was no less puzzling. As we consulted, one of the party exclaimed that a vase on the chimney-piece, which had been full of flowers when we sat clown, was empty; and so indeed it was. The spirits had made use of all the flowers it contained to decorate the child's head, and, moreover, it proved that they had emptied it of all the water, thus accounting for the general sprinkling we had received.

After we had verified these strange performances we were again desired to put out the light. Presently we heard on a table at the other end of the room, whereon were laid some sheets of blank paper and pen and ink, the rustling of the paper, and the loud scratching of a pen rapidly writing.

This was in the highest degree interesting; for it was nothing less than the marvellous phenomenon of the "direct writing," *i.e.*, the writing by a spirit, without the intervention of any human hand, on which so much has been written by the famous Baron Guldenstubbé, who is so well known among spiritualists in Paris.

Immediately afterwards the candle was lighted again, when it was found that various sentences had been written, while two papers on which the girl had been writing previously, had vanished altogether. As we were seeking for them, the remainder of the family who were locked out of the room came running to the door to inform us that the other papers had been carried over their heads down the stairs, at the bottom of which they were actually found, and this occurred previously to our having unlocked the door.

Subsequently an interruption took place in our *séances*, for some intermeddling friends succeeded in persuading the father of the girl that the magnetic trances into which she was constantly thrown might be

injurious to her health. He therefore refused to let her continue, nor was it till a fortnight had elapsed that my entreaties and their own curiosity got the better of these unfounded scruples.

Several times now the table rose up and supported itself horizontally in the air, untouched, except on the surface; but this was in the dark, and consequently less satisfactory. What however was equally curious was to hear the spirits answer to any sound made on the table, which occurred constantly, in the full light of my lamp. Thus, if I scratched on the table, immediately the distinct loud sound of nails responded, scratching in precisely the same manner underneath the very spot where my hand lay.

On one occasion, a Polish gentleman came to call on me, who, from various circumstances which had come to his knowledge, was a believer in spiritual phenomena, although he had never been so fortunate as to witness any.

He was extremely desirous to see the medium, and at his request I called her upstairs. The spirits answered, of course, by rapping, as they never failed to do under the medium's hands. I inquired whether they could show the gentleman any striking phenomena. They promised to do so if I would darken the room. I replied, that as there were no shutters, I could only let down the curtains. "Never mind, try," replied the spirits.

The curtains were closed so as merely to exclude the sunlight. The Pole, the medium, and her aunt, sat down to the table; an English lady who had come in the interval to pay me a visit, and myself, looking on at a little distance. Presently the table began to make various jerking motions, trying to rise off the floor; at last it made one bound, and rose about a foot in the air, falling heavily back on the floor, as if let suddenly drop. I then made the girl kneel on a chair, to avoid suspicion, while I stood at two or three yards off, looking underneath it as it rose several times. Again it leapt, but at last it succeeded in maintaining itself, or rather the spirits succeeded in sustaining it, *horizontally in the air*, at a height of about two feet from the ground. In this position it answered all the questions put, by moving from one side to the other, for about ten minutes, falling down heavily again at the end of that time. This marvellous feat it achieved eight or ten times, myself and the other spectators looking under it the while, whence all suspicion of surreptitious aid from hands, feet, or knees, was altogether out of the question. During one of these ascensions or suspensions, it moreover beat time to a polka mazurka which I hummed.

Decidedly this experiment, in my own drawing-room, in *broad daylight*, on an improvised occasion, with no paid, interested, or practised medium, with no preparation or trickery possible, and performed in the presence of two other casual spectators, as indifferent and disinterested in the question as myself, was absolutely conclusive as to the fact of Professor Faraday's fiat being to the full as fallible as the Pope's. At least I believe I may safely certify that it would have been even more difficult to have persuaded any of the witnesses present that morning, that what they beheld was not a fact, than to convince Professor Faraday that it was. Curious incidents of these and the like description now varied our experiments every day, but all were interesting, chiefly as manifestations physically marvellous, for the spirits were evidently all of that mediocre class adapted to the sordid and uneducated family to whom the medium belonged. Several instances occurred too, fully corroborative of the fact asserted by Judge Edmonds and other spiritualists, that inferior and imperfect spirits retain all their earthly propensities and recollections, and are wholly unchanged by their transition from carnal to spiritual existence. Thus, one of the spirits who presented himself, was an old dancing-master who had given lessons to the girl, and who, evidently, remembered his terrestrial vocation, for he insisted on beating time, whenever he came, to various dancing measures.

One day when I was trying the table with a couple of friends, a spirit came who would only beat time to the Marseillaise, which he did very accurately, remaining resolutely still every time I sang God save the Queen. On my inquiring why, he stated that he was a republican, an admission which no doubt would make the aristocratic world set him down as a spirit of low degree and decided *mauvais ton*. In this, however, they would be, according to their wont, much mistaken, for subsequent experience of a much higher nature than any here narrated, has led me to the discovery that democracy is the supreme belief in the spiritual world, and that there is nothing so *been porté* there among the *crème de la crème* as to be uncompromisingly *rouge*. In point of fact it appears that all the spiritual entities of the highest order are *sans culottes* of the most flagrant description, treating blue blood, blue ribbons, stars, garters, royalty, red books, Almanacks de Gotha, genealogical trees, and *toute la boutique* of fictitious distinction and terrestrial vanities and lusts, as mere frippery and tinsel, altogether below contempt. In a word, it would seem that the society of the higher spheres is absolutely *le monde renversé*. But of this more anon: I only allude to it here *en passant*.

Meanwhile, being, for the nonce, genuinely interested in these spiritual investigations, all the more so perhaps from discovering how infinitely more the spiritual world realizes my *beau idéal* of society than that among which I am at present sojourning, I was not idle in endeavouring to discover if there were any adepts extant in the city besides myself. My researches were very soon rewarded by the discovery that there were at least half a dozen spiritual societies, completely organized and in the habit of holding weekly meetings at the houses of the respective members; a fact which I should have little suspected had I not inquired into the matter.

And here I must add, that the same curious evidence has been afforded me, of the under-current of Spiritualism which is rapidly filtering through every class of society, altogether unknown to the majority, who pursue their path absolutely unaware that the ground is being daily more rapidly mined beneath their feet, and will fall in with them and their worldly concerns, their unjust privileges, their ill-gotten wealth, their unearned honours, their painted masks, and usurped authority, when they least expect it. There is scarcely a city or a considerable town in continental Europe at the present moment, where spiritualists are not reckoned by hundreds if not by thousands; where regularly established communities do not habitually meet for spiritual purposes, and where they reckon among them individuals of every class and avocation, and intellects of the highest order; where, in short, spiritual doctrines and adepts are penetrating the substratum in every direction, with the same subtlety and ubiquitousness as the early Christians of yore, and the *Lcarbonari* and *illuminati* of past and present times.

I had small difficulty therefore in finding a whole nest of spiritualists, even where I was, so soon as I took the trouble to seek for them; nor did it prove a mare's nest either, whatever the anti-spiritualist's wits may be tempted to conjecture.

Among two of these societies I got introduced without difficulty, for if Spiritualism is not actually synonymous with concord, it is decidedly inscribed with the republican formula, "*Liberié, érijalité fraternité.*" Strange to say, I found that the greater part of their members appertained to a rank and avocations least of all, one might have presumed, given to spiritual or imaginative propensities. They were mostly rich shop-keepers, merchants, professors, and others whose minds and time were wholly occupied with money-making trades and pursuits, or with public and private instruction. There were even several physicians of the number—those incorrigible materialists *par excellence*. There were also various individuals of eminence in their respective departments, among others a *savant* and antiquarian of high reputation, one or two directors of normal schools, and numerous teachers of all descriptions. One of the houses where these meetings took place was a school kept by a French professor, his wife, and three daughters. These latter, young and nice-looking girls, were all mediums in various ways. The *séances* were curious and interesting. They generally began with music, one of the girls and an Italian professor playing under spiritual inspiration. The remainder of the party sat round a large table, every one with a sheet of paper before them, the advanced mediums writing away as fast as they could, and others waiting for inspiration, while the tyros were making strange arabesques and fanciful figures of all kinds. For it appeared that mediums were often only enabled to write after repeated essays, and a period of probation more or less protracted.

I here had occasion to realize the necessity of physical phenomena, and the signification and value of the paltry wooden telegraph which has so often aroused our impatience, and caused us to repine at not being able to hold our conversations by any less tedious and imperfect method. The communications by writing, *i.e.*, the medium's hand, writing, under the volition of the spirits, though in every way satisfactory to the medium himself, who of course can be under no uncertainty as to the fact of the thoughts and the motion of his hand proceeding from an impulsion extraneous to his own will, is completely the reverse to the on-lookers. No one but the writer himself, unless among advanced spiritualists, certain of each other's integrity, and able to verify it by their own spiritual intercourse, can have any security as to the fact of the medium being wholly passive in the matter; consequently, no conviction whatever can reach, through this method, the minds of any who are not writing mediums. Not so the tables, or whatever material article it is that is used for the purpose of a telegraph. This humble A B C, so ridiculed and scoffed at, is alone capable of conveying certitude to the incredulous, as to the extraneous source of the communications, it being easy to subject it to a control and scrutiny which the spiritual writing escapes.

One of the most curious manifestations to me was the drawing. One evening I had taken the ambassador and the officer with me to one of these meetings; all were seated round the table, we three neophytes included. Presently the Italian professor's hand started off as if possessed, and began with furious rapidity to cover his paper with heaps of little dots. Soon the dots formed themselves into figures of various descriptions, and in about twenty minutes a curious design covered the whole sheet with fantastic-looking flowers, lamps, bells, and numerous *bizarre* devices and emblems. The drawing was handed round for inspection. It was curious and quaint, and so intricate, elaborate, and enigmatical that it must have taken considerable time and trouble to the most sagacious mind to have given a rational solution of its signification, even from imagination. Another medium, however, achieved this difficulty in the same rapid manner, giving a very striking and ingenious elucidation of the various symbols, all of which were referred to the opening prospects of Spiritualism, its progress, futurity, and connection with the reform and development of modern society.

The whole performance was interesting and curious in the extreme, and had I been no believer in spiritual phenomena, I should have been much puzzled to understand how both the designer and the interpreter could have succeeded in accomplishing their tasks without pausing an instant, either in the elaborate designs, or no less elaborate interpretations.

It was in vain, however, that I tried to write, my hand remained immovable. But not so the officer, for after

an essay of about a quarter of an hour, his whole arm was seized with a sort of convulsive movement, jerking violently about, and the pencil he held, drawing extraordinary figures on the paper, which were not susceptible of any rational interpretation whatever, being evidently the pot-hooks and hangers of spiritual caligraphy.

So much for one of the ordinary spiritual meetings, which I only occasionally frequented, for I found on the whole that my own private ones were more interesting and satisfactory.

Innumerable other curious phenomena of various descriptions took place during the ensuing two months; too long to enumerate, and supererogatory to the end I have in view. I shall therefore close my narration with one of our most remarkable *séances*.

It had been promised that others besides the medium should behold the spirits, and I invited the officer before mentioned to join our party.

The *séance* commenced at eight o'clock, several other persons being present. After different communications had been rapped out, we were informed that we were about to see and feel the spirits, and that darkness was indispensable. Such being the requisition, I took the precautions I made it a point never to omit under similar circumstances. For although certain that no trickery was intended or possible, on the part of either the child or her parents, my object being to obtain absolute conviction as to the genuineness of all I witnessed, it was my special desire to make assurance doubly sure, and to leave no loophole whatever whereby any doubt or question could subsequently arise in my mind as to the facts; a practice which I strongly recommend to all those who are anxious to arrive at any decisive convictions or conclusions whatever.

I therefore enacted that no one should remain in the room except the co-operators; and in order to be able to control their motions, and thoroughly to satisfy myself, I separated the party, consisting of six, into two sections, three, including the girl's father and aunt, being seated at a table at the opposite extremity of the room, while I kept the medium completely under my own *surveillance*, by placing her at the table with the officer and myself, thus isolating her entirely from any friends of hers. Lights and matches were placed on both tables, in order that no one should be authorized to move from his place in the dark. I then made the girl place both her hands, one above the other, on the table, laid the officer's hands in the same fashion upon hers, held down their four hands with one of mine, and then, having extinguished the light, I placed my other hand on the top of theirs, not one of the three persons at the table being able thus to move a finger, much less to withdraw or make use of a hand, without the knowledge of the two others. The same precautions were taken at the other table, which was removed from ours by the entire length of a tolerable-sized room.

Stillness and silence ensued for about a quarter of an hour. At last a slight current of cool air passed over my hand—a peculiarity I had often previously remarked. A few minutes after I felt a slight touch, like that of a feather, pass over my fingers, which, as before mentioned, were crossed on the top of the other four hands; the same light feathery touch was then drawn across my forehead. And now the persons at the other table called out that they were touched in the same manner. Then the officer exclaimed that he had been touched on the face and arm; then the medium said that the spirits were passing hands over her.

It was *my* turn now. The spirits were apparently gathering strength, for I distinctly felt a hand upon my shoulder, and then upon my knees. The next variation was a hand laid upon my cheek, and then upon the side of my head. There could be no illusion in my sensations, for although the pressure was still soft and light as a feather, it pushed my head thrice down upon my shoulder. Neither was there any probability of deceit, for the four hands of the only two persons at the table besides myself, were still immovably clasped together under my own; and the three individuals at the other table were far beyond our reach. Neither was there any possibility of their moving from their places without our hearing them, in a room perfectly quiet and still; besides which they were exchanging words with each other and with us during the whole of the time.

Again the hand of an invisible was placed upon my head, clasping my forehead, whereon this time I distinctly felt the four fingers and the thumb. I took one of my hands off, and held it over my head. There was no tangible arm to the spirit-hand, but no one whose senses are lucid and discriminating could have been in doubt upon the subject; for there was an unquestionable distinction between what I felt and the pressure of a human hand. Analysing my sensations, during the whole time, with the nicest accuracy, I distinctly perceived that the spirit-hand, although perfectly formed in human shape, and warm and soft to the touch, felt more like down than flesh, and that I could perceive no joints or bones in it whatever. Moreover it possessed a power peculiar to it-self; for the pressure which had forced my head down was actually so light and soft that, had it been human, it could not have moved my head at all.

On the whole, the impression produced by this, my first tangible contact with spiritual entities, was singular and marvellous in the highest degree, and not wholly free from awe.

While we were thus scrutinizing our sensations, the medium cried out that she be held the spirits; but this time it was in a sort of magic picture on the table.

"Who do you see?" I inquired.

"It is a Turkish Pacha" said the child. "Oh, I see; it is R——Pacha of Aleppo."



"How do you know?" inquired the father from the other table.

"I see it written in letters of light upon his forehead," again said the child.

"Oh, my God! I see him, too," suddenly exclaimed the officer. "It is my dear friend; he who came the first evening to us at the Bey's."

"But how do you see him?" I asked, fevered with eagerness and curiosity.

"The table is like a field of light, and I see my friend's head upon it; but for Heaven's sake do not speak; it is too solemn," he concluded, bursting into tears and sobbing audibly.

"I see my father on the table in the same manner," now cried out the master of the house, from the other table.

Meanwhile I strained my eyes in vain. Nothing was visible to me except a few electric sparks, which I distinctly perceived, glittering here and there upon the table.

For several hours a repetition of the same phenomena took place, various spirits alternately appearing to the three persons aforesaid, in the form of magic pictures invisible to the others, while in compensation they kept touching from head to foot the remaining three who did not see them.

This manipulation, we were subsequently informed, signified that the spirits were magnetizing us, in order to enable us to see. Whether they would have been successful or not, in course of time, it is impossible to say, for after three or four hours, the officer and the other persons present got tired, and at two o'clock we were forced to raise the *séance*, much to my regret. Doubtless the gentlemen in question had often remained till four or five o'clock, at a ball, and would have thought little of sacrificing a night again to any temporal pleasure or advantage, of an equally interesting description; but nothing being to be gained, as is generally supposed at least, by investigations into spiritual matters, except information concerning the world beyond the grave and the futurity of the soul, he could not, of course, any more than the ordinary run of mankind, be expected to submit to similar inconveniences for such comparatively unimportant considerations.

Many other curious phenomena took place subsequently under the mediumship of this girl, no less than in the house of the Bay, and with two Polish ladies of my acquaintance, who turned out to be mediums likewise. Most of them, however, resembled the above, except on one occasion, when the family having agreed to consult the spirits at twelve o'clock on the following day, and not coming to the rendezvous at the appointed hour, the table in their drawing-room, habitually used for the spiritual telegraph, suddenly moved, *untouched*, a couple of yards along the floor, and rapped loudly of itself, in the presence of one of the aunts who was sitting working, and of the servant who was dusting the room, both of whom came rushing upstairs in astonishment and alarm to announce the extraordinary fact, and to call down the truants.

I forbear to narrate any more of the *séances* which took place, the phenomena produced having been chiefly repetitions of incidents of the like nature to the preceding. For having shortly after quitted Naples, I was unable to follow up the development of the girl's medium powers, always a matter of progression, more or less slow or rapid, according to circumstances.

What I had been so fortunate as to witness was amply sufficient, nevertheless, to certify the marvellous extent of the physical phenomena, and to point to the conclusion logically deducible therefrom—that where such powers are included in the attributes of spiritual entities, there is no limit which, in our ignorance, we are justified in assigning to the marvels we are doubtless yet destined to realize.

It fully sufficed, likewise, to prove the incontrovertible nature of the evidence thus afforded, and the facilities providentially granted for its attainment, to all those who conscientiously and perseveringly seek the light.

In every single instance when I had seriously directed my attention to the subject, or rather, when I had sincerely aspired to ascertain the truth, and honestly taken some trouble to obtain the necessary evidence, light and demonstration of the most incontrovertible nature had been vouchsafed to me. To any reasoning, intelligent, and unprejudiced mind, the hand of Providence was unmistakably visible throughout the whole.

The chain of providential circumstances which Madame de N——'s clear and logical mind had first pointed out to me, was confirmed by the sequel.

Nothing could have been more evident than the fact that design, not chance, had brought about the display of the last and more extraordinary phenomena narrated.

I had found unusual and unaccountable difficulties in discovering a house to suit me on this occasion. It had been, according to my custom, my wish to reside in the country, and, if possible, on the sea-shore. Various residences had been pointed out to me; several of these I was on the eve of taking, when each time some unforeseen obstacle had intervened to break the bargain. A lady with whom I had become slightly acquainted, to all appearances by the merest chance, resided in the Jew's house. Without any assignable reason, she suddenly took it into her head to offer to cede me her apartments, and persisted in urging me to take them, till, sick of the hotel, I accepted the proposal. The rest I have narrated. It certainly cannot be attributed to chance, that when I casually requested the attendance of some grown-up member of the family, the child should have

been selected whose medium powers were absolutely unknown to everyone, herself included.

If I dwell on these personal matters, it is with the view of calling the attention of all those who are sufficiently earnest, intellectual, and aspiring to take an interest in topics of a higher order than mere worldly gain or frivolous amusement, that it is within the power of every private person to investigate and ascertain the truth for himself; and that, moreover, those who pursue the research with perseverance, sincerity, and good-will, may reckon upon arriving at the goal, and being providentially assisted in their efforts. No one knows who may prove mediums among their own family circle, or their acquaintances and friends. No one can tell, till they essay. The probability is, that on an average, among every group of seven or eight people, at least one medium might be found. Hence there is no necessity whatever to have recourse to those who make a trade of their powers, and are consequently liable to suspicion, in order to obtain evidence as to the facts. Upon this the entire controversy turns for the present. The whole matter, vast as it is, lies in a nut-shell. It is, I repeat, a simple question of fact, which it depends on every one to verify for themselves.

Theory and *à priori* arguments are altogether premature at the present stage of the inquiry. The question stands thus:—Hundreds, and not alone hundreds, but thousands and hundreds of thousands, of educated, intelligent, and disinterested witnesses assert, like myself, that they have had ocular, tangible, and incontrovertible evidence of physical phenomena indicative of the agency and volition of invisible intelligences; *i.e.*, of spiritual entities. Thousands of others, who have been brought up to believe that if spirits exist they cannot communicate with men, contradict the affirmations based on collective testimony and evidential fact, by simple negations based on nothing at all, except their own prejudices, on an arrogantly assumed definition of the laws of nature, of which they are in complete ignorance, and, likewise, on *à priori* theories and arguments which they fail to prove, either by facts or logic, the only two species of demonstration which can claim the title of evidence to rational and intelligent minds. So far it can hardly be questioned which party has the best of the controversy. As yet the anti-spiritualists have nothing on their side but that worst of all arguments, "*la raison du phis fort.*" They make considerably more noise, and are still in greater numbers, but that is all that can be said for them.

To retort upon them one of their favorite expressions, nothing can be more unphilosophical than to meet a question of fact by unsupported denegations, without having given the facts alleged any fair, honest, accurate, or sufficient investigation. But when the empty denegations are ostensibly based on assumed theories, which are not alone undemonstrable, but which can be proved to be logically untenable, the lack of philosophy becomes a peccadillo, and the arrogance of the denegation attains to the *we plus ultra* of presumptuous absurdity.

I have already shown the utter fallacy of several of the theoretical objections which are urged against Spiritualism. Nor do I fear that the cleverest of our antagonists can find any logical ground whereby to refute my demonstrations. He will be a shrewd man who finds means to dispute my premises, that, admitting the existence of spiritual entities, a surmise which there are no reasonable grounds for denying, and innumerable analogical, psychological, and philosophical grounds for admitting, there is no reason for assuming that they are all either good or evil. Secondly, that, admitting them to be of mixed natures, it is infinitely more presumable that inferior spirits should be ready and willing to come at the beck of every insignificant individual who calls them, than intelligences of a lofty order. Thirdly, that the fact of an intelligence being inferior, puerile, or mediocre, does not imply that it is no intelligence at all, for mediocre men might by the same rule be declared to be non-existent, if the fact of inferior or frivolous communications being received from frivolous or inferior "spirits could be accepted as an argument of their non-existence. Fourthly, that as freedom and independent volition here are essential characteristics of the human soul, which is a spirit, it is logically deducible that in a spiritual condition souls must possess them likewise; and that as, moreover, it is contrary to all reason, that beings in a superior condition of existence, such as the superiority of spirit to matter, should be less privileged than their inferiors, or subjected to them, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that spirits cannot be presumed to be worse off than men. It follows hence, too, that the parachute and dyspeptic wits are altogether hypercritical when they fall upon the poor mediums who honestly confess that the spirits come, or do not come, at their own pleasure.

How far this may or may not prove convenient to the said mediums is totally irrelevant to the question. I should say it was decidedly the reverse of convenient, but this is a matter of opinion. That, however, which is on matter of opinion, but of logical evidence, is, that these gentlemen are really not justified in falling foul of the mediums for not being able to compel spirits to assist at their assemblies whenever it suits them to call them, when they themselves would find it impossible to compel the least clerk or errand-boy of Moses & Co. to honour their tea-table with his presence, if he did not choose to do so, and when the Czar of all the Russias could not bring his shoeblack to his Imperial dinner-table against his will, otherwise than by a grossly tyrannical abuse of power.

I have said likewise that if the motion of a table or a chair, without any human agency, produces exactly the

identical effect, and conduces as efficiently to the purpose in view as the removal of a planetary sphere from its orbit, it is not altogether foolish or unphilosophical to suppose that the table or the chair may be used in preference to the planetary sphere; and I shall now proceed to elucidate that portion of the argument which affords such an inexhaustible source of pleasantry to the facetious gentlemen in question. We shall then see whether they or the spiritualists have the best of the argument on that point likewise.

In the first place, it is absurd, and unmeaning to dispute as to the wisdom or propriety of the manifestations, while the question of fact remains yet in abeyance. The critics who presume to ridicule the phenomena without having any genuine evidence to adduce in proof that they are false, and that the innumerable honest, intelligent, and disinterested witnesses who avouch them are consequently all either fools or impostors, forget it is the supreme wisdom of God which they are presuming to arraign before their petty tribunal.

For if the facts are *true*, who shall deny that they proceed from God's will? and if from Him, who shall presume blasphemously to assert that they can be either puerile, foolish, or vain? Before, therefore, they have succeeded in disproving the facts, it is the climax of arrogance, folly, and impiety to scoff and criticise what they are too shallow, ignorant, and frivolous to comprehend or to investigate. Setting this obvious consideration aside for the present, let us now examine the question theoretically, and ascertain how far, in a purely logical point of view, the manifestations can be justly stigmatized as puerile, ridiculous, or unphilosophical.

To commence with the *à priori* considerations, I presume that it is a generally accepted truth that the human race is progressive and perfectible. History teaches us that civilization and revelation have been alike progressive hitherto, and were history silent on these points, philosophy, common sense, analogy, and logic would alike combine to demonstrate to us that it is both rational and indispensable that the education of the human race should be adapted to its successive degrees of intelligence and advancement. Who is ignorant that the education of a child or a savage can only be judicious or advantageous when it is suited to their receptive faculties? We do not put a child to learn algebra before he is capable of digesting the multiplication table; nor do we lay Euclid before a peasant or a savage before he has learned to spell and read; or if we did, it would certainly not be held to be a proof of our wisdom, or an experiment likely to be successful.

Hence it follows, that revelation must necessarily be suited to the degree of enlightenment and development of the minds destined to receive and turn it to account. In other words, to be judicious or efficacious, it must inevitably be progressive. For where all around is progressive, it is a patent truth that whatever stands still recedes. Revelation, to be wise and efficient, must therefore progress with progressive man, for the self-evident reason that more cannot be judiciously imparted than his existing faculties and intelligence are equal to receive and turn to a good use. Consequently, when those faculties have attained to a higher order of development, he has outgrown the preceding revelation, as a child outgrows his primer and his baby clothes. Revelation therefore can never be final, since more cannot be conceded to the mass than what is on a level with the receptive faculties of the epoch; and when those receptive faculties have enlarged their scope and powers, a supplementary revelation becomes indispensable.

Christianity was the supplement afforded to the dawn of modern civilization.

For the last two centuries, science and enlightenment have been rapidly outgrowing it. I do not mean, of course, its moral precepts. This is simply a logical necessity, for moral principles being synonymous with truth, must evidently be eternal. They may be amplified and developed, but they can never be radically altered.

In saying that modern civilization has outgrown Christianity, I mean therefore solely its evidence; the innumerable absurdities, superstitions, metaphorical exaggerations, and falsehoods with which the folly and ignorance of men, and the sordid aims of interest and priestcraft of all sects and denominations, have surcharged, disguised, and defaced the pure, sublime, and inspired revelations of Christ.

Hence the hour is now arrived, when, if men are not to reject revelation altogether, and to lapse into the dismal chaos of materialism, with the irretrievable degradation and despair it entails, a supplementary revelation has become absolutely indispensable.

I am quite aware of the hue and cry that this declaration is calculated to call forth among a certain set in England, although not on the Continent, where, among the educated and enlightened classes, there are none who will be disposed to deny my postulate, except a small minority of priest-ridden ultramontanists, who either abdicate their entire judgment and surrender their responsibility to the hands of their confessor, or who hypocritically profess, for interested purposes, the direct converse of what they think.

It is to the English, therefore, that I specially address myself on this point. And here it is not irrelevant to state that the large majority who think they have discharged all the obligations of a Christian by going to church on a Sunday, are completely mistaken in supposing that the indifference which they mistake for religion, and which enables them to pursue their jog-trot routine without even troubling themselves to inquire what it is they really do believe, or outwardly profess, is the general condition of minds of a higher order even in England. The empire of exterior observances, and the tyranny of public opinion, or rather of public hypocrisy, in England being of the most intolerant and oppressive description, it is only a very small proportion of the enlightened and

intelligent minority who possess sufficient moral courage and temporal independence to venture to stem the tide, or to risk the buffets and bruises they are likely to encounter in the contest. Very few, moreover, take a sufficiently deep interest in the controversy to induce them to risk the unpleasant consequences they foresee, merely in the cause of truth and abstract principle. Hence it arises, that by far the greater number of those whose reason absolutely rejects the popular creed take special care to suppress their opinions except in confidential intercourse with congenial souls. It is thus that in England the large majority whose time and interest are mainly absorbed by lucre, worldliness, or frivolity, have remained in profound ignorance of the widely extended under-current of Scepticism which has been rapidly modifying the convictions of the more intellectual and gifted portion of the community; very different in this respect from the Continent, where, the majority freely expressing their thoughts on all subjects except politics, Scepticism has been long known, and universally acknowledged to be the spirit of the age.

For myself, however, being one of those who have never condescended to yield the mind to intolerance, bigotry, tyranny, or prejudice, and who feel supreme scorn for those who do, no less than for those who are weak or dastardly enough to profess opinions they do not hold, having always taken the initiative of frankness on such topics with all those whose brains I considered worth picking, I am enabled here boldly to affirm that Scepticism is very little less widely diffused among the intellectual and reasoning portion of the British nation than abroad. This, at least, I know, that I have never yet found a mind of a high and powerful order among my English compatriots which, in reality, believed a single syllable on faith that is contrary to reason, or incompatible with justice, morality, wisdom, supreme benevolence, and logical demonstration,—a wide category, under which, *nota bene*, much of the doctrines and the fables received as Divine revelation by the Protestant no less than the Catholic Church are indubitably to be classed.

On inquiring wherefore these individuals so carefully kept their convictions to themselves, I invariably found that the reason was the same with all; *i. e.*, that they do not think it worthwhile to expose themselves, as they express it, to "being chalked on the back."

The fact therefore remains averred to me, and doubtless to all those who, like myself, have taken any trouble to inquire into the question, that Scepticism is as much the order of the day in England as throughout continental Europe; for it is assuredly the meditative, the erudite, and the philosophical minority whose opinions can alone claim any weight and value,—not the frivolous, the worldly, and the unthinking mass.

What then docs the prevalence, and rapidly increasing extension of Scepticism throughout the civilized world signify and indicate? Scepticism means doubt; what is doubt but darkness, ignorance, uncertainty? Uncertainty of everything most interesting and important to mankind,—at least, to the superior portion of it. Where does doubt arise? Clearly, from the want of such evidence as is of a nature to induce conviction. Wherever there is ample and incontestable evidence, there neither is nor can be any doubt. It follows thence, irrefragably, that Scepticism being the tendency of the present day, this alone demonstrates that the evidence of Divine revelation has become insufficient to satisfy the advanced condition of enlightened nineteenth-century minds; for did the evidence amount to demonstration, Skepticism could not exist, or, at least, must be wholly exceptional, instead of being, as it unquestionably is, the general bent of higher intellects at the present day; for otherwise it would be that logical impossibility, an effect without a cause.

It must be no less evident to every rational being, that if the immortality of the soul be a fact, and the providential interposition of God, both in revelation and human affairs be a certainty, it is beyond all else desirable that these sublime truths, in which we are so deeply interested, should be demonstrated to men, in order to moralize, to console, and to enlighten them as regards their present trials and their future destinies. Nor, I believe, are there many, if any, individuals, whether skeptics or believers, who would venture to deny that the perpetuation of our existence beyond the grave is a universal aspiration, even with those who question it most. It may indeed be assumed as a certainty, that there is no human being who would not recoil from the idea of annihilation, and aspire to immortality, especially if freed from the dismal perspective of eternal punishment, and certain of having a chance of redeeming his past errors whenever he chooses to profit by it.

Skepticism has likewise another evil; namely, the egotism and worldliness it inevitably propagates among all but exceptionally elevated natures. If ordinary men question their chances of a future existence, they immediately consider it a *métier de dupe* to sacrifice any tangible advantage for a doubtful contingency. Hence the majority of society ends, by putting in practice that most revolting and fatal of all principles, *l'après moi le déluge*." To this is clearly traceable the intense anxiety for the acquisition of wealth, which, when it absorbs all the higher aims and ends of existence, becomes the most sordid and debasing of all human passions, a trait eminently characteristic of the present century, more than any preceding period of the world's history. It is this supreme love of money, above and beyond all things, which renders men more worthless, selfish, and ignoble than almost any other failing, and which finally extinguishes every noble feeling and every high principle, while it silences even the voice of conscience, no less than every genuine sense of honour, dignity, and uprightness. Hence Skepticism is in every sense an evil, and one whose direct consequences not alone darken,

but inevitably tend to degrade and demoralize the world.

It may be objected by some, that the lofty precepts of Christianity are fully adequate to religiously instruct, and to elevate humanity. Those who take this side of the argument overlook the obvious objection, that to him who questions its Divine authority it possesses no more weight than the philosophical speculations of a Socrates or a Plato; hence, that its conclusions, its revelations, and its teaching, in their eyes, are no more impressive than erring human speculation, and degenerating human wisdom. It is to this cause that is no less clearly attributable the remarkable discrepancy between Christian doctrines and Christian practice. When men received the first with implicit faith, as proceeding directly from Divine authority, the single recommendation of St. Paul, that it was better to be single than married, was sufficient to induce hundreds and thousands to go and bury themselves in caves and rocks, in the trackless deserts of Egypt, or to renounce every human enjoyment for the dismal prison of the convent cell. When men have ceased to feel any reasoned conviction as to its Divine origin, it has likewise ceased to influence the minds and conduct of the majority, any more than the teaching of the *académie*, or the Sunday sermon.

It must be evident, therefore, to all reasoning minds, that when the evidence of a revelation, purporting to proceed from God, has become totally inadequate to convince the majority of superior minds, and when it has, in consequence, ceased to exercise any substantial influence upon the great mass of mankind, it has become totally inefficient for the purposes which revelation is designed to fulfill. That such is the present aspect of the question, few liberal, unprejudiced, and intelligent minds will be tempted to deny. Hence, that the moment is evidently arrived, when, if revelation is either a truth or a necessity, it is indispensable that the preceding ones should be supplemented in a manner calculated to meet the advanced requirements of modern civilization.

It now only remains to be seen whether the new revelation comes in a form to fulfill these conditions; for if Spiritualism be true at all, as the new revelation it must evidently be accepted.

It is universally recognized, that education and science have obtained of late years an extraordinarily wide and rapid extension. The impulsion once given, it is inevitable that it should proceed henceforth at a geometrical ratio; *ergo*, education being, above all, the development of the intellectual faculties, and science the demonstration of facts, the rapid propagation of both must conduce to render logical and tangible demonstration the chief requirement of men's developed reasoning faculties and increasing knowledge.

Let us see whether the spiritual phenomena can be classed under this head or not. They are ridiculed as puerile, petty, unmeaning, foolish, and unphilosophical. Now, it strikes me, that if the ends and purpose of a design be in the highest degree important, necessary, and sublime, it cannot be held liable to any one of the censures aforesaid. Secondly, that if the means adopted for that purpose can be proved to be not alone admirably calculated to attain every one of the ends in view, but are moreover the *only adequate, efficient, judicious, and possible* means to attain those ends, they can hardly be held to come under the above sweeping criticism either.

That both these postulates can be proved respecting spiritual manifestations, I am about to demonstrate.

I must not, however, omit in the list a last objection which has been gravely urged to me by intelligent and serious persons. I have heard it asserted that it is unworthy of the dignity of Providence to resort to such means. It is so amusingly absurd to assert that anything can be unworthy of the dignity of Providence, as if it were possible for God to let Himself down by anything not unjust or unwise.

To return, however, to arguments which are less palpably ridiculous, though no less untenable. I have said that I can demonstrate that if the ends of the new revelation are sublime, the means are no less admirably and judiciously adapted to attain them.

I have shown, likewise, that a new, more complete, and convincing revelation cannot be held to be supererogatory or undesirable for the great majority of mankind at the present epoch. I proceed to prove the second postulate, that the means now resorted to are the best, most sagacious, and most efficient to fulfill the purposes of revelation, and, what is more, the only ones compatible with the well-being of men and the wisdom of Providence, or adequate to achieve those aims at the actual stage of intellectual development at which men have arrived.

First, then, the ostensible and logical aims of all revelation, universally avouched and acknowledged, are threefold; namely, to moralize, to console, and to enlighten men throughout the trials of temporal existence, by certifying to them their moral responsibility, the immortality of the soul, and the providential government of God throughout the universe. The first point requisite, then, is to convince men's minds of the Divine authenticity of revelation, for in this primary postulate its entire authority and weight resides. If not directly emanating from God's infallibility, it is at once reduced to the level of questionable human speculation.

There are but three ways, that I am aware of, by which this fact can be demonstrated, and conviction superinduced in reasoning beings; these being inspiration, miracles, or the return of the dead, *i. e.*, of departed spirits, to bear witness of their existence and condition beyond the grave. Let us see how and in what form these methods are available at the present time. To commence with inspiration; what chance would that intimate and

personal assurance of Divine communication have of transmitting its convictions, and impressing its dicta on the anti-inspired brains of modern critics, *savants*, and skeptics. I have elsewhere declared that were Moses and Isaiah, St. Paul and St. Augustine to appear in the monk's frock or the minister's surplice, and to thunder forth their eloquence in every capital of modern Europe, the sole acknowledgment their inspiration might hope to receive, and the utmost effect it could produce would be to become the fashion, and attract a crowd, like the *conférences* of Lacordaire, or the sermons of *Père* Felix and Mr. Spurgeon. I here say far more, for I boldly avouch that were Christ to return upon the earth, modern Scepticism would scout His Divine authority, and both ridicule and deny the miracles by which He averred it, unless of a totally different description from those which sufficed to convince His disciples, if not the Jewish nation.

I ask the public of the present day, what weight they would attach to the self-arrogated pretension of Divine authority set up by any reformer, if all he had to support it were the miracles performed by Christ. On the healing of the sick I need not dwell. That is too obviously susceptible of explanation and question to require comment. But to take those more indicative of supernatural agency, is there anyone who would venture to assert that, were the miracle of the loaves and fishes performed to-day by the most admirable of preachers, and the most virtuous of men, in the Champ de Mars or Hyde Park, before assembled thousands, there would be any considerable portion of those witnesses, much less any non-witnesses whatever, whom it would be possible to persuade that no other loaves and fishes had been surreptitiously introduced than the original five. Again, would the devils running into the swine, and the swine into the sea, conduce to the conviction of any other minds than those which still consent to digest the supernatural performances of winking Madonnas, and sweating wooden Christs? Would even a second Lazarus resuscitated produce any other conviction in the public than that of delusion or imposture? and would not the least skeptical attribute the miracle to a fortunate restoration from trance or catalepsy? In a word, is there any Bible miracle or record which could not and would not be successfully confuted by modern Skepticism, were it to be repeated in our times?

This brings us to the second manifestation of revelation, by miraculous phenomena. What species of miracles are susceptible of successfully withstanding the ingenuity of modern incredulity and the vast resources and scope of modern science? Evidently, nothing of the description which in a less advanced age was sufficient for the purpose of conviction—the chief aim of all miracles. What then, I repeat, is of a nature to produce that effect even upon the most invincible Skepticism? Clearly, nothing but the realization of actual and undeniable impossibility.

This alone is adequate to stand the brunt of modern disbelief, and to set at defiance the explanations, the ingenuity, and the speculations of modern science. How then can the evidence of impossibility be incontestably afforded? Only in two ways—either by the production of extraordinary and supernatural marvels on a stupendous scale, or by the realization of physical impossibilities of every minor description, absolutely unquestionable to each individual witness. Let us now see which of these two methods is best adapted to conduce to the three ends of revelation. The first must evidently consist either of extraordinary revolutions in the heavens or on the earth, or of astounding spiritual pageants appearing to thousands of spectators. Such events could assuredly not be matters of frequent occurrence, for several obvious reasons. First, great revolutions of the planetary orbs would be inconsistent with the laws established by Providence for the regulation of the universe. Neither would they, if constantly repeated, produce any greater effect, or be classed, in the long run, under any other head than the marvels they already reveal to us.

On the other hand, extraordinary revolutions on the earth would be destructive of the economy of nature, and injurious to the avocations and the tasks allotted to men. The apparitions of vast spiritual pageants are equally liable to the latter objection. Man who have been startled out of their ordinary senses by the sight of a legion of seraphim careering through the skies, or of paradise opening before them, are not likely to recover their equanimity sufficiently to bring their ordinary faculties to their daily work for many a day and week.

But forcible as is this objection, there exist others to this method, of a still more insurmountable description. It would be absolutely inefficient to attain any one of the three aims of revelation. It would be powerless to convince, because it would be utterly disbelieved by all, save the ocular witnesses; and as it could not be constantly repeated, the greater part of those witnesses themselves would suffer themselves to be persuaded, after a time, that they had been deceived by an optical delusion, or some extraordinary species of aurora borealis or fata morgana. That this is no unwarrantable conclusion, history may serve to convince us, by the numerous instances therein recorded, wherein angelic hosts—not to speak of the questionable cross of Constantine—were beheld in the heavens by assembled armies, whose testimony failed to convince contemporary nations, much less their posterity. For purposes of permanent conviction, therefore, such means would be vain; for moralization or consolation they would be still more futile, inasmuch as they would fail to convey any certitude to men's minds concerning their own individual futurity, or that of the beloved dead, and the probability of their final reunion,—the main objects, to which every other is secondary, and comparatively uninteresting, to the great majority of human souls.

There remain, therefore, only the last two methods capable of attaining the ends in view; *i. e.*, spiritual phenomena of a minor description, and the return of the dead from the spiritual world. The latter is evidently the most convincing, consoling, and efficient of all, and the only one that completely attains and fulfils the three ends of revelation. The testimony of a fellow-being who has passed the great bourn of the grave, and who has learned the impenetrable mysteries of the spiritual world from personal experience, must evidently be more convincing and ample than any other. When, moreover, it proceeds from those we have loved and lost; when we are thus enabled to communicate with the departed dear ones, whom we never hoped to behold and hear again; when *from themselves* we obtain the certainty of their existence and the information for which we so intensely long; when from lips whose affection never deceived us, whose supreme interest in our welfare we know beyond all doubt, we learn their actual condition, the providential interposition of God, and the fate that awaits those who live in vain, as well as the supreme bliss prepared by the love of the great Creator for those who fit themselves for spiritual life by their virtues and their aspirations in this; when we learn from those we mourn, that it depends on us to rejoin them forever in realms of supreme felicity, or to be separated from them for indefinite and perhaps countless ages,—who will have the courage or the folly to pretend that any conceivable consolation, that any possible mode of instruction and reformation can even approach to the impressiveness and the efficiency of this?

Hence has the universal aspiration been to receive testimony from beyond the grave. What was Byron wont to say?—"Let one return from the dead, and I shall believe." How often have I heard skeptics of lofty intellects declare that no other evidence, save that of the departed speaking from the spiritual world, could be deemed conclusive, or force absolute conviction upon their minds. In what form then does the new revelation come, but in that which is universally felt to be the most desirable, the most consoling, and the most convincing, by every intelligent mind. It comes in the form of the spirits of the departed returning to this earth, and communicating with those who mourn and love them; or with those who invoke them, if they so please. It comes in the form of information imparted by the lips of the so-called dead, conveying knowledge of the amplest and most profoundly interesting description, concerning the conditions of spiritual existence, the future of the soul, the providence of God, the genuine and rational nature of the rewards and punishments that await us, and true methods whereby to avoid the one and to attain the other.

But there is another side to the question. In order that the testimony should be convincing—for the revelation to be incontrovertible, efficacious, supreme—it is indispensable that the authenticity of the spiritual communications should be so amply demonstrated as to place their nature and origin beyond all doubt, so as to force irresistible conviction upon the most skeptical and stubborn minds. How can this be effectually accomplished? At a superficial glance, nothing seems easier, presupposing the possibility of ghosts or spirits returning to the earth and rendering themselves visible and audible to men, than to convince these latter of the fact. Viewing the matter practically instead of theoretically, we shall find, however, that it is not quite so facile a task as might be supposed.

How can spirits demonstrate their tangible presence' to the minds of disbelievers in ghosts, or spiritual communication? By appearing to them, or rendering themselves positively audible, is the first idea that presents itself. But if that would suffice to convince mankind of spiritual phenomena, it would long since have been universally acknowledged as a patent fact; for innumerable are the apparitions on record, authenticated by testimony of the most unquestionable character, and which no one would dream of questioning on any other subject. How is it that spirits invariably appear at night, in the dark, to persons alone, under circumstances always liable to deceit, delusion, and suspicion? say the anti-ghost seers. Why do they not come in broad daylight? at times and in places when nervous or dyspeptic individuals cannot be scared out of their wits by an old tree, a linen rag, a cow, or anything else, which in the phantastic mirage of the moon or stars they mistake for a phantom?

I need not here allude to the far-famed and often-repeated story of the ghost who persecuted the Wesley family for many months, and made his presence audibly and tangibly evident to the thirteen intelligent members of that family; neither is it necessary to recall the apparition which appeared to General Winyard in broad daylight, or that of the Empress Anne, of Russia, seen by twenty persons or more, in the throne-room of the palace of St. Petersburg. The list is much too long to find a place here. But among many others publicly recorded in every country, and among the far greater number that are known only to the private families wherein they have taken place, two or three have chanced to come immediately under my own observation, which are too much to the point to be passed over in silence, fulfilling as they do the chief requisitions of skeptics. The one was narrated to me when at Berlin, where it occurred, and is well known. The others I heard from the lips of the gentlemen to whom they happened.

A celebrated Prussian professor whose name is famous, but which I do not at this moment recall, entering the public assembly room of the Academy of Berlin, at three o'clock in the afternoon, beheld seated in his accustomed place another professor, an intimate friend of his, who had been dead three months.

It cannot be suggested that there could be any alarm or delusion to predispose the mind of the seer to behold, or fancy he beheld, a ghost. A learned and intelligent man, going to a customary meeting of *savants*, in broad daylight, traversing the busy street of a great capital, is certainly most unlikely to have selected such a moment to think of ghosts. If it be urged that he had been used to seeing his friend there, and that fancy might have pictured his apparition in his empty seat, such an explanation cannot be rationally accepted, for if his imagination were thus deeply impressed by his loss, the effect would evidently have been produced at the time, or immediately after, not when an interval of three months had worn off the edge of his regret, and had accustomed his eyes to the empty *fauteuil*.

Neither is it a very usual thing for imagination, under normal conditions, to be so vividly excited as to give to the pictures of the mental vision the force of objective realities. "We call up the image of our absent friends whenever we think of them, but it does not occur to people in their senses to fancy they are tangibly before them, or to feel disposed to walk up and shake hands with them. If imagination were suffered to lead us astray to that extent, there would be no distinction between sanity and madness. Yet such was the impression produced on the professor in question, who, according to his own version of the story, declares that he never beheld any living person more distinctly or tangibly than this apparition, so much so that, had he not been positively certain that his friend had been dead and buried for three months, he should have gone straight up to welcome him.

The second story concerns a gentleman, now an eminent lawyer in London, whose name I am not authorized to divulge. He is a travelled and highly educated man. I need hardly add that he is a sharp, sagacious, and discriminating one. He narrated to me, that awaking one fine summer's morning in broad daylight, the sun streaming full into his chamber, he beheld, on opening his eyes; as distinctly as ever he saw anything or anyone in his life, a strange man standing before the fire-place, and leaning his elbow on the mantel-piece.

He started up in bed, rubbed his eyes to assure himself that he was not dreaming, and called out wrathfully, "Who are you? What brings you here?" The man returned no answer, and did not move. Mr. C——sprung out of bed, walked straight up to the intruder, *continued to see him till he came close up*, when, as he was about to collar him, the figure instantaneously vanished.

Another gentleman, a highly scientific and intelligent man, one whose veracity none who knew him would question for an instant, informed me that riding home one night across a common familiar to him from infancy, he beheld, in the broad moonlight, three individuals coming across it in his direction. It was past midnight. The hour was unusual for labourers or workmen to be abroad; the apparition, was consequently suspicious. Bold and daring, as most Englishmen are, he spurred on his horse and rode straight up to them. He continued to see them advance towards him, till when they were within a very short distance, all three suddenly appeared to sink into the ground. He rode up to the spot. He knew it well. There was not a burrow or a bush, much less a quarry or a limekiln-, within a mile, wherein a man could have concealed himself, yet he groped round and round, on all sides, in vain. The three men had totally vanished. He confessed to me that he had never felt so startled in his life, or had such strange misgivings as during that solitary gallop homewards.

Here, at least, are three persons who might be presumed to have some faith in ghosts, if objective apparitions have power to impress the belief on their eye-witnesses. Yet far from it; these three gentlemen were among the firmest disbelievers in ghosts and spiritual communications. Each of the three was thoroughly persuaded that he had been the victim of optical delusion.

What species of apparition, then, can convince skeptical minds if such was the impression made on three intelligent eye-witnesses by apparitions be held under the least ambiguous conditions; all three being in perfect health, never having suffered from optical or any other delusions before or since, and knowing themselves to have been uninfluenced by any fear or predisposition whatever.

It will be retorted, perhaps, that if the spirits rendered themselves visible to several witnesses at once, the optical-delusion theory could not stand their united testimony. That, however, is taking an erroneous view of modern Skepticism. It is not so easily baffled. If apparitions are more frequently visible to individuals alone, there are too many instances authenticated, wherein numerous spectators, or members of one family, have beheld or heard the same thing, for collective testimony to have escaped its ingenuity. Such was the ghost who persecuted the famous French actress, Mdlle. Clairon, and whose strange freaks, performed in the presence and the hearing of half the *beaux esprits and Voltairiens*, of the last century, during two years, caused such a sensation in Paris at the time, and are so minutely recounted in half the memoirs of that day. Such, too, was the Wesley ghost, and various others no less celebrated. Hence, Skepticism has been driven to take refuge in one of the most original, and certainly one of the most illogical and absurd solutions of the problem which it is possible for a sane mind to conceive; it has of late years supplemented optical delusions by "collective hallucinations."

Here let me ask all reasoning individuals, what species of domestic apparition can possibly escape being classed in one or other of these two categories? I ask them, likewise, supposing it to be desirable to reveal to the



world at large the possibility of communicating with departed spirits, by what means men's minds can be convinced of the fact, if the dogmatism of modern science, rendered arrogant by what should have made it humble—*i. e.*, by recent discoveries which clearly indicate that it has scarcely yet crossed the threshold of the higher knowledge now dawning upon mankind—has led men to reject the most incontestable of all demonstrations which in former ages no sane person would have doubted for an instant; namely, the lucid evidence of their own senses, and secondly, the united testimony of the most respectable and credible witnesses?

If they look into the matter a little less superficially than is their wont, and interrogate their own brains as well as those of their friends, they will find, if I am not much mistaken, that nothing, save physical and tangible *impossibility*, is equal to meet the emergency.

Let us see now how this evidence of impossibility is rendered palpable and undeniable, in the case of the spiritual phenomena, to even the most mediocre intelligence. Every human being, not an idiot or a lunatic, is aware that inert matter of all descriptions possesses no intrinsic volition, action, nor intelligence. Hence, if it displays any one of these three attributes of spirit, there is no one, down to a child or a peasant, who is not positively certain that the cause cannot by any possibility originate in itself.

Let a table, a chair, a candlestick, a pencil,—in a word, any inanimate object whatever, move of its own accord, obey intelligently an intelligent command, or reply intelligibly and intelligently to a question, it becomes instantaneously evident to every witness of the fact that some other agency than its own has produced the marvel.

It is very easy for those who are seriously bent on investigating the phenomena, to make such dispositions and take such precautions, as can positively certify them that none of the human spectators have contributed to it. This ascertained, the conclusion is self-evident and absolutely irresistible, that an invisible agency is the cause. Were motion alone produced, it might be attributed to some yet undiscovered physical force; but intelligence being invariably the concomitant, that surmise becomes at once wholly inadmissible to any logical mind; for every individual who is capable of reasoning at all, knows that independent volition and mental spontaneity are altogether incompatible with mere matter. The electric telegraph conveys a message from one end of the earth to the other, but it transmits it passively as it received it. Were it to alter its tenour, even by one idea or one word, electricity must at once be recognized as identical with spirit.

Those, therefore, who, admitting the spontaneous motion of tables and chairs, etc., etc., attribute their independent action to a recondite physical force, entirely overlook the fact, that, as by far the greater part of these motions are accompanied by intelligence, being either in obedience to some express request, or in reply to some interrogation, they are altogether unaccountable by any other agency than that of an invisible, consequently an incorporeal, intelligence, which means a spirit, for it is a patent fact that there can be no effect without an adequate cause. It follows thence that *absolute conviction* at once forces itself upon every lucid mind which witnesses the intelligent motion of any portion of inert matter, under conditions which place the passiveness of all the human spectators beyond all possibility of doubt.

But why such ignoble and paltry articles as tables and chairs? reiterates Skepticism, driven to its last entrenchments.

The cavil is puerile and disingenuous; for everyone who has seen or heard anything on the subject is aware, by this time, that it is not tables and chairs alone, but any and every species of article composed of inert matter, by which the same species of phenomena can be and is reproduced. As for greater and more important things not being used for the purpose, the reason already given is obvious, since the sole object of giving intelligent motion to inert matter is to prove, *by the impossibility* of the fact, the co-operation of an invisible, intelligent agency; it being every atom as impossible for a chair, a stool, or a hat to nod and answer, or rise up in the air by its own unaided action, as for a house or a church steeple, it may naturally be concluded, that the stool or the hat may be selected as more convenient for the purpose than the house or the steeple.

But there is another reason less obvious. The nature of the evidence is such that it is absolutely indispensable that each individual should obtain it for himself. No intelligent person can possibly accept it implicitly on the testimony of others, be they ever so trusted or so trustworthy. The utmost second-hand evidence can effect, in their case, is to induce curiosity and research. Hence it becomes indispensable that the phenomena should be easily and conveniently producible, since it is requisite that it should be incessantly and universally reiterated. The most familiar and common-place objects being equally available for the purpose in view as the rarest and most inaccessible, it is entirely consistent with supreme wisdom that the first should be selected in preference to the second, the phenomena being thus placed within the reach of the poorest peasant, no less than of the wealthiest peer.

It may be objected that familiar physical marvels may prove the fact of spiritual existence and communications, but that they can do little more. There are others, too, who will declare, like my literary friend, that if inferior, ignorant, and puerile spirits more generally respond to men than entities of a lofty order,

their acquaintance can hardly be esteemed worth cultivating, and their instructions can still less be expected to contribute to the enlightenment of mankind. To this the reply is simple. The physical phenomena are the means, not the end. They are not intended to afford any other enlightenment than that of evidence. They are simply the corroborative testimony of the fact of spiritual intercourse and Divine inspiration. It is the same with the communications of inferior spirits; they are not destined to enlighten, but to *prove* the return of the departed. The inspiration of a higher order is communicated in a very different manner, and under totally converse conditions. This, the supreme boon of revelation, is reserved, like all that God in His justice and wisdom decrees, for the chosen ones who deserve it best and are most capable of bringing it to full fruition by the purity and loftiness of their aspirations and the receptive power of their intellectual faculties. These nobler natures may alone hope for communications of a superior description, and for the intercourse of spirits of a high degree and possessing supreme knowledge.

But in order that these communications should obtain the influence and the authority which we believe they are destined to acquire, it is indispensable that their spiritual origin should be authenticated by evidence capable of accrediting them to human minds. Hence the necessity of the revelation coming in a double form, that of evidence tantamount to demonstration, and of lofty intellectual illumination.

All spiritualists of a high order are aware that the table rapping and other physical demonstrations cease to be the accompaniment of spiritual communications as soon as the minds of adepts are absolutely convinced of the facts, and seldom return except in case new doubts arise in their minds, or they are desirous of convincing neophytes. This results from natural causes, like all the other physical phenomena, which are no violation of a law of nature, since spiritual evocations and intercourse are no new miraculous power granted to man, but simply a development of the powers originally latent within him, providentially revealed at the hour when it has become necessary that what was only known to the favoured few should be universally divulged to the mass.

Hence, when a *lofty* mind is convinced of the facts, it is ripe for higher spiritual intercourse. It aspires intensely to the supreme light which has dawned before its mental vision; it supplicates for greater and higher revelation. Higher and purer spirits are thus attracted. As a necessary consequence, inferior entities are compelled to withdraw, since, wherever spirits of an elevated description congregate, evil or impure ones are pretty sure to be excluded.

Thus, by a natural law, physical phenomena are replaced by that form of spiritual intercourse which is denominated in the present day mental impression, unless it is spiritual dictation, the more ordinary method which is resorted to.

There are some too, more highly favoured still, either in consequence of intellectual power and lucidity of a high and peculiar description, of exceptional virtues, or aspirations whose disinterested, unworldly aims and spiritual intensity render them no less rare. To these elect it is conceded that their latent spiritual perceptions may become so highly developed, even in their carnal condition, as to enable them to anticipate the faculties of the disembodied soul, and to behold the, to us, invisible spiritual world, and converse directly with its inmates, independently of any of the customary adjuncts.

In *résumé*, the new revelation differs from those which have preceded it, chiefly in the evidence by which it is made manifest,—evidence which is adapted, with supreme judgment, to the requirements of a scientific age, which nothing but irrefragable demonstration can convince. It differs likewise in another characteristic, no less incontestably wise and providential; namely, the vast advance which it makes beyond all that has hitherto been vouchsafed to men for their information and guidance.

In this respect it is clearly adapted to the developed knowledge and reason which are now so rapidly gathering around us. Nothing has ever approached the nature of the evidence now afforded, in regard to its universality, its supreme conviction, and the vast and glorious perspectives it opens to progressive humanity. Imagination can scarcely conceive, nor reason embrace, the stupendous horizon that is now in process of revelation to the world at large. Meanwhile, one truth at least results from the present stage of the investigation; *i. e.*, that there are no limits assignable by our finite conceptions to the heavenly faculties and transcendent spiritual light to which men may attain, even in this material world. In other words, it becomes evident to all reasoning minds which have taken the trouble to ascertain the facts, that the spiritual program me is no myth, and that, in sober earnest, nothing is impossible to man.

One reserve, however, qualifies the sublime boon. Men cannot obtain it in its higher aspects unsought, develop it without persevering self-exertion, or conquer its loftiest privileges without special aptitude, high moral worth, and aspirations of the purest and most elevated spiritual intensity,—conditions which render the best gifts of the new revelation absolutely unattainable to the sordid, the narrow-minded, the worldly, the unintellectual, the frivolous, and the base. To the vulgar herd, spiritually not temporally speaking, the general evidence will be afforded which may enable them to realize the main truths that concern the soul, and are sufficient to point the way to higher things and to moral transformation. But not till that transformation is radically effected will the supreme glory of Divine light dawn upon their gross perceptions, materialized as they

are by their animal propensities, carnal frailties, and sordid instincts.

Should there be any who thoughtlessly inquire why, if Divine revelation be a truth, it should not fulminate mankind with the unchangeable splendour of sunlight, I reply, that the answer has already been given here, and is afforded to them by every law whose operations they behold around, no less than by every page of history and every rational conclusion. It is clearly God's will that every step of physical and moral advancement, in the career of reasonable and responsible beings, should be worked out, or at least furthered, by their own intelligent, zealous, and persistent efforts. When they have done their best, He will doubtless come to their assistance, but not till then. In point of fact, the French axiom, "Help yourself and God will help you," is evidently the complete *résumé* of His providential government. If we look around us, we shall see that nothing which possesses any intrinsic value, that no personal merit or acquirement of any description, can be obtained by any other means than our own exertions. Millionaires, peers, and princes find it alike beyond their power to purchase brains, genius, or moral excellence.

If we look back, we shall see that no onward movement of civilization, that no moral or Divine revelation, has ever been granted to men under any other conditions. Was the world indoctrinated at one fell swoop by the inspired teachings of Christ? Did they not work their way onward to credit and to sway in the identical manner that Spiritualism is doing in the present day? Were they not withstood and rejected for several centuries by the great majority of society, and especially contested by all the wrong-headed and presumptuous *savants* and philosophers of that age, precisely in the same ratio as Spiritualism is contested by the obstinate and arrogant scientific minds of this? Did not a Plotinus, a Porphyry, a Celsus, the whole reigning school of the new Platonicians, *et hoc genus omne*, ridicule and revile that revelation with no less virulence than the parachute wits of the present clay? the only perceptible difference in the two cases being, the infinite superiority of the former in causticity and logic to their feeble modern emulators; and the only similarity between them being the signal *fiasco* which will infallibly attend the antagonism of the last no less than of the first. I say infallibly, not from any presumption of infallibility on my part, in emulation of that of the omniscient critics in question, but simply from my positive certitude of the facts, and the logical deduction that one single voice that whispers truth has greater power than those of a million who vociferate falsehood, inasmuch as, truth being eternal and immutable, it can never be quenched, silenced, or refuted by any amount of ridicule or clamour.

Spiritualists may therefore boldly maintain their opinions, with the certainty that the future will amply compensate them in all ways for the petty annoyances to which the propagators of every novel theory are invariably subjected. There is a French proverb which says, "*Rira bien quirira le dernier*;" *Anglicè*, "He laughs best who laughs last." Time will show which of the two parties is likely to have the best of the argument in this sense, no less than in all others. One thing is certain at all events, that when the tables *are* turned, as we who have ascertained the truth are fully assured they will be, never will a discomfiture be more complete or more humiliating than that of our opponents, or a triumph more supreme than that of the bold hearts and clear intellects which have dauntlessly taken their stand upon demonstration, and defied all insult, all mockery, all moral persecution, scientific arrogance, and vociferation to silence them. Well may they take their stand on the position they have intelligently conquered and energetically maintained, and say with Galileo and posterity, "*Eppur si muove.*"

There is much more of the deepest interest connected with Spiritualism which escapes the ken of superficial observers, but which the limits and the aim of these pages preclude me from doing more than alluding to here. It is evidently the key of all that has hitherto appeared enigmatical and inexplicable in the history and faith of all nations and all ages.

It has been well remarked by the erudite director of the *Revue Spiritualiste* of Paris, that the new light now bursting on the world clearly points to the fact that every preceding revelation has been based on truth Divinely communicated to men; that the gross superstitions, absurdities, and abuses which have subsequently overlaid them are human excrescences not originally contemplated by their inspired founders, and that each revelation has been evidently adapted by its form and expression to the zone and race for which it was intended, in order to give it life and efficiency.

It may be added that this is but another illustration of the law which we behold in operation throughout the universe—variety in unity. That this philosophical view is correct, those who care to investigate such unworldly matters may easily assure themselves. There is, I believe, no existing record of a religion established among a civilized nation, that is to say, among a race whose intelligence has reached a degree of development which renders it susceptible of receiving the higher truths of Divine inspiration, which is not traceable up to the great fact of the one supreme Creator—alone, increate, omnipotent, unrivalled, unapproachable. In every form of polytheism, even the most exaggerated and debased, the same great root forms the foundation-stone of the whole superstructure. Thus even under the fanaticism of the Hindoo creed, this grossest of polytheisms, we find the great Brahm, the unique, the eternal. So with Bouddhism, with Lamaism, with the belief of the Egyptians, with Sabaism, Islamism, etc. Other features distinctive of all these ancient forms of revelation, which clearly

mark their affinity to each other and to the present influx, are the Divine inspiration on which they are all avowedly based, and the spiritual phenomena which have ever attested the superhuman illumination of their profits, and have accompanied their manifestations whenever they have broken out. It is no less remarkable, and evidently providential likewise, that these wide-spread and sudden outbursts of spiritual illumination and phenomena have invariably taken place at epochs of transition and moral degradation, when the preceding revelation had ceased to find credence among the superior intellects of the educated classes of society, whose Skepticism, filtering down through the mass, renders the popular creed powerless any longer to influence the feelings or the conduct of the majority, and when, as the inevitable consequence, materialism and its accompanying temporal lusts, sordid passions, and unmitigated egotism have invaded and corrupted society at large.

These are considerations which might and ought to suggest themselves to every reasoning mind that studies history and psychological phenomena, past and present, with intelligence and earnestness, but there are others, if possible, still more striking, which fall less within the reach of ordinary observers.

When occupied with these investigations, I had occasion, in my cosmopolite wanderings, to discuss these subjects with learned individuals of many races and creeds. I was greatly surprised to find that among all, without exception, the tradition of spiritual intercourse is believed and maintained by those most versed in the recondite tenets of their faith, not alone in the past, but in the present day. Justly reasoning from analogy, I make no doubt that the same fact may be verified throughout the far East, by any one whose opportunities of investigation may be still more extensive than mine. To mention a few of the instances that came under my own observation: My friend the Turkish ambassador, once convinced of the facts, placed himself in communication with some of the most venerated and erudite dervishes of Stamboul on the subject. They informed him that his discovery was no novelty to them, for that the holy men of their sect had been in possession of the secret of communicating with spirits for twelve hundred years.

I myself, previous to this, on going to visit the howling dervishes, at Scutari, instantly perceived that the inauguration of the ceremony was entirely a spiritual evocation. Incense was burned in a sensor before the chief dervish and his two principal assistants, precisely as we read of in the magical operations in the "Arabian Nights," while all three prayed inwardly and with Moslem solemnity for a quarter of an hour, the remainder of the confraternity muttering in the interim a sort of chant. But this was not all. The sequel fully confirmed my first observation, and converted the surmise into certainty. Previous to that part of the ceremony when the dervishes cut and transpierce themselves with knives, poniards, and hooks, *every one* of the fanatics who took part in this performance went up to the head dervish, who *magnetized each in succession*, palpably, and incontestably, after the most approved fashion of modern magnetizers; first taking hold of the hands and pressing the thumbs between his own for a few moments; then stroking him down with both hands on the cheeks, shoulders, and thighs, gazing fixedly into his eyes the whole time,—an operation which took between seven and eight minutes for each individual. I need not remind those who know anything of magnetism, that less time is requisite to induce magnetic effects with some subjects, and even trance, with clairvoyants and those who are in *rapport* with magnetizers.

At the close of the ceremony, three infant children were brought in for the chief dervish to heal. He was a large, tall, corpulent old man. The babies were laid on the carpet at his feet. They were from a few weeks to two or three months old. Two assistants then helped him to mount upon their bodies, having done which they withdrew, leaving him standing with one foot full on the chest, and the other on the stomach of the infant, which, as if purposely, kept smiling and crowing during the entire five or six minutes that this perilous feat was protracted. Three times it was repeated, the baby each time being carried away in the mother's arms, without having shed a tear or uttered a cry, though wide awake, laughing, and evidently uninjured,—an absolute impossibility, had not some occult influence preserved it from harm; for under ordinary circumstances the ponderous weight of the old man must inevitably have crushed in the stomach and chest of the infant, and have broken its feeble bones. As for deceit or delusion, there neither was nor could have been any capable of eluding my eyes, for I was seated with various other spectators, on a low step within a couple of yards of the dervish, watching his naked feet the whole time, placed as they were full on the top of the babies' bodies, his arms, the while, crossed on his chest, and nothing whatever within reach to take any portion of his weight off his human pedestal. Yet so dull are the generality of observers, that these strange facts, and their elucidation, scarcely attract more than a cursory word from travellers, and not one, I believe, has remarked the details I have previously given.

Had I known nothing of Spiritualism till that hour, I should then have made it a point to look into it, so self-evident was it to me that only by some occult agency could the singular performance I had witnessed have been thus innocuously achieved.

Discussing the topic subsequently with the then Seraskier of the Porte, a very learned and sagacious Moslem of the old school, in whose house I was staying on a visit, he informed me that it was a fact only

known to the initiated in the deepest mysteries of Islam, that certain individuals have always possessed the secret of communicating with the spiritual world, and, moreover, of receiving direct inspiration from God; that the means are a mystery scrupulously concealed from the profane; that they can and do communicate it occasionally, but only to adepts of the holiest lives, the purest aims, and the loftiest aspirations, and seldom, except at the point of death when they are desirous of transmitting it to a disciple and successor; while no money, no bribe, can purchase it from them. One of the first preparations to facilitate the operation of their superhuman gifts and the mysterious agencies they call into action, the Pacha informed me, is intense asceticism. Most of these individuals, he assured me, reduced their corporeal requirements to the extreme of human abstinence, some gradually reducing their food till they brought themselves to live upon a single date a day. More, he either could not or would not tell me.

Since then, questioning the Jews in the Levant and in Morocco, I have found that they hold exactly the same creed. They, too, assured me that there are still holy men among their Rabbis and most religious sects, who, being absolutely detached from all temporal lusts, and leading a perfectly pure, religious, and ascetic life, obtain the faculty of receiving direct inspiration from God, and performing miracles by prayer and volition, aided by superhuman agencies. It is supposed likewise, that they possess a secret by means of which they attain to these gifts, and which is never divulged to any but adepts, and then under certain solemn conditions. Many extraordinary narratives are treasured up of the actions of these holy men.

In Algeria, I found the identical belief prevalent among the natives. Moreover, in addition to many an extraordinary tale, recounted of their marabouts, or saints, there still exist there two famous Zaouias (the name of certain religious institutions where dervishes and priests reside and are educated). One of these is situated in Grand Kabylia, the members of which profess openly to hold communion with the spiritual world, and where persons of holy aspirations retire, and in order to obtain visions of direct intercourse with superhuman entities, and miraculous gifts; give themselves up to an ascetic life, a condition apparently greatly conducive to this result, probably by etherealizing the body as much as possible, and thus by disembarassing it of much of its material grossness, facilitating the development of spiritual perceptions.

I need not here allude to the more current traditions of the Catholic saints, but I cannot forbear pointing out the remarkable coincidence between the spiritual phenomena recorded of them and those which attend spiritual mediums in the present day. In half the convents of Italy are to be seen pictures representing St. Francis of Assisi, St. Bruno, St. Catherine of Sienna, etc., etc., rising into the air, in a state of trance, before their astonished communities; representations founded on the traditions handed down in their convents. This is precisely the parachute phenomenon which has been repeatedly witnessed in the present day, in the case of Mr. Home and other powerful mediums, affirmed, as the wits declare, by persons whose testimony is in all ways unexceptionable, when not given in favour of facts to which these gentlemen are pleased to take exception.

I have often heard it observed by determined skeptics, who had read the famous writings of St. Theresa from curiosity, celebrated, as they are among Catholics, for their unction and eloquence, that there was one startling characteristic pervading them which had taken them by surprise, namely, the supreme conviction which inspires every line. The accents of impassioned truth in which she narrates her visions, and the heavenly raptures derived from the presence of her superhuman visitants in her convent cell, are generally admitted to bear se striking an impress of veracity and reality, that it is hardly possible, when reading them, to attribute the whole to imposture or self-delusion.

The mystery is now solved—as is many another problem, past, present, and future, that has hitherto baffled explanation—by the sublime revelations of Spiritualism. It is the great Isis of antiquity; "all that is, that was, and is to be; whose veil no mortal had ever lifted." It is the source of every ancient prophecy, of every miracle, of every oracle, of every wonder that history has ever recorded. It is the wisdom of the magi; the secret of the hierophants and gymnosophists of Egypt; of the mysteries of Eleusis, of Mithra, and of Trophonius; the illumination of Pythagoras; the demon of Socrates; the inspiration of Plato; the ring of Solomon. Its invisible and fluid entities are the gods and demigods of every mythology. They are the nymphs, naiads, fauns, sylvans, and satyrs of Greece. They are the lares and penates, the manes and lemures of Rome; the valkynes and nomas, the gnomes, elves, fairies, sylphs, brownies, vampires, latins of the North, and the peris, genii, houris, and afreets of the East. Their occult agencies are the wand of Merlin, the lore of the sibyls, the Druids, and the augurs; the demonology and witchcraft of the middle ages; the miracle-workers of Apollonius, of the apostles and the saints of Mahomet and Albertus Magnus, of Paracelsus, Cagliostro, and the Count of St. Germans, no less than of Hindoo and Arabian sorcerers. They are the doctrine of the *illuminati*, the conviction and strength of the martyrs. In a word, spiritual agency is the key of every enigma, and the explanation of every phenomenon at which short-sighted *savants* and skeptics have strained and revolted from the earliest dawn of scientific arrogance to its full development in its present noonday, and with which baffled science, from the days of Herodotus and Aristotle down to those of Professor Faraday, has invariably failed to grapple.

If these conclusions are sweeping, they are not the less founded on logical and warrantable deductions.

Those who take the trouble to verify the facts with unprejudiced eyes, and who read the darkness of the past by the light of the present, will be able to affirm them, if they study both with reasoning and careful investigation. They will find, on looking deeper into the question, that in all avowedly superhuman phenomena, in ancient as in modern times, the evocation and the indication of spirit presence was the indispensable and universal preliminary. Thus Pythia could pronounce no oracle till the laurel-tree beside the grotto *shook its branches spontaneously*, to announce the arrival of the invisible. The brazen basins or cymbals, suspended on the trees of Dodona, *sounded untouched*, previous to the oracle's transmission, evidently for the same purpose. The apparitions and communications in the imitations of Eleusis and Mithra, the visions and prophetic dreams in the cave of Trophonius, in the fanes of Æsculapius and other gods, were all the sequel of spiritual invocations. Throughout the entire history of revelation and occult science from the remotest records of mythology and history, spiritual evocations and spontaneous evidence of spiritual agency may be traced in one unbroken sequence, as the method adopted by every thaumaturgist, and as the generating action of all occult and superhuman phenomena that have ever fallen under the observation of men, and been transmitted to a wondering and skeptical posterity by their written or oral traditions.

Before bringing this dissertation to a conclusion, there is one remaining point on which I think it not irrelevant nor unimportant to dwell, for the enlightenment of those who, only knowing Spiritualism by name, might perhaps imagine that the new revelation, confirming the debated question of the Divine inspiration of its predecessors, may claim to be the consecration and confirmation of the superstitions and the illogical absurdities which priestcraft and human presumption have interpolated in them all, and which even in our day, are foisted upon the human understanding as an integral part of the original dispensation, consequently, as Divine truth. The reverse is the case, as reason tells us must be, with all that proceeds from God. The abdication of our reasoning faculties in favour of tenets which every conclusion of sound logic demonstrates to be contradictory, absurd, and immoral, hence, necessarily at variance with every Divine attribute, is a requisition evidently incompatible with the wisdom, justice, and truth of the Almighty. That we should place trust in His supreme goodness and omniscience is totally different from the egregious demand upon our faith exacted by theologians of all creeds, who tell us that we have no right to question His decisions, and that He has a right to do what He pleases, because He is omnipotent; a strange method, certainly, of extenuating the crimes and blunders laid to His charge in writings reputed Divine, notwithstanding the intrinsic evidence of human passions and human ignorance which they afford.

It is hardly conceivable that any rational person should seriously urge so shallow and untenable an argument as that God has a right to do what He pleases simply because there is no judge above Him to call Him to account for His actions, which is the true interpretation of the theory of justification by omnipotence. Its real bearing is to impute to God the same unwarrantable abuse of force as that which disgraces and condemns human autocrats, and accusing Him of justifying it by the basest, the most illogical, and the most revolting of all arguments, the "reason of the strongest." In a word, it is reducing God to a level with the ruthless Czar, or the sanguinary King Bomba.

It is quite conceivable that God, leaving men to the exercise of that free volition with which He has endowed them, in order to enable them to acquire that moral and intellectual merit which even omnipotence *could not* give them, unless they acquire it by their own exertions, and by their own intelligent selection between good and evil, should turn their own crimes, errors, and follies to account for His providential purposes, as we daily see around us; but it is inconceivable and inadmissible, on any plea of expediency, omnipotence, or prescience, that He should originate, ordain, or favour their evil instincts, guilty deeds, and ignorant blunders.

Fortunately for the futurity of Spiritualism, and the great consolation, happiness, and enlightenment which it promises to mankind, it is not these obsolete and irrational tenets which it comes to confirm and approve. Everywhere the sublime and glorious truths discovered by spiritual entities of lofty hierarchies, destroy all these abominations, and combine to divulge revelations of a nature so sublime, so perfect, so stupendous, so logically conformable to every Divine attribute, that nothing the human imagination has ever conceived, or its loftiest ambition aspired to, can surpass or image the glory of the providential scheme which is now first dawning on man's limited and clouded horizon.

This much briefly resumed of spiritual doctrines and illumination to rectify any misconception on the part of the uninitiated as to the theoretical bearing of Spiritualism, or the nature of the recantation of Scepticism avowed by the author of these pages. While admitting the fact of spiritual intercourse, on incontestable evidence, were the spiritual entities, who testify their presence by the physical phenomena around us, to endorse the dismal credos of the past, I should assuredly be as little disposed to give them credit for a Divine authority as I should be to accept the fiat of another Hildebrand or another Loyola, against the testimony of reason, even if the days when popes and saints were reckoned infallible could ever return. Such, however, is not the alternative thrust upon us. To all those who have sought to dive into its deeper mysteries with sincere and

lofty aspirations, and with minds unbiassed by preconceived prejudices, and a *parti pris* as to certain rooted sectarian ideas, the information conveyed is such as must convince any intelligent mind that the advent of this new influx of Divine revelation is specially destined to convince a scientific age of the tangible reality of truths, whose unapproachable splendour has hitherto only flashed in faint and uncertain gleams across the purest souls and the grandest intellects.

Before dismissing the topic for the present, there are two remaining categories of antagonists, who take their stand on special grounds, which it is likewise necessary to refute, not having hitherto had occasion to allude to them.

The first, question the fact that any Divine revelation has ever been granted to man, on the plea that the evidence upon which this truth has been hitherto accepted, is not sufficiently unquestionable to amount to demonstration, and revelation, in their eyes, stands in that dubious light which, in legal parlance, is denominated "*not proven*." The second are that novel branch of rationalistic materialists, who entitle themselves utilitarians, and who contest the necessity or use of any revelation whatever.

The objections of the first are justifiable and intelligible, on the score already discussed; namely, that the evidence hitherto afforded as sufficient for the mass, has been outgrown by the rapid strides of the last two centuries. The second are at variance with all philosophy, science, analogy, logic, and common sense, no less than with themselves. Starting from the premise, that physical improvement advances in a geometrical ratio with a progressive world, and that the moral perceptions of humanity become ameliorated and civilized with the improvement of its material conditions, they assume that revelation is supererogatory, on the plea that, when prosperity becomes more general, physical obstacles being modified or removed, and pauperism extinguished, improved laws, greater philanthropy, and more enlightened science will enable mankind to obviate so large a proportion of the evils which now afflict it, that the human race may attain to felicity and comparative perfection on this earth, without the aid of any revelation whatever.

Few evidences of providential agency have struck me more forcibly than the insuperable difficulties which forbid reason to disprove a truth, or to demonstrate a falsehood. To this are attributable the glaring fallacies into which the finest minds lapse, when they attempt either of these logical impossibilities. One most remarkable oversight of this description occurs, to evidence my postulate, in a recent pamphlet on utilitarianism, due to one of the noblest intellects of our day—Stuart Mill. After elucidating the theory of physical progress and moral perfectibility, and deducing thence the prospect of a general felicity originated by purely human causes, independent of any providential interposition whatever, he states, that "Good laws are the first necessity of civilized communities, since without law, no *security* can exist." While, failing security, there can be no happiness for reasoning beings, since they can otherwise reckon on nothing beyond the enjoyment of the present moment,—a species of satisfaction which could only content unreflecting animals. Strange to say, he fails to see that this one admission upsets his entire theory of possible happiness for intelligent beings, independently of immortality or revelation, since the *primary security* most essential of all others to happiness, *that of life*, is precisely the point which no amount of physical improvement can ever insure. Not all the sanitary ameliorations and advanced science he boasts can ever guarantee to men immunity from the fatality or accident which may send either themselves or those they love best, prematurely to the other world, at a second's notice.

Hence, the first of all securities, that of existence, being wholly unattainable in this world, under any conditions of material or moral advancement, happiness is no less beyond the reach of intellectual beings, on any other conditions than those of a reasoned conviction of immortality.

There is another striking point entirely overlooked by the advocates of utilitarianism, which is equally destructive of all their conclusions; namely, that with loftier and more widely propagated intellectual development, spiritual aspirations and perceptions augment and deepen in the same ratio. As the intellect becomes more enlightened and more refined, its instincts and feelings become perpetually more exalted, acute, and profound. The mind embraces a wider radius and purer aims, while its aspirations to immortality and progress become more absorbing, more intense, and more soaring, with every successive phase of mental development; thus, with the universal diffusion of education, spiritual instincts and affections must ever become more and more widely propagated, and more active and powerful in their operation. Hence, instead of the world becoming a paradise with advancing science, it would approach nearer and nearer to a moral Tartarus, unless the progress of spiritual science kept pace with its physical rivals.

The necessity, therefore, of immortality, implies the necessity of revelation, since the first would be an unjustifiable deception without the second. Immortality implies the responsibility of free and progressive souls. Hence follows the necessity of revelation, since no one can justly be held liable to the penalty of his acts, unless he is duly apprized of the fact; and being warned of their consequences, is thus induced to reject evil and to aspire to excellence. It is unquestionably, therefore, in the highest degree important that men should be assured of the truth, in order to regulate by it their conduct here. It is only on the surmise that both providence and immortality are a delusion, that it can be admitted that revelation would be supererogatory.

On premises as logically incontestable, it can be demonstrated that revelation is an essential concomitant of the dispensations of an omnipotent and perfect being. There is an argument which I do not remember to have seen suggested either by philosophers or theologians, which to any logical mind must, I think, afford absolute demonstration; namely, that admitting the existence of God, He cannot be inferior to our highest conceptions of Him. This stands to reason; for could the human imagination realize anything superior to the nature and attributes of the Divinity, men would virtually surpass Him, since all that failed them to do so, would be, not the will nor the conception, but simply the material power. Hence it follows, that God's providential government of the universe must be a fact, and not a myth, unless we deny that there is a God at all; for evidently, providential government, presupposed to be perfectly just, wise, beneficent, ubiquitous, omniscient, and omnipotent, is incalculably superior, both theoretically and practically, to a government ruled by general laws alone. These can evidently operate efficiently and satisfactorily only when applied to inert matter. Intelligence and free volition necessarily entailing infinite variety of character and adventitious concomitants, no general laws, conceivable or possible, be they framed by God or man, can by any amount of ingenuity or power be adapted to meet the immeasurable modifications, and the extenuating or aggravating circumstances which in justice ought to be weighed in the balance of each individual case. So far, therefore, as they concern the government of free, intelligent beings, they are clearly only a paltry human expedient, destined to supply the deficiency of the Divine prerogatives which are indispensable to the efficient carrying out of the first.

I proceed to illustrate my meaning.

Let us suppose that a human sovereign were supremely good, unselfish, just, and generous; that he were absolutely incapable of permitting any but the most impartial, upright, wise, and elevated motives to impel his actions; that he were, in short, the exact converse of what sovereigns generally are. It would evidently be infinitely more grand, bountiful, and beneficial, that he should inquire into every individual case, administering justice, distributing favour, protection, or condemnation with due consideration for the peculiar circumstances, and the intrinsic character of each several person, including every element which has contributed to bias it. For this, however, it would require the faculties of seeing into men's minds, of weighing their deeds by their genuine intentions, desires, and motives, of attending to myriads of different matters at once, and of seeing, hearing, accomplishing everything one's self, hence, being everywhere at one and the same moment. It need scarcely be pointed out that such a task as this wholly exceeds the limits of human life, capacity, knowledge, and power. Hence, recourse has been judiciously and indispensably had to general laws, by which much injustice, much suffering, and much evil is necessarily occasioned, since they cannot possibly be adapted to every individual case, but which is nevertheless infinitely preferable to the futile and pernicious attempt to carry out what it is far beyond man's power to put in practice,—a fact of which we possess the daily illustration in the miserably inefficient and evil working of all so-called paternal or autocratic governments.

But an expedient is only acceptable *faute de mieux*, or conceivable, on the plea of the impossibility of doing better. Is there any rational, upright, and conscientious being who would select the imperfect in preference to the perfect? or any philanthropic mind which, having it in its power to confer vast benefits on humanity, and the option of two methods whereby to effect it, the one being capable of doing some good, tempered with a large proportion of evil, and the other effecting the *ne plus ultra* of good, without any admixture of evil at all, would, in full discernment, select the first in preference to the last?

Should there be any one so blind as to contest the fact that providential government, under those Divine conditions which can alone render it efficient, practical, and perfect, would be infinitely superior to a government by general laws, I would propose the following query:—

Let us suppose a bishop full of philanthropy, disinterestedness, and wisdom,—in a word, the precise converse of bishops in general. He establishes the most sagacious general laws for the government and guidance of his diocesans. He provides for their spiritual and temporal wants, *en masse*, as far as in him lies. He lays down general directions of all descriptions, for the enlightenment, and assistance of the good, the reformation and reprobation of the evil. He omits nothing, in short, which judicious general laws can do to ameliorate their moral and physical condition. In the neighborhood there lives a model clergyman, one of those professors of Christianity who practises charity instead of only preaching it. He, instead of laying down general laws, visits every cottage and every household in his parish; makes himself intimately acquainted with the character and history of every one of their inmates (for beneficent, not for interested or prying purposes). Fortunately for his parishioners, he is wealthy, influential, wise, just, and munificent. He personally ascertains the wants and aspirations, the virtues, weaknesses, capacities, and shortcomings of each individual. He metes out to each with judiciousness, impartiality, and benevolence whatever is best suited to the circumstances and the minds of each person, whatever he knows to be best adapted, whether as trial, correction, consolation, or reward, to the faults, the evil tendencies, the afflictions, and the merits of each and all. Will any one venture to deny that the providential ministration of the benevolent clergyman, presupposing it to be perfect and infallible, would be infinitely more beneficial in every respect, moral and temporal, to his parishioners, than the wise



general laws of the sagacious bishop?

What is true, therefore, on a minute scale is no less true on an infinite one, with the advantage on the side of Divinity of being able to carry out the providential system without any of the flaws, errors, and shortcomings inherent to all that is human.

It is evidently quite conceivable that God being supremely good, perfect, wise, and just should govern the reasoning, feeling, and responsible beings He has created by providential care and love, rather than by general laws which amount to leading men on to their destiny, whatever it may be, like a flock of sheep, or straws floating on the stream. It is, moreover, infinitely more just, beneficent, sublime, and glorious thus to govern the universe and its myriads; and since, to a being who possesses the necessary qualifications of omniscience, ubiquitousness, and omnipotence, there can be no difficulty in realizing this stupendous scheme, it cannot be logically supposed that God should give the preference to the inferior and imperfect expedient, *the option being in His power*.

This argument, to my mind at least, amounts to demonstration, and, I trust, will produce the same effect on many another. Following it out in its necessary consequences, it results thence that the immortality of the soul is a certainty, for there can be no providence for intellectual beings, under other conditions. This involves the necessity of revelation; for immortality and the moral responsibility it entails would be, as before stated, an unjustifiable snare, unless men were duly prepared for them, and assured of their truth.

This brings us back to the question previously discussed; *i.e.*, the necessity of revelation being proportioned to the enlightenment of the age, and of its coming in a form, and accompanied by evidence of a nature, fully adequate to authenticate its Divine source and to convince the most sceptical minds.

These requisitions I hope that I have demonstrated Spiritualism completely to fulfil, always starting from the premise that the marvellous manifestations to which I and so many others bear witness, are undeniable facts. For I repeat once more, it is the question of fact which is the turning-point of the entire controversy for the present. If these wonders are facts, no rational person can any longer contest their source or their purpose, unless it be the somewhat prejudiced members of the sacred college, and the disciples of Loyola, the inquisition, and the *propaganda*. These facts it is within the power of every intelligent individual to test and ascertain for himself; and it is assuredly the duty of every one to test them who cares about the future of his soul, or, indeed, about anything except temporal interests and mundane pleasures. They have only to do what I and my friends did,—to give the matter serious and impartial investigation; to devote to it a fair proportion of the time and patience they so liberally consecrate to cricket, or whist, or interesting morning visits and evening re-unions, in order to obtain the evidence for themselves.

To those, however, who find this too great a sacrifice in a matter of such trifling importance as the future condition of their souls, and the revelations of God, I have a few observations to address. As they do not choose to seek the evidence which they can obtain on no other conditions than that of self-exertion, the question of fact must, to them, inevitably remain doubtful. Nevertheless, as hundreds of thousands of educated, intelligent, and disinterested witnesses corroborate these facts, both in the Old World and the New; as they number among their converts some of the brightest intellects and the most brilliant reputations in Europe; as spiritual societies are spreading to such an extent over intelligent, sceptical France, and among the upper classes of quick-witted, brilliant Italy, that the whole Catholic clergy have taken the alarm, and are everywhere vainly endeavouring to stem the tide by multiplying their predications and diatribes against Spiritualism and spiritualists from every pulpit and in every pastoral letter,—it is only a rational conclusion, that in order to progress so rapidly, to spread so wide, and to become so formidable, they must have some ground to stand upon. In other words, it might be clear to any one who reflects at all, that there is at least a very strong probability that there is something in it.

Another sign of the times, which those who are shrewd enough to give certain significant indications their due weight might digest to some purpose, is, that the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" has recently come boldly forward and *proclaimed the certainty* of the spiritual phenomena and intercourse, in a series of articles which have excited world-wide attention among Catholic circles, and which are not yet or only just terminated. I think little of the asseverations of Jesuits or Ultramontanists, where their own interests are concerned; but where the reverse is the case, the value of their testimony is considerably enhanced. In another point of view, moreover, this avowal is in the highest degree significant. For those who do not know it, I have to state that the publication in question is the chief organ of the Roman Catholic party. It aims, as its title implies, to be looked upon as the interpreter of Catholic civilization, the vindicator of the intellect, the erudition, the progressiveness, the enlightenment, and the science of the Catholic Church. It is intended to be a triumphant refutation of the reproaches of obscurantism which are flung in its teeth by its opponents. It is directed by the picked brains of Catholic *savants* and *litterati*. It is the particular organ of the Jesuits, and to its *rédaction* the special talents of the most remarkable writers of that very learned and sagacious body are particularly devoted. When they thus boldly pledge their veracity and brains in attestation of the reality of the physical phenomena, it is very evident that

they must have ascertained them to be facts beyond all question, before they would thus venture to stake their reputation and science on the truth of marvels which it is within the power of all investigators to ascertain, and of which the ultimate and incontestable solution cannot now be long protracted.

This is not a question of a local miracle, which can only be verified in one particular spot, and which is seldom looked into by any other eyes than those of a few devotees. These are matters reproduced in every part of the world, under every possible condition, and among all classes of the social community, throughout the civilized globe. Let those who question these facts look into the correspondence of the French spiritual reviews, and learn there from what vast and increasing groups of spiritualists are scattered over Brazil, the French Antilles, the principal cities of the Levant, Spain, Algeria, France, and Italy. Where this is the case, there is assuredly good reason for concluding that there must be something in it more than smoke.

Two peculiar features in this novel propagandism are specially remarkable; the one is the extraordinarily rapid extension of a belief so marvellous, and so contradictory to the universal tendencies of a scientific and incredulous age; and the other is the ubiquitousness of the manifestations, and the general character of affinity the phenomena present throughout the world. It is only about twelve or fourteen years since the first outburst in America,—a privilege, by the way, which is doubtless attributable to its republican institutions; for, according to high spiritual informants, democracy is the precursor of Spiritualism and the universal abolition of all fictitious distinctions. Hence the establishment of republican institutions throughout our globe, will be the sequel of its general acceptance and the first step to a loftier standard of morality, to genuine prosperity, and the dawn of the higher destinies to which its inhabitants are now about to be called. It is only six years since the first spiritual reviews were established in Paris, and regular spiritual societies organized. Already, as before stated, their ramifications extend all over the Old World, while branch societies are starting up every day like mushrooms throughout the continent. As for the various manifestations and spontaneous spiritual phenomena, they are alluded to daily in every local journal of France and other countries.

How then is this wide-spreading conversion of such vast numbers of intelligent minds to be accounted for? How can this unprecedentedly rapid extension of a belief so absolutely opposed to the universal tendencies of a sceptical and scientific age be effected? What can produce such sudden and irresistible conviction, not in one or two exceptional cases, but among thousands of learned, intellectual, honest, and discriminating individuals, in direct contradiction to their previous convictions and antecedents? Christianity took three hundred years to filter partially and imperfectly through a comparatively insignificant portion of the globe. Islamism owed its rapid propagation mainly to the sword. Mormonism appeals sagaciously to the material interests of the disinherited portion of mankind, offering homes to the houseless, and husbands to all disconsolate and despairing spinsters, who, spurning the uncompromising *tout ou rien* of their unpromising faith, have come to the conclusion that if a part be not better than the whole, it is at least better than nothing.

Pure Spiritualism, on the contrary, offers nothing to its disciples, except the merchandise which is assuredly at the lowest discount in the social market of the nineteenth century; *i.e.*, heavenly, light, spiritual happiness, and information of that world beyond the grave, from whose mystic spheres the most glorious news ever transmitted to humanity would assuredly interest two-thirds of mankind considerably less than the last telegram at Lloyd's, provided their pockets were concerned in it. Far from promising any material gain or advantage, it is, for the present, a service of danger, and a source of obloquy and mortification, to take up the cudgels in its defence, while, temporally speaking, there is everything to lose and nothing to gain by its advocacy, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. What then can be the inducement to imperil one's position, and confront the ridicule and clamour of the multitude, and the insult of the *soi-disant* leading authorities, who, notwithstanding the innumerable contusions they have already received in their hereditary warfare against innovations and facts, and the signal defeats their assumption of omniscience has already undergone, still persist in asserting their infallibility, in defiance of the long list of blunders already recorded against them? What is it or can it be, except the irrefragable and irresistible demonstration of tangible fact, and the certitude, thereby attained, that the future will fully and incontestably demonstrate the truth of all that we have witnessed and assert, to the unspeakable confusion and humiliation of our obstinate, shallow, and presumptuous adversaries?

It is, logically speaking, altogether inadmissible, to surmise that hundreds of thousands of perfectly sane people, educated and civilized, should be labouring under the identical delusion concerning a creed which bases all its affirmations on a simple question of tangible, physical facts, which it urges every one to test for themselves, and which every one who arrives at conviction has tested, and continues to test for himself. It will no doubt be urged in reply, that there have been such epidemics before; that the Camisards of the Cevennes rose up in thousands, proclaiming their spiritual intercourse and inspiration; that thousands, too, were burned as witches, who avowed their convictions of spiritual, or as they then miscalled it, demoniacal intercourse ages before; that in the last century we had the famous convulsionists of St. Medard, etc. To this the answer is even more simple; namely, that these thousands were labouring under no delusion or hallucination whatever, and that what was laid to that score was simply direct spiritual intercourse of an inferior and pernicious description, as

the present revelations prove. Whence we may deduce that such a thing as collective hallucinations on questions of positive fact are a logical and mathematical impossibility, as reason alone suffices to assure us, among sane and intelligent people, and more especially when the same supposed hallucinations are reproduced independently and simultaneously, under all kinds of circumstances, among all classes of society, and in the most remote and dissimilar regions of the globe,—particularities specially characteristic of the present spiritual influx, to an unprecedented extent.

Under such conditions, delusion is altogether impossible and inconceivable, on any question, much less on one of physical fact.

One of the peculiar characteristics of the present manifestations, I have said, is their ubiquitousness and independence of each other. The instances of this remarkable feature of the new dispensation are too numerous to be cited here; but one remarkable episode of spiritual influx is too singular to allow me to pass it over in silence, more especially narrated and attested as it is, by the most determined adversaries of Spiritualism. The society of the Catholic propaganda publish a monthly account of the labours of its missionaries throughout the globe, under the title of "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith." In number 216, for the month of September, 1864, published at Lyons, there is a graphic account, by an eye-witness, of a great spiritual manifestation which broke out last year at Madagascar, previous to the death of King Radama II. The writer describes it as having first displayed itself in the south of Emirne, where suddenly bands of people had been seized with convulsions, and received a mission from the deceased queen-mother Ranavalona, to come and speak to the king in her name. The missionary narrator declares that "the epidemic has just burst like a bomb on the capital, Tanariva," and that while he is writing, thousands of these fanatics are encamped at Machasina, where they make such a noise as to prevent every one sleeping at two leagues' distance. He proceeds to state, that on Holy Tuesday, when a great review took place, more than one thousand soldiers left the ranks and began dancing, one of the features of the *obsession*; and that, no menace availing, it was necessary to stop the review. He describes the epidemic as commencing with convulsions, pains, and hallucinations, *unaccountable to science*, after which "*the living enter into communication with the dead.*" They then see Queen Ranavalona, Radama I., and other high personages deceased, who "speak to them, and give them various commissions," most of them specially directed to Radama II. The missionary *naïvely* adds, that "they appear specially deputed by the old queen" to signify to her son to return to the old regime, and to drive out the whites, with other minor details,—an avowal which, as the requisition involved the downfall of Catholicity, to which the old regime was opposed, and the exclusion of the priesthood, comes amusingly to attest the veracity of the narrator. One particularity he notes as most inexplicable, viz., that numbers carry jars of water on their heads, to drink from, which said jars stick on their heads "as immovable as if they were nailed to them, notwithstanding their most convulsive springs and bounds,"—a fact only to be explained on the same principle which can retain a carcel lamp immovable on a table tilted up at an angle of forty-five degrees.

These singular manifestations at Madagascar took place as late as the holy week of last year, and were followed by the assassina- tion of Radama II., who thus, it appears, was not warned without good reason by his spiritual friends,—a fact which I presume it is as difficult to deny as that this strange outburst of spiritual phenomena among the blacks of Madagascar can hardly be attributed to the contagious influence of spiritual propagandism, nor can the authenticity be contested, as the evidence is furnished by its most inveterate opponents.

Thus from all parts of the world concurrent testimony is converging, to the demonstration of the marvellous phenomena which is now becoming more general every day, in order to corroborate the Divine inspiration of the new revelation and the great truths promulgated by its delegated adepts.

That a large portion of the English public should be still ignorant of the vast movement now in progress throughout the Continent, is only to be expected from their antecedents and their character. If they do not actually parody in words the famous dictum of the *Grand Monarque*, "*L'état c'est moi*," practically they certainly act up to the conviction, *I'univers c'est moi*. If, as individuals, the English can be munificent and charitable in money, more especially when their names figure in a long subscription list beside my Lord This and the Duke of That, collectively, there is certainly no nation so entirely wrapt up in self-adoration and self-interest, so cold, exclusive, and unsympathising in its foreign policy, and so completely absorbed by lucre and material aims. Hence, there is no country and no people so inaccessible to novel theories and generous ideas. When the Utopian but lofty programme of French republicans thrilled every superior mind and generous heart in continental Europe, they found no other response than ridicule in England: the English say, they have too much sound sense to accept Utopias; but if the Utopias had promised any profitable percentage or flattering speculations, they would doubtless not have found the English quite so sensible, or so indifferent to them.

Among a nation who offer up their incense to the golden calf, in preference to all intellectual and spiritual altars, it cannot be matter for wonder that Spiritualism should penetrate least and last of any other. This is no reason, however, for ignoring the fact of the extraordinary progress of the new revelation among continental

nations, infinitely more quick-witted, sceptical, sharp, and penetrating than the English, *en masse*, and who boast, now as always, many of the greatest *savants* and the deepest thinkers in Europe. Those who question this, among the presumed frivolous French, will do well to read *Jean Reynaud* (not *Renan*), and to ask themselves how many Englishmen there have been in the past, or there exist in the present, who are capable of electrifying the philosophical world with thoughts so profound, a logic so splendid, and speculations so sublime, as those assembled in his last work, celebrated throughout France, entitled "*Terre et Ciel*,"—a philosophical treatise specially interesting at the present moment, confirming as it does every spiritual theory on grounds of pure logic, laid down by a scientific man, not himself a professed adept, or a believer in the spiritual phenomena,—an anomaly evidently providentially originated in order to give greater weight to the independent and unbiassed testimony of one of the most powerful of contemporary intellects.

One evidence results unquestionably from all this concurrent testimony; *i.e.*, that there is at least room for doubt. Those who do not think it worth while to clear up the doubt for their own benefit, ought at least to remember that if there be anything in it at all, that anything is Divine revelation; hence, that if the punishment of the indifferent and the worldly may be chiefly the deprivation of that Divine light and supreme consolation it was in their power to obtain, they can scarcely hope to be held guiltless, or to be let off so cheap, if they venture to ridicule and revile it in their presumptuous ignorance, and thus to deter others from investigation and conviction. In a doubtful case it is always well to be on the safe side, and I recommend the parachute wits and their disciples to take this axiom to heart.

I need hardly remind them either that there has never been any revelation, whether physical or spiritual, which has not been ridiculed or pooh-poohed by the shallow wits and the so-called *savants* of the day. But I venture to ask them, how would the Faradays and the Voltairians of the last century have demolished the scientific discoveries of the last twenty or thirty years, and hat cutting sarcasms and merry puns they themselves would have made some fifty or sixty years ago, upon express trains and electric telegraphs? In fact, it is a striking characteristic of ignorance, folly, and presumption, to find everything ridiculous or absurd which is above their comprehension or beyond their knowledge. I never remember to have seen any one laugh so heartily as a Bosnian peasant, whose intelligence I took upon me to enlighten by telling him a few of the wonders of steam. I recommend these gentlemen to take this hint to heart likewise, and to take heed, too, lest they should not be classed pretty nearly in the same category as the merry Bosnian, at no very distant date,—a possibility which is likely to be realized much sooner, perhaps, than even spiritualists calculate.

Having, I sincerely flatter myself, distributed a few wholesome corrections, and some tolerably severe home-thrusts among our decidedly feeble antagonists, which I am fully assured will tell rather mortify-ingly against them in the future, both in their own estimation and that of the public, however little impression they may make on them at present, I address myself now to another class of individuals, to whom I am desirous likewise of administering a valedictory admonition; namely, the cowardly time-servers who have not the courage to avow their conviction, and the contemptible false witnesses. They are in a still worse case. It might be supposed that among the upper ranks the last category were, at least, wholly exceptional, but such is not the fact. In my brief experience I have met with two despicable instances of individuals whom no one would suspect of such meanness, denying what they had seen, for fear of compromising themselves by admitting their conviction. One was a friend of my own, who, cowed by the authoritative *fiat* of an English ambassadress,—one of those miserable specimens of humanity who disgrace aristocracy; a peeress who distributes her favour according to wealth and pedigree, and distinguishes them by granting one finger to an *attaché*, two to a baronet, three to a lord, and five to an earl,—was so weak and contemptible as to deny all that he had witnessed at my house. Another was an eminent Scotch professor, high in the scientific world, who was present at the remarkable *séance* first narrated in these pages, when the table tilted up at an angle of forty-five degrees, with the carcel lamp on it, and subsequently rose up entirely from the ground, in my literary friend's house. This learned gentleman, not content with being too cowardly to give evidence concerning this *séance*, to which his reputation would have given great weight, was so base as to publish an account of it wherein he suppressed the more surprising phenomena and garbled shamelessly his narration of the rest.

Should either of these two individuals recognise themselves in this brief notice, I can only tell them, and those who may be inclined to imitate their example, that, apart from a meanness for which every honourable mind must feel the most supreme contempt, I would not be in their place for anything the world could offer me, convinced as I am, that if there be one crime which God will visit with supreme reprobation and retribution, it will be the cowardly falseness of those who, having had the evidence proffered to them, are not afraid to bear false witness against His providential dispensations, from paltry worldly motives.

One word more, in conclusion. Among the many reflections suggested to me in the course of these investigations, two or three observations have specially impressed me. One is the extraordinary indifference felt by the generality of society to everything concerning the world beyond the grave; the entire absorption, in short, of the ordinary run of human minds in temporal pursuits and pleasures, unsatisfactory, puerile, and precarious

as they are, to the total exclusion of every philosophical, intellectual, or spiritual aspiration,—a fact which nothing could have made me realize to its genuine extent, except these spiritual inquiries.

Another is the amazing number of apparitions and spiritual phenomena *spontaneously* occurring on all sides, of which no one ever hears, scrupulously as the cowed ghost-seers abstain from alluding to them, unless the subject be mooted by believers. During a brief interval of two or three months, conversing on J these subjects with persons of various nationalities, I reckoned between thirty and forty persons who had, either themselves or some near relation or friend, beheld an apparition; and I make no doubt, that any one curious on the subject, pursuing the same method, namely, inquiring into the matter with interest instead of ridicule, will obtain precisely the same average results.

Thirdly, I have been in the highest degree amazed at the flimsiness, the sophistry, and the transparent fallacy of the arguments brought forward by the wits, *savants*, and sceptics in the anti-spiritual crusade, and at the placidity and extra-verdant simplicity with which the public contentedly swallowed them.

The recent Davenport controversy is rich in specimens of this parody of logic, which one might think the least perspicuous must see through. To select only a few of the more prominent quiddities which the unsophisticated public are so ingenious as to accept for argument: one intelligent individual observes, that "one of the principal *séances* having taken place in the house of a theatrical manager, all sorts of nefarious contrivances might have been expected." The critic in question, it would appear, has never entered the dwelling of so necromantic and suspicious a personage as an *impresario*, but he might have ascertained from the *habitués* of Mr. Lumley and others, that these mysterious individuals are not in the habit of transporting the trap-doors, pullies, and side-scenes of the stage to their private domiciles in London or Paris. The public, too, might naturally reflect, that if pullies, trap-doors, Bengal lights, subterranean thunder, and other contrivances, are very effective on a distant stage, by the help of drop curtains, side-scenes, and numerous other accessories, which do not even render the effect altogether illusory on the stage, it is rather too much to surmise that pullies, trap-doors, etc., could pass muster quite as easily before the shrewd eyes of twenty-two intelligent English gentlemen, within the four plain walls of a London drawing-room.

Another no less brilliant suggestion, which has found more adherents than is flattering to English brains, is, that one or two other individuals can slip their hands out of knots likewise, and that many very clever tricks are performed by other ingenious individuals. With Robert Houdin beckoning us to his little theatre in the Palais Royal, and the Polytechnic inviting us to its experimental curiosities, we really do not want to be informed that legerdemain and electric machines can achieve very curious and amazing feats indeed. But the question is not whether others can perform feats by the help of due apparatus for the purpose, the real question is, whether they can perform the *identical feats without any apparatus whatever*. Until that has been demonstrated of their emulators, as it has been of the Messrs. Davenport, this ingenious elucidation, unfortunately, labours under one radical defect common to its fellows, and exceedingly detrimental to its powers of persuasion; *i.e.*, that it proves nothing at all. When Robert Houdin can give his fifty or sixty different *liqueurs* to amateurs, without any bottle; when he can show ghosts and hands without any mirror or contrivance whatever; when other experimenters can produce electrical, or any other phenomena, without any machines or apparatus of any description to produce them,—they may enter the lists with spiritual mediums, but not till then.

As for slipping one's hands out of knots, that I believe is only an accessory of the performance destined to assure the sceptical spectators of the passiveness of the mediums, certainly not what they purport to display; and until the conjurers can perform something more spiritual than that achievement, they will be compelled to cede the palm to their adversaries. Nothing, moreover, is easier than to ascertain, that the Messrs. Davenport make use of no apparatus. Every English gentleman has it in his power to invite them to his own house, and inspect their preparations and performances under his own roof, and thus place the question, as did my literary friend, beyond all possibility of jugglery or deceit.

Another sage inquires if rational people can believe that God concedes the power of performing miracles to a pair of speculators, for the sake of putting guineas in their purse, entirely overlooking a few telling considerations which are something more than a reply to his pert and shallow query. He forgets, first of all, that Christ declared that "the labourer is worthy of his hire." Secondly, he forgets that his argument applies equally to clergymen of every rank and description, who make a livelihood by preaching God's revelations. Thirdly, he forgets that the Davenports have no monopoly of mediumship. Fourthly, he forgets that if this be a Divine revelation, which God is desirous of propagating by human means, as every other revelation has been propagated, no more effectual method can be adopted than that of exciting the sordid minds of men to display their medium faculties by the incitement of cupidity, and thus placing the evidence within the reach of every idler who has a guinea to spare; while at the same time attracting public attention to the subject in a manner which no private medium can ever achieve, since those who do not want to make a living by it will certainly not hold themselves or their faculties up, *en spectacle*, for the benefit of public curiosity. All these, and a great many other qualifying considerations, do these sapient critics overlook, and what is even more inexplicable, the

gullible and unreasoning public consent to overlook with them.

As for the *cheval de bataille* of our opponents, the obscurity demanded for many of the principal phenomena, I have already had occasion to observe that the want of eyes does not preclude the full use of our remaining senses, and that it is perfectly easy to prevent the possibility of delusion, even in the dark. The fact in itself is a point yet unexplained, but evidently dependent on some conditions of the physical or magnetic force, which the spirits require to achieve the physical phenomena.

On purely scientific matters I am quite disposed to bow to Professor Faraday, and *qui de droit*; although certainly not on a question of plain, demonstrable fact, whereon I bow to no one in contradiction to the direct evidence of my lucid and discriminating senses.

In a little popular treatise on atmospheric phenomena, I find the following observations, which are so apposite to my theme, that I think it not irrelevant to quote them here, evidencing as they do the independent judgment of an eminent scientific man on the irrational and unscientific method of treating novel discoveries which I have been reprobating, and which, unfortunately, still obtains among the learned world, no less than among its ignorant echoes, notwithstanding the supposed enlightenment of the age. Speaking of the universal opposition with which the announcement of the fact of atmospheric pressure was met two centuries since, and of the host of celebrated names numbered in the ranks of its most inveterate antagonists, including that of Galileo, he remarks, that the history of this famous controversy ought to "guard us against the influence of preconceived notions, foolish prejudices, and the *authority of great names*, which are some of the *greatest obstructions to the expansion of the human mind and the reception of useful knowledge*."

He proceeds to point out that it is only "since men began to emancipate themselves from these shackles, that science commenced the brilliant career which has issued in our times in so many interesting and important discoveries." He adds, that "we are only yet beginning to cast off the yoke of that *ignorance under the guise of wisdom*, under which the men of other times bowed with abject submission."

In all probability, this gentleman, being a scientific man, would treat Spiritualism precisely with those one-sided, prejudiced assumptions, and irrational, unfounded denegations which he so wisely condemns with regard to physics. It behoves every rational person, however, to remember that the only difference between physical and psychological science is the infinitely greater elevation, profundity, inscrutability, and importance of the latter. In other words, that they are only distinguished by the vast gulf which divides matter from intelligence, the terrestrial from the Divine, the finite from the infinite, but that in all other respects they are both fields for scientific inquiry of the most supreme interest; that both should therefore be entered upon in the same philosophical, unprejudiced, and investigating spirit, with this sole difference, that if every lesson of experience, and every dictate of common sense teach us that the domain of physical nature should be approached with unbiased, patient, humble, diffident, persevering research; far more are we bound to apply the same scientific and philosophical method, to the far higher, more marvellous, and more inaccessible regions of spiritual spheres and Divine essence.

Such at least, is the system which logic, philosophy, experience, and common sense alike indicate as the only rational mode of inquiry by which men can ever hope to progress, and to arrive at the truth.

F. Pitman, printer, 20, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

## List of Works

## Published by

## Frederick Pitman, 20, Paternoster Row, London, E.G.

*Second Edition, demy 4to, cloth, price 7s. 6d.*

The Psychonomy of the Hand; or, the Hand an Index of Mental Development, according to MM. D'ARPEMIGNY and DESBARROLLES. With thirty-one tracings from living and other hands. By R. BEAMISH, F.R.S., &c., Author of "Life of Sir M. I. Brunel."

*Third Edition, Revised, demy 8vo, extra cloth, price 6s. Gd.; half-morocco, 12s.; morocco, 15s.*

Life: Its Nature, Varieties, and Pheno-mena. By LEO H. GRINDON, Lecturer on Botany at the Royal School

of Medicine, Manchester; Author of "Figurative Language," "Manual of British and Foreign Plants," &c. *This work can also be had in Twelve Sixpenny Parts.*

*Cloth, price 2s. 6d.*

A Manual of British and Foreign Plants, consisting of the Latin and English names of those likely to come before the Botanical Student; with other useful information. By LEO H. GRINDON, Author of "Life: Its Nature, Varieties, and Phenomena," &c.

*Third Edition, crown 8vo, extra cloth, price 2s. 6d.*

Our Eternal Homes. By a BIBLE STUDENT. Contents:—1. What is Heaven? 2. Guardian Angels. 3. Heavenly Scenery. 4. Death the Gate of Life. 5. Do the Departed forget us? 6. Man's Book of Life. 7. Infants in Heaven.

*To be completed in Twelve Parts, price 1s. each.*

Parable, or Divine Poesy. Illustrations in Theology and Morals, selected from the great Divines, and systematically arranged. By R. A. BERTRAM.

The various illustrations are placed under appropriate headings; and each subdivision is chronologically arranged. In addition to many advantages of arrangement, the divisions and subdivisions *constitute outlines of sermons*; so that, in addition to several thousand illustrations, the work will contain nearly *five hundred* homiletic skeletons. The value of such a volume to the Lay Preacher and the Sunday-school Teacher will be at once apparent.

*Fcap. Svo, extra cloth gilt, gilt edges, price 3s. 6d.*

Love: Selections from the best Poets.

*Cloth, price 3s.*

Forty Moral Lectures for the Young.

By the REV. W. MASON.

*Fcap. 8vo, extra cloth, gilt edges, 3s.*

Poems. By B. H. FARQUHAR, Author of "The Pearl of Days," &c.

*Fcap. 8vo, cloth, price 3s.*

Vegetable Cookery, Pastry, Pickling, &c. By the Author of "Fruits and Farinacea the proper Food of Man."

This volume supplies a want long felt. Cookery-books exist in abundance, but they relate almost exclusively to the preparation of dishes from animal food. This work is devoted entirely to the proper cooking of vegetables, to preserving, pickling, the preparation of sauces, soups, beverages, &c., &c., and forms a complete treatise upon the subject.

*Second Thousand, crown 8vo, cloth, price 5s.*

Hidden Springs. By the Rev. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., of Manchester.

*Extra cloth, gilt edges, price 2s.*

Seven Stories for Children. By MARY C. (HUME) ROTHERY.

*Crown 8vo, cloth 5s.*

The Wedding Guests; or, the Happiness of Life. A Novel. By MARY C. (HUME) ROTHERY.

*Paper hoards, price 1s. 6d., 254 pages.*

Hits. A collection of the best Tales contributed to "Household Words," "Temple Bar," "Once a Week," and "Chambers's Journal." By LEWIS HOUGH, M.A.

*16mo, extra cloth, price 1s.*

Original Nursery Rhymes, for Girls and Boys. By ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, F.R.S. With Four full-page Illustrations by EDWIN J. ELLIS, engraved by J. D. COOPER. This book is an attempt to substitute playful sense for serious nonsense.

*Cloth, price 1s., with 102 illustrations.*

Reading Made Easy; or, Child's First Book; in which the elements of knowledge are arranged in a pleasing and attractive form, and by which Spelling, Reading, "Writing, and Drawing are taught simultaneously. With full directions for Parents and Teachers. BY GEORGE VASEY.

*Cloth, price 2s., with 160 illustrations.*

Knowledge Made Easy; or, the Arts of Spelling, Writing, Arithmetic, and Short-hand, taught simultaneously; and (by means of the short-hand characters) the Elements of Architectural, Geometrical, and Ornamental Drawing, easily and pleasantly acquired. BY GEORGE VASEY.

London: E. Pitman, 20, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Rules and Regulation of the Dunedin Philharmonic Society. Sketch of musical instruments Dunedin: Printed by Mills, Dic & Co., Stafford Street 1866.

# Rules of the Dunedin Philharmonic Society.

## Title, Objects, and Constitution.

1. The Society shall be called the DUNEDIN PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.
2. The objects of the Society shall be the practice and performance of Vocal and Instrumental Music.
3. Any person may, on the nomination of any member of the Society, and upon due election by the Committee at any of its meetings, be admitted to attend the Society's Concerts on the terms of subscription hereinafter provided. (Rule 38.)
4. Any person having been duly proposed, and having given sufficient proof to the Conductor of ability to sing, or play an orchestral instrument, may, on payment of the annual subscription hereinafter provided, be admitted by the Committee at any of its meetings, and continue to be a member of the Society. (Rule 39.)
5. Any person who, in the opinion of the Society, shall have rendered important service to the Society, or shall be a musician worthy of distinction, may, on the nomination of any member of the Society, be elected at any general meeting an honorary member, and as such receive one ticket for each of its ordinary Concerts : provided always that the number of honorary members shall not at any time exceed five.
6. The Society's year shall extend from the 1st January to 31st December, inclusive, in each year.
7. The annual meeting of the Society shall take place on the second Wednesday in January of each year, and such annual meeting may be adjourned on a resolution to that effect of the members then present.
8. At the annual meeting, or at any adjournment thereof, the report of the outgoing Committee shall be read, the officers for the then current year elected, and all other business not specially provided for in these Rules transacted.
9. All goods and chattels belonging to the Society shall be held by the Committee for the time being in trust for the Society.
10. The Committee shall have power to admit as a free performer any person whose assistance may, in the opinion of the Committee, be advantageous to the Society.

## Government and Duties.

11. The Society shall be governed by a President, Vice-President, and a Committee of Management consisting of seven persons.
12. The duties of the President shall be to preside at every annual or special meeting of the Society.
13. The duties of the Vice-President shall be to perform the duties of and to act generally for the President in his absence, and to preside at meetings of the Committee.
14. The duties of the Committee shall be to manage the financial affairs of the Society, to select the music for practice and performance, to fix the days for, the time of commencement and close of all Rehearsals, and the dates of all Concerts and Public Performances, and also the rates of charges for admission thereto; to make arrangements for and superintend all Concerts and Public Performances, to make engagements with vocalists, instrumentalists, and others, for the benefit and advancement of the Society; to provide suitable rooms for Rehearsals, Concerts, &c.; and generally to manage and direct the affairs of the Society consistently with these Rules : and the Committee shall have power to appoint, on such terms as to salary and security for the faithful performance as to the Committee shall seem fit, a collector to collect and get in monies at any time, and from time to time, due to the Society, and to assist the Secretary in such manner as he may direct.
15. The Committee shall meet (five constituting a quorum) at least once a month, for the transaction of business, at a time and place to be fixed by themselves; and shall have power to call, by reasonable notice, special meetings of the Society for the despatch of special business; and they shall also call such meetings on a requisition made to them through the Secretary by any six members of the Society.
16. Any member of the Committee who shall absent himself from three meetings of the Committee, without assigning satisfactory reasons for his absence, shall be deemed to have resigned his membership of the Committee, and another person shall be appointed in his place by the Society at the next practice.
17. The Committee shall submit to the Society at each annual meeting a full report of their proceedings during the then past year, and of the general state of the Society's affairs.
18. The Committee shall have the sole management and control of the Society's property.



## **Elections, Officers and their Duties.**

19. The President of the Society shall be selected from the Subscribers to the Society's Concerts, and shall be elected at the annual meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, pursuant to nominations to be made by members or a member of the Society.

20. The Vice-President and Committee shall be selected from among the Society, and shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting, or at an adjournment thereof; and any vacancy which may occur among the Officers or Committee during the year shall be supplied at the Rehearsal next ensuing, after such vacancy shall have been declared.

21. The Officers of the Society shall be the Conductor, Leader of the Orchestra, Organist, Secretary, Treasurer, and Librarian, who shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee, provided that they shall receive no remuneration for their services out of the funds of the Society.

22. The Officers of the Society shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting of the Society, or at an adjournment thereof.

23. The duties of the Conductor shall be to conduct all rehearsals, concerts, and public performances of the Society; solely to manage, direct, and control the Choir and Orchestra; and to examine the qualifications of any applicant for admission to the Society as a vocal or instrumental performer.

24. The duties of the Leader of the Orchestra shall be to lead the Band at all rehearsals at which the Conductor may require his services, and at all Concerts and Public Performances of the Society.

25. The duties of the Organist shall be to accompany the Choir or Soloists on the Organ or Pianoforte at all Rehearsals, Concerts, or Public Performances at which the Conductor may require his services.

26. The duties of the Secretary shall be to attend all Committee meetings and meetings of the Society, to take minutes of the meetings and enter them in the minute-book, conduct all correspondence, prepare (with the assistance of the Committee if necessary) the annual report of the Committee, attend all rehearsals, concerts, and public performances, and note the attendance of performers, whom he shall furnish with the necessary tickets of admission, sign all concert tickets, and countersign all cheques drawn by the Treasurer, and generally to act for the Society under the direction of the Committee.

27. The duties of the Treasurer shall be to receive and pay all monies due to and from the Society, and to submit at the end of the Society's year a full and particular account of all the receipts and disbursements to the Auditors appointed to examine it.

28. The duties of the Librarian shall be to take charge of the Society's Library, attend at the commencement of every rehearsal, and deliver to the Choir and Orchestra the music intended to be practised, and at the close of every rehearsal collect all the music and deposit it in the Library; to correct or cause the correction of errors discovered in any of the vocal or instrumental copies; superintend the conveyance of all music to and from all concerts and public performances of the Society, and generally to act in his office as the Committee may from time to time direct.

## **Members.**

29. Any member of the Society shall, if required by the doorkeeper, produce his or her ticket prior to admission to any practice or rehearsal; and at twenty minutes after the time fixed for the commencement of rehearsal the roll of members shall be checked by the Secretary.

30. Any member not present at any rehearsal within thirty minutes after the time fixed for commencement, or finally leaving the room fifteen minutes before the close, shall be considered absent from the whole rehearsal.

31. Any member absent from any three rehearsals preparatory to any concert or public performance, shall not be allowed to take part in that concert or public performance without the consent of the Conductor, to whom every case of such absence shall be reported as it may occur, by the Secretary.

32. No member shall be allowed to be in the practice-room and not in the Orchestra during any Rehearsal without the consent of the Conductor, and any member who shall in the judgment of the Conductor behave refractorily, or in any manner improperly during any Rehearsal, Concert, or Public Performance, may be at once suspended from membership by the Conductor until the next succeeding Committee meeting, and in the discretion of the Committee be expelled from the Society altogether.

33. Any person not a member or subscriber to the Society shall not be admitted as an auditor to any Rehearsal without introduction by the Conductor or Honorary Secretary.

34. At the first Rehearsal of the Society's year the members of the Choir shall appoint a Captain (who may on any occasion provide a substitute) for each of the four vocal divisions of the Choir, and the duty of such

Captain shall be to receive the music for practice, distribute it in his or her division, and afterwards collect and hand it back to the Librarian; also to introduce new members to their seats.

35. Each member shall at the last rehearsal for any concert or public performance be provided with an orchestra ticket for such concert or public performance (without which he or she shall not be admitted thereto), and shall be allowed one transferable ticket for each concert or public performance.

## Auditors.

36. At the last rehearsal of the Society's year, the members shall appoint two Auditors to examine the Treasurer's accounts and the Library, and report thereon to the annual meeting.

## Concerts, Subscriptions, and Fees.

37. The number of subscription concerts to be given by the Society in any year shall be four.

38. The amount of subscription payable by each subscriber to the Society's Concerts shall be—for one ticket for each of the four concerts £1 1s. per annum, which subscription shall not entitle the subscriber to admission to any extra concert or public performance.

39. The amount of subscription payable by each member of the Society (regard being had to the exceptions in rule 5) shall be one guinea, which sum shall be paid within one month from the date of any annual meeting, or an adjournment thereof; or in the case of members admitted in the course of the year, within one month of the date of such admission.

## Prohibitory and Penal.

40. None of the preceding Rules shall be altered, amended, or rescinded, but by the decision of the Society, or the majority of the members thereof present at an annual or special meeting duly convened; and unless a written notice, together with all particulars of any proposed alteration, amendment, or rescission shall have been given by any member of the society to the Secretary at least one month before, and have been read to the Society by the Secretary at three rehearsals next preceding the day of meeting.

At the Annual Meeting of the Society, held in Milton Hall, Dunedin, on the evening of Wednesday, January 31, 1866, it was resolved that all former Rules affecting the Society be abrogated, and that the foregoing Rules be adopted as the Laws and Regulations under which the Society is now constituted, and shall for the future be governed, managed, and directed.

Mills, Dick & Co., Printers, Stafford Street, Dunedin.

### An Examination and Refutation of Phrenology.

by T. Halliwell

HEAD MASTER OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT SCHOOL, DUNEDIN.

"The phrenological doctrine of human affections, emotions, passions, or sentiments, being dependent on the condition of, and in proportion to the size of certain regions or lumps on the head, is contradicted by the self-evident fact, which shews that these emotions,—c., depend upon the enlightenment of the conduct of the understanding; and that what we feel depends chiefly upon what we think; and that men's characters, and the progress of the world, depend on knowledge, thought, and principle, and not on the outward formation of men's heads or bodily organization."—EDINBURGH REVIEW.

Fructu non foliis arborem aestima.—PLAUT. (Judge of a tree from its fruit, not from its leaves.)

Dunedin: Published by Joseph Mackay, Bookseller, Stationer,—c., PRINCES-STREET NORTH. 1864.

# An Examination and Refutation of Phrenology.

## Chapter I.

Nimium ne credo colore.—VIRG. (Trust not too much to your good looks.) Said by the poet to a conceited youth, but applicable to outward appearances in general.

It is from a deep conviction of the injurious influence of Phrenology on the public mind, that I have ventured to write the following pages, with a view of awaking rational doubts as to the truth of this supposed science. It is because I believe low views of man make him low; whilst a lofty estimate of his moral and intellectual motives, elevates his aims, and deepens his convictions of power and responsibility, that I have felt

it my duty to state in this essay what I think important to others.

It is on account of the evil tendencies in this materializing philosophy, and because of its utter incapacity to benefit the world, whose progress depends on knowledge, thought, and principle, and not on bodily organization, that I have given this subject some degree of earnest attention. Such are my motives, and I trust they will be so accepted, both by the reader and by Him through whose wisdom and power we are fearfully and wonderfully made, both in body and in mind.

I propose to treat the subject in the following order :—

## Chapter I.

- That phrenologists do not give satisfactory definition and proof of their doctrine.
- That the brain is not the manifester of mind.
- That size of brain is not the measure of mental power.
- That judgment cannot be formed of character from size of organs.

## Chapter II.

- General observations.
- Men's characters can only be known by their conduct.

*Acclimis falsis animus meliora recusat.*—OVID. (The mind intent upon false appearances refuses to admit better things.)

There are difficulties in the way of a person opposing Phrenology; he must oppose popular prejudice, and there are few who do not know the effect of prejudice relative to an individual opposing a popular theory, in rendering his motives and arguments liable to be underrated, misunderstood, and misrepresented. People love their opinions as they do their old friends, and it is no easy matter to attack them; in the onward progress of humanity, there are certain stages in which truth is in a minority, but the work of truth has changed minorities into majorities, in which in the long run it surely ends. There are two things demanded of all advocates of Phrenology, as in all other doctrines, namely, definition and proof. What is meant, and why it is assumed; explanation of the point to be received, and a reason for receiving it. Now this I hold stops Phrenology at the outset; they do not know what they mean, and therefore cannot tell others.

They divide the head into thirty-seven divisions, and all their organs, namely:—

- AMATIVENESS.
- CONJUGAL LOVE.
- PARENTAL LOVE.
- FRIENDSHIP.
- INHABITIVENESS.
- CONTINUITY.
- VITATIVENESS.
- COMBATIVENESS.
- DESTRUCTIVENESS.
- ALIMENTIVENESS.
- ACQUISITIVENESS.
- SECRETIVENESS.
- CAUTIOUSNESS.
- APPROBATIVENESS.
- SELF-ESTEEM.
- FIRMNESS.
- CONSCIENTIOUSNESS
- HOPE.
- SPIRITUALITY.
- VENERATION.
- BENEVOLENCE.
- CONSTRUCTIVENESS.
- IDEALITY.
- SUBLIMITY.
- IMITATION.
- MIRTH.
- INDIVIDUALITY.

- FORM.
- SIZE.
- WEIGHT.
- COLOR.
- ORDER.
- CALCULATION.
- LOCALITY.
- EVENTUALITY.
- TIME.
- TUNE.
- LANGUAGE.
- CAUSALITY.
- COMPARISON.

And judge now whether an intelligent answer has ever been furnished to the question I have proposed, namely, definition and proof of what an organ of thought is. From the assumed organs in the usual order as given, we shall see that it is clearly proved, according to quotations of Gall and other phrenologists, that the same faculty or organ does many contradictory things, and that different organs do the same things, and that the whole may be reduced to less than half, and that several are merely modifications of one.

And it will be seen that this arrangement of faculties shows ignor-

*Frons, oculi, vultus persaepe mentiuntur.*—POPE. (The forehead, eyes, and features, often deceive.)

ance of their nature, being probable cross divisions, and that nature does not provide organs based on such grossly false inductions and general illogical principles. We may indeed comprehend the Anatomist, who states that, on dissecting the cranium or skull, it is found enveloped in a very fine membrane, full of bloodvessels, with a second membrane much thicker and stronger adhering to the internal surface of the cranium, and between these a third membrane, so very delicate and transparent as to be scarcely perceptible; and we may also venture to reflect on the fact, that the brain is the common centre from which the nerves communicate sensation to the whole body, and which enables the senses to receive the impressions which they convey to the soul; but who can explain and enforce the doctrine of phrenologists of thirty-seven compartmental divisions for character guessing. What, indeed, would be the reflections on the infinitely wise Creator, if it were, as phrenologists assert, that some men are made to be murderers and the like. Are not such reflections too humbling even to think of? Phrenologists must admit, that the proposition I have made, namely, *definition* and *proof*, as reasonable. There are few persons who deny the propriety of such a demand in all sceptic questions at least; *first*, what do you mean, translate into English; *secondly*, give your proofs. It is simply required that phrenologists give the same explanation as is given, say by a physiologist, of any other organ; namely, the functions and processes, with the adaptation of the organ; as the air cells of the lungs, the oxygenization of the blood, the digestive process, and the chemical elements which decomposes, etc., or the ducts which convey secretions through that part of the blood which enters the heart, and issues thence physical reasons for the blue veins,—c. What analagous process do they discover in the brain? As yet they have detected none at all, and know not what they say or whereof they affirm. So, a fevered brain should disorder thought, but not prostrate the entire frame and destroy the bodily life. Therefore the brain has a sensitive and vital function, consequently has enough to do without thinking.

But, perhaps, the argument on which phrenologists rely the most, is the supposed stoppage of mental operations by brainal injuries. Now, what stops a process is not necessarily the means of carrying it on; many can stand in the way who yet cannot do the work. Phrenologists have provided in brainal organs for the operations of the five senses, and they assert that no such internal organs are requisite; yet a diseased brain, or the severing of the connexion between the brain and the, optic nerve, produces blindness; still brain is not the organ of seeing, but conveys the conditions essential for the groundwork on which the picture is to be formed. A person cannot see with his eyes shut, or when blindfolded, yet the eyelid and handkerchief are not the organs of vision; we cannot see without light, yet light is not the organ of seeing; therefore what is essential to a process, or whose presence or absence may interfere with a process, is not

*Ex habitu homines metientes.* (Estimators of men from their outward appearances.) Coke's definition of phrenologists.

necessarily the organ of a process. That is, if injuries or conditions of brain do disturb thought, it is not therefore the organ of thought. Why is one born deaf, also dumb? Because speaking depends upon hearing; for he that could never hear, could never speak; yet, is hearing the organ of speaking? certainly it is not, though speaking depends upon it. Therefore, again, what being out of order may prevent a process, is not consequently the organ of that process. This I think nullifies all phrenological stirring accidents. They only show that the brain may stop thought, not that it can carry on thought. Its states interfere with our reception of outward views,

and with our communication of inward process, just as the atmosphere being thick obscures the sun, but is not the organ of vision, it is only the medium which, admits or presents objects of vision; so of the brain as to our twofold connexion with outward nature; it affects, first, our capability of perceiving intimations of sense, and, secondly, our bodily action upon outward things; but it does not interpret the intimations of sense, nor decide upon the appropriate actions which it may physically enable us to perform. Press the question, what is an organ of thought? upon any phrenologist, and then conclude on the replies received, whether it does not simply amount to this. The brain is nobody knows what; and then say whether such a science is not an insult to the common sense of mankind.

If, then, leaving this point, we come to their *proofs*, that the brain is this uninterpreted organ, what is adduced. First observe that the first general motion of the brain, that as a whole, it is the organ of thought, is held by those who deny Phrenology, which, properly speaking, is not that the brain is the organ of thought, as their first assertion generally runs, but that it is a set of organs of thought. Here are multiplied mysteries; and the second point contradicts the first, since the brain cannot be both the organ and seventy half-organs. Phrenologists sometimes ask what the brain is for, if not for thought. Now, if we could not tell, this would not prove that the brain is for thought. A man who knows the classics, may be shown a book written in some language unknown to him and told it is Greek; he replies, it certainly is not Greek; but is asked, if it be not Greek what language is it? I do not know. Then it must be Greek. If the horse is neither black nor white, of what color is the horse at all? This is Hibernian demonstration.

But we do know that the brain is for something else besides thought; viz., not only for supplying that nervous energy which gives vitality to the organ of sense and motion; but also for supplying something essential to bodily life. This is plainly proved by the fact, that brain fever is often fatal; whereas, if the main function of the brain were to think, then brain fever should only disturb the mind, and leave all bodily functions in full vigor. If the eye be injured, it interferes with sight, but with nothing else; a defective ear produces deafness, but does not touch the health.

It may be asked what is the body without the head, and the reply

Coruntur in agendo virtutes.—TACIT. (The virtues of a man are soon in his actions.)

is, just as good as the head without the body. The brain is nothing without blood, for withdraw this from the brain, and what can we do" therefore blood is the organ of thought; or take the wind out of a man and what can we say to it; therefore it is the organ of thought; or prick the heart with a penknife, and what then? or go without food,—therefore, thought is merely digestion; whereas, all these things, including the brain, are essential elements of life and health, bodily organs for bodily processes; whilst the mind alone does mental work.

That volition itself is no brained process, but bodily in its expression, mental in its nature, is plain from the fact, that in cramps or rheumatism, or in sleep, as in disturbed dreams, we *will* to speak or flee, and cannot move; because the bodily machinery is in wrong condition: therefore the consequent bodily act, not mental volitions, depends on bodily organization. Many persons attempt, that is, will actions after they have lost the bodily power, therefore bodily power is not will, which prepares for the next principle, that the brain is only useful in preserving the proper condition of the organs of sense and motion, by which alone, mind manifests, but does not perform its operations.

Just as the heart prepares the brain for its work; since without blood there is no more vitality or exhibition of life or mind, than without brain, yet, blood is not called the organ of those functions which it fits the brain to perform; but without blood the brain is disabled: so without the nervous energy from the brain, which is the heart of the nervous system, (which supplies the circulation and so gives susceptibility and power) the limbs and senses cannot perform their part. Yet their part is their own function; the brain gives only the conditions of vitality; which the heart first gives to the brain. Nerves of sense and motion as existing in the brain, are only conductors of nervous energy, from its reservoir, to give susceptibility and power to the organs of sense and motion, which alone are actively and proveably employed in the process. But this is purely a question of receiving impressions and communicating results;—of sensation and action, not a question of thought, which is the immediate mental work.

It is to be observed then, distinctly, that all this has no relation to the operation of thought; but to the communication of results, which cannot be communicated by brain at all, nor by sense and motion without the healthiness of condition, which alone brain helps to supply, whilst the brain itself in common with all, depends solely on the blood.

The blood is an essential condition of everything, yet performs not any functions for which it prepares. The brain is still more subordinate, being itself dependent on the heart. And neither of them could do anything without mind. The lungs and atmosphere are requisite for oxygenising the blood; without oxygen blood and brains are nothing. This method, according to the requisites of induction,

Non semper ea sunt quæ videntur.—PHAED. (Things are not always what they seem to be.)

meets all stunning accidents, and removes all logical necessity for guessing at brainal thinking processes. The relation of the brain to the nervous system, and of the nervous system to the mind, may be partially understood by the following brief observations. By nervous system is meant here the organs of sense and motion: the brain gives sensibility to these through the channels of those parts in the brain called nerves of sense and motion; which I take to be the conductors (to the appropriate organs) of the nervous energy generated in the brain, and essential to the healthy exercise of the separate and specific functions appropriated to the bodily organs, eyes, ears, hands,—c. The brain gives sensibility and vigor to these, just as the heart gives health to the brain; but the brain no more performs their functions, than the heart performs the brain's functions. Yet, as when the heart or circulation of the blood is defective, the brain suffers, so when it is injured, the organs of sense and motion are impaired. Consequently the two connexions with outward things, perceiving them by sense, and acting on them by motion, are cut off. Sensation gives orders and materials, the mind receiving them by sense, weaves them into a piece by a spiritual process, and returns articles thus manufactured by the delivery-cart of motion, including speech and writing. A masterly article appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* in September, 1856, on guessing at brainal thinking processes, and is summed up in the following words which it will be seen damages the entire system of Phrenology:—

- There is not the least reason to suppose that any of our faculties but those which connect us with external objects (our senses), or direct the movements of our bodies, act by material objects at all; and that the phrenological organs have no analogy whatever with those of external senses.
- There neither are, nor can be, any such primitive and original faculties, as the greater part of those to which organ are assigned by the phrenologists.
- If the 37, with organs of which they have covered the whole skull, are admitted to exist, it seems impossible to refuse a similar existence to many hundreds of thousands of the same kind, for the organs and operations of which they have, however, left no room !"

But now, to pursue the argument in reference to the brain; and here I observe that all bodily injuries of stunning blows only shut up the factory. No one can get in or out; but this does not prove that the doors are the machinery and organs of manufacturing—only that being shut no raw material nor order is given, and no wrought article returned.

Besides, in all such cases the observer is outside, and therefore knows nothing of what is going on within; the exhibition room is closed, and no new orders are received, but the old ones are being executed: otherwise, when a man is locked up in a chest, he being then unable to manifest mind till you open it, the inference is that the

Fleible ludibrium. (A deplorable mockery.) Such is the definition of Phrenology as given by the "Edinburgh Review."

chest is the organ of mind because it can lock up mind : now, the sailor who fell down from the mast was locked up in such a chest, and the doctors unlocked him and restored him his look-out, and active bodily power : and thus sensation and volition returned. But other injuries of the brain which do not thus turn the body into a prison or iron chest, do not always nor generally injure the mind : many causes might doubtless be quoted from the first physiologists to prove that wounds have often vastly improved the mind.

The "Edinburgh Review," to which reference has before been made, says, "that there is not the smallest reason for supposing that the mind ever operates through the agency of material organs, except in its perception of material objects, or in the spontaneous movements of the body which it inhabits;" and this degrading science rests upon an assumption for which there is neither a shadow of evidence nor any show of reasoning. It is very true that in our present state of existence the mind is united, in some mysterious way, to a living and organized body—and that when the vitality of the body is suspended, all the functions of the mind, and indeed all the indications of its existence, cease and disappear also. The mind's functions, however, never appear; they are objects of consciousness, not of sight; only its indications by action, speech,—c., ever appear; it is the seer but is not seen. Certain actions of the brain, too, we find, are necessary to the bodily vitality, and not of the brain only, but of the heart and lungs also; and if these actions are disturbed, even for a moment, the vitality of the body, and along with it, in so far as we can judge by our senses, sensation, consciousness, and all the other mental operations, are extinguished or suspended.

But this affords no sort of proof that the mind, when it is not percipient of matter, acts or is affected by material organs of any sort; and certainly, no proof that the organs are in the brain any more than in the heart or lungs. If the head be greatly injured or strongly compressed all the faculties and functions will no doubt be destroyed. But the same effect will follow, and even more suddenly and completely, if the motion of the heart be stopped, or the cavity of the lungs be filled with unrespirable matter, although the brain remains perfectly sound and unaltered. Insects continue to perform all their functions after their heads are off; and cold blooded animals live and move in the same predicament. The use of the brain is to keep open two communications—from nature to us and from us to nature. From us to nature by actions, speeches,—c. From

nature to us by means of the internal senses. Now, look at the relations of these to the mind? First, they constitute the earliest training, because they are primary occasions of the mind's exercise: waking up its attention. Hence, those with deficient senses, as deaf mutes, or blind persons, are proportionately restricted in subjects and occasions of thought. Whilst in a usual way men are sane only by the aid of their senses, they know when they answer a bell, or turn a corner by some outward mark; this is being in their senses, and is all about their sense;

Qui medicus vivit misere vivit.—OVID. (He who lives by prescription lives wretchedly.)  
whereas, the few who by the occasions of sense have also cultivated thought, especially in reading by sensible signs of words the thoughts of others; these are more than in their senses, they are in their understandings. If, now, they be deprived of any sense, as seeing, their sanity is preserved by the habit of reflection previously acquired, they have already materials, and this is why Milton could write his "Paradise Lost and Regained," while, if he had been born blind, he could not have done it. But he had used his eyes, both in reading and writing immensely.

Milton, then, did not compose his poem without the advantage of eyes, but filled every line with what he had seen in nature and read in book: and though while inditing he was blind to outward objects, he was ever reading over those stories of books which he had already placed in his mental library, and for which Phrenology affords no room. Milton, by the use of his outward senses, had acquired eyes inside his head, where every wise man's always are, and with these he could proceed successfully.

He was no brain man, but had a soul for work, without which we have obvious instances that brain is but so much stuffing, and produces only stuff. But it is degrading to introduce such a science as Phrenology alongside such a man, or to put it in competition with that purer and more natural and refined system of human nature, the philosophy of mind and body, and their mutual relations; for it is by countertraining and better tastes that an effectual check will be given to this vulgar science of Phrenology, by the natural disgust of minds better informed.

But phrenologists hold that *brain is the manifester of mind*. In consequence of the undefined language of phrenologists, they can readily shift their ground under the same supposed topic; hence, while speaking of brain as the organ of thought, they slide into *manifester* of thought. Well, I will endeavour to expose this fallacy. Mind cannot be manifested by brain, which cannot manifest itself, being enclosed in a bone box, and no brain could open it; it requires hands to manifest brain, which of itself manifests nothing, whilst manifestation of thought and manufactory of thought, dome of reason and organ of reason, palace of soul and instrument of soul, are very different things, but pass for one another in phrenological dialect. We read of varieties of misfortunes to orators; one is afflicted with blisters on his tongue, which prevent his speaking. He has no blister on his brain, nor on his phrenological order of language. Now, take his pen away, and ask his mind something. All the brain in the world manifests nothing; it is the work of writing, speaking, painting, acting,—c., that manifests mind, nothing else can do it. And brain alone can do no work, never say a word, nor hear a word, nor make any signs. Lift the skull off and watch it, see what mind you learn, but further, use your own brain only to learn it with, that is, shut your eyes and let your brain see it,—have your hands tied behind you and let brain feel it.

Fallacia alia aliam trudit.—LUCRET. (One deception makes way for another.)

Nothing can be done or manifested without the other bodily organs, however perfect brain may be. The new method of teaching the blind by raised letters is a beautiful illustration of the fact, that the senses of the body are the only channels for communication between mind and mind; no one after Milton will be able to say of blindness, "wisdom at one entrance quite shut out." But the affecting and interesting case in proof of this argument is that of Laura Bridgman, in the Boston Institution for the Blind.

The following Notes of a Tour in the United States of America, are given by the Rev. W. Chambers, in February, 1848:—"I know not where the world presents such a phenomenon as Laura Bridgman, born deaf, dumb, and blind; and yet, through the single sense of touch, the only avenue to her mind, acquiring and exhibiting wonderful proficiency in all useful knowledge. It was indeed a sight to see her stand before an embossed map, or beside a globe, on which the outlines of sea and land, rivers and mountains are raised, holding her teacher's hand in one of her own, and from the rapid motion of its fingers ascertaining, the questions proposed; then passing her other hand over the rough surface of the map or globe, and pointing out any place she had been asked to show; answering with her fingers, through her teacher, any question that might be put, and could only be put to her in that way, and manifesting thorough intelligence on all subjects, and a capacity for acquiring any amount of information. The puzzling question was how to begin to communicate with a being, having no eyes to see you, no ears to listen to you, no voice to tell whether you were understood or not, but dwelling in darkness as deep, and in silence as unbroken as that of the grave. The effort, however, was made, and succeeded. Step by step the abyss was crossed, and now a highway of communication is established between that region of silence, solitude, and night, and the busy sun-lit world around, and the vast universe beyond, and the immeasurable and eternal world to come. The eyes of the blind are opened, the ears of

the deaf are unstopped, and the tongue of the dumb has been made to sing. The exile dwells no more alone, but passes into the abodes of men, and holds companionship with kindred minds, nay, ascends to heaven, and rejoices in communion with angels and with God ! Never was there a more signal triumph of wisdom and patience over obstacles which at first seemed insuperable. Laura is now herself a teacher of the deaf, dumb, and blind !" Such are Mr. Chambers' notes about Laura Bridgman.

Now on this, one simple question may be put: Had Laura Bridgman lost her fingers, how much mind would her brain have manifested or received? The organs or branches of a tree do not manifest mind, its tendencies, capabilities, or acquired powers; otherwise we should require no other source of evidence for Phrenology than skulls, without the least reference to corresponding character, or the concomitance between "my eye," and the faculty of language. But some proof is adduced from quite a different source than the head, namely,

Esto quod esse videus.—PLAUT. (Be what you seem to be.)

from the character exhibited or manifested in action, it is manifest enough that the brain is not the only manifestor of mind.

It is by the fruit that we know the tree, not by the tree that we know the fruit. A philosopher who had never seen or heard of a fig-tree, could not tell by any examination what fruit it would bear; but having seen the results, and given a name to these products,—figs: he would then call it a fig-tree, according to its kind of fruit; this nature he learns originally not from the tree, but from what it bears. So Gall and others first gather fruit in observation of character or of mind manifested, then afterwards examine the head or tree, and name each pair of the seventy branches, according as its imagined prominence coincides with the separate and distinct manifestations of fruit in the life. Therefore, they never find a manifestation of mind in the brain, but by observation of actions they find the mind's tendencies, and having gathered a little unripe fruit, they name whatever organ they pitch upon *after* they find independently, and before looking at the organ; thus they find veneration in the sincerest worshippers, then having got the manifestation of mind, they look for a brain lobe; first they think the organ might be boldness, then they think it to be a bump at the top of the head; but the bump does not manifest to them the nature of veneration, this is manifested in action, therefore not by brain. But the grand misfortune of the trees is that they bear no fruit at all; nothing grows in the organs; all fruit is in the character and in the action; it oozes out into the fingers' end into a book, a painting, a building, a mechanical contrivance,—c., or glances out of the eye, or echoes forth from the tongue. These are the branches on which the fruit grows; we gather nothing but hair by shaving the head, and, therefore, if a tree be known by its fruit, those trees having no fruit cannot well be known in that way, though as timber they do for fuel, or for a wooden pavement.

Again, not only is the tree known by its fruit, but the fertility of the tree is known in the same manner; we cannot tell by size and manifestation what number of apples will grow next year on the biggest tree, perhaps the gardener may guess from the average "yield" of past years, but the safest plan is to wait for the gathering.

Whilst it is certain that the greatest produce of all sorts is produced from the smallest area of earth, by the concentration of human labor, of which mere measurement takes no notice; which in character is not manifested by brain, but by the lessons learned, the books read, the answers given, and the skill exhibited in action. From all this it is a very safe and obvious conclusion that the brain is not the manifestor of mind, especially if we do not forget the assertion, that it is possible during life, by fixed laws of size,—c., to decide upon the character and powers of the mind from the proportion and conformation of the brain; for it is observable that the brain itself is not manifested during life, and, therefore, cannot manifest anything else. We do not usually see brain at all; we see hair, or baldness,—a cranium, but never brains. So that the great manifestor is hidden

Sæpe est sub pallio sordido sapientia.—COKE. (Wisdom is often found under a mean cloak.)

till the mind departs. Whilst the proportion of the brain does not always correspond with the skull, which may be thick all over, or thick in places, or not filled up inside; matters that should make fumblers modest Whilst the exercise of the brain, which makes all the difference, is not made manifest outside the skull.

That brain does not develop mind is obvious; a man is awake half the night, and lays down a scheme or an argument; but who knows anything about it till he speaks in a meeting, acts in business, or writes on paper?

Books, not brain, are the grand manifestors of the author's intellects; otherwise, give us a stereotyped edition of Milton's brains, or embalm his head, and bury his books,—what then should we learn of him?

Let a witness send his cranium into court, and the jury will find nothing instructive in the subject; otherwise it would save much time and expense to get a phrenological manipulation of plaintiff, defendant, lawyers, and judge; and deduce scientifically the whole business in a phrenological way. This point is triumphantly proved from Phrenology itself. Take any of Gall's discoveries,—what did he discover first, the faculty of mind or the supposed organ of brain? He found the faculty first, therefore the brain did not in him originally manifest the faculty; but by the clumsy inference of a false induction, the skull is now taken as an index of capacity, which capacity is a very wide word, since any man is capable of being an angel or a devil. Gall, then, first finds a



faculty of language from the fact of readiness in getting up lessons by heart; this getting and reciting was therefore the only manifest of the faculty; so that if Gall's companion could not have spoken or written from memory what he had learned, the mind would not have manifested itself in that capacity; therefore, speaking or writing, and not mere brain, are the manifestations of mind. Also, in finding out self-esteem, a man tells Gall he begs because of the honor of his ancestors; well, in this plain hoax, what manifested the man's mind? Evidently his words; and Gall, having thus found the mind manifested, felt on the man's head for an unnamed bump; then that bump did not manifest the faculty, but the observation of conduct taught the existence of the faculty, and after this discovery Gall began feeling the man's head. This is true of every phrenological discovery; and so palpable is the distinction, that conduct and speech alone manifest mind, that Sidney Smith, in his "Principles of Phrenology," gives two points as constituting the science. "Phrenology," says the writer, "is the philosophy of mind; it is based altogether on observation of correspondence, cerebral projections, and mental manifestations." Their mental manifestations are quite different things from cerebral projections, and must be known in conduct to be compared with the head; therefore, conduct and not cerebral projections is the manifest of mind. Let phrenologists understand and answer this reasoning before they are permitted to reiterate to the world such contradictions and baseless assumptions.

Resque quod uon es.—CLAUD. (Reject what you are not.)

And now, further, as *to size of brain being the measure of Mental Power*. Three things are essential to Phrenology at its outset:—1st. Organs of thought; 2nd. their size measuring the power of the supposed faculties; and, 3rd. whence character guessing takes place. In a science every technical phrase and word is defined. Phrenology has in definition, faculty! size! organ! all indefinite. The explanation of an organ is fairly abandoned; this ought to upset the science, or to name it, "the science of I know not what."

Size and power seem big, strong words, but are as vague as the rest. We have shewn, first, they have no measure of size. "The gradations are thus denoted: very small; small; rather small; moderate; rather full; full; rather large; very large."

Now, is this any definite measure,—rather large, as big as a bit of chalk? Then, where is the accuracy of the science? Further, it is not size of brain, but the relation of the head to the body, and of the organs, not to other heads, but to the organs of the same heads. Then all busts are useless; for they, first, have not the size of the body given; second, are not to be compared with each other; thirdly, have no average standard head with which to be compared in the whole character.

First, then, *there is no measure of size*. It is quite slippery under the fingers. Second, there are several deductions before the pretended "rather large" is to measure the character. Temperament, exercise, counteraction, to be reckoned,—confusion worse confounded. Third, taking the rude guess of the relative size of head to body, size here again is no measure of power; for, whilst the average weight of man's brains is 491½ oz., and woman's 44 oz., a difference of 5 to 6 oz., yet the relative size of woman's brain, compared with her body, is, within a fraction, the same as man's. The proportion of brain to body being in woman 1 to 36.46, in man 1 to 36.5,—an appreciable difference; therefore, according to Phrenology, woman has the same power as man.

Again, *relative size is not the measure of power*, "for the proportionate weight of brain to body at birth is greater than any other period, being in boys 1 to 6.85, in girls 1 to 6.5." Infants have, therefore, about six times more power than adults. Is their mind correspondent? From the age of 1 to 10, there is a great relative decrease; the proportion becomes 1 to 14; therefore, the mind may be lessened about one-half. From 10 to 20 it becomes about "1 to 30," a still greater diminution of proportionate size of brain, and less intellect. After 20 years of age the general average of 1 to 36.5 prevails. Less intellect still. But what is worse, beyond the period between 31 and 40, there appears a slow but progressive diminution in weight of brain of one ounce in ten years. But is 40 the beginning of manhood, and have the wisest works been achieved when the brain is thus not only relatively, but absolutely smaller! The whole progress of the brain is backwards; the growth of the mind is forward. Then size cannot be the measure of power. "Gall and Spurz-

Sat pulchra si sat bona.—PLINY. (Handsome enough if good enough; or, Handsome is who handsome does.)

heim were of opinion that the brain grew until the fortieth year." They must have written afterwards, in the decline of their brains; when men's minds get sounder.

Again, *whilst man's brain, in relation to the weight of his body, is heavier than that of animals, there are some exceptions*. In the following specimens, selected from "Cuvier's Natural History," the brain is heavier, and in some lighter, relatively to the body, than it is in man :—Blue-headed tit, 1 to 12; canary, 1 to 14; goldfinch, 1 to 24; linnet, 1 to 24; monkey (small), 1 to 22; field mouse, 1 to 31; rat, 1 to 76; cat, 1 to 156; dog, 1 to 305; horse, 1 to 400; elephant, 1 to 500. These specimens are sufficient, and demonstratively overthrow Phrenology. The tit should be three times more powerful than man, having just three times more brain in proportion to body! The canary, linnet, goldfinch, small monkey, and field mouse, beat him hollow. While the cat beats the rat just

2 to 1, the dog is just three times stupider than the cat, and six times stupider than the rat. The horse and elephant are brainless beyond comparison, that is, phrenologically; while, in reality, the horse, elephant, dog, and cat, are the most intelligent of the lot! There is no escape from this; if it is not the actual size of the brain, nay, the actual size of a whale's brain is 2 lbs. larger than man's, reckoning man's at 3 lbs.; and an elephant's brain, according to Sir A. Cooper and others, "is between 8 and 10 lbs.," about three times larger than man's. Therefore, actual size is not the measure of power; and that relative size of the brain to the body, the only measure left, is no measure of mental power, is proved by all previous instances. Whilst in addition, the absence of exercise is one discount, temperament another; then adhesiveness, concentrativeness, firmness,—c., are all employed to intensify the other organs; therefore, if we have intellectual faculties large, that largeness is no work of power, if these overlookers and regulators (who keep the others at work) should happen to be different. Further, if destructiveness be large, it will account for murder, nothing else is looked for; whilst if conscientiousness, who use a moral whip and reins, be large, and has not kept destructiveness in order, the evasion is, conscientiousness has not been exercised; therefore, its size is no index of its actual power. Whilst if we find another head with small conscientiousness and large destructiveness, yet free from murder, the answer is again, destructiveness has not been exercised, or conscientiousness greatly stimulated, *then size is not the increase of power.*

There is another palpable failure in the doctrine of size and power, namely, that whilst phrenologists are fond of the blacksmith's arm illustration, its increase by use, and the power indicated by larger muscles; yet the illustration in this respect, that a large arm is the absolute measure of power, a large muscle on a larger animal can exercise a proportionate greater amount of strength, in an elephant for instance; whereas the larger brain of the elephant, it being three times greater than man's, is not able to do the proportionate work.

Fronti nulla fides.—LIVY. (There is no trusting the features.)

At once phrenologists fly to relative size, and say its brain is to be measured in proportion to its body; but is this true of the muscular power of the elephant and blacksmith? If so, the smith should be stronger than the elephant. *The doctrine of size and power fails therefore in every light in which it may be regarded.* There is no consistency in the theory, whilst neither absolute nor relative brain is the measure of mental power.

*Finally*, on this point we may inquire, by what means men have been cheated into the belief of this false doctrine? It has been by the phrenological method of confounding two different things, physical size in relation to physical power, with size of brain in relation to mental power. The deception is gross, and succeeds only by gross boldness. Size is the index only of physical strength, not of sensibility nor of thought; a bar of iron one inch in diameter is stronger than a rod of a quarter of an inch; a beam is stronger than a walking stick; a blacksmith's arm is bigger and stronger than a lady's, and his head may no doubt be larger than Mrs. Somerville's, but the probability is that there is not so much in it. Physical power alone is measured by physical size; but everybody knows the proverb—"big head and little in it." Again, size, phrenologists say, is the measure of power; and yet, it has been well observed, that "the most important ones purely intellectual of the faculties, have on the whole very small organs assigned to them."

All the reasoning and reflective powers are crowded into a small area on the forehead and temples; and look at the eyebrows, in which five or six organs jostle one another. Sir Charles Bell observes, if we look at the skull in front, we may consider the orbits of the eye as crypts under the greater building. And there under are groined, that is to say, there are strong arched spines of bone, which give strength sufficient to permit the interstices of the groinings, if they may be so termed, to be very thin.

Between the eye and the brain the bone is as thin as parchment; but if the anterior part of the skull had rested on this, the foundation would be insufficient. This is the purpose of the strong ridge of bone which runs up like a buttress from the temple to the lateral part of the frontal bone, whilst the arch forming the upper part of the orbit is very strong; and these ridges of bone, when the skull is formed with what we call a due regard to security, give an extension of forehead! Although they are solid arches, connected with the building of the cranium, and bear no relation to the surfaces of the brain, both the earlier and later craniologists would have persuaded us that their forms correspond with the surfaces of the brain, and indicate particular capacities of talents. Power, then, is measured by size only by the smallest size. If we examine other organs, it appears that smallest is favourable to delicacy of perception; a small eye is better than a great one, and this eye is enlarged by exercise; the student's eyes do not grow bigger; the ploughman's hand does, but it is exercised physically, whilst the slenderest and most delicate

Respicere exemplar vitae morumque jubebo Deotum imitatore, et veras hinc ducere voces—HOR. (I would direct the learned imitator to study closely nature and manners, and thence to draw his expressions to the life.)

fingers become the best instrument by which a quickened mind either receives intimations or performs operations. .

In these impressions and exercises, which are the most closely connected with mind, smallest is no

advantage; and though we do sometimes say, "little pigs have long ears," when we wish to preserve a secret, it is not found that large ears are signs of power, or a donkey would have the advantage in any intelligent audience; an elephant's trunk is larger and has more power than a man's nose, but might not be so good an instrument for judging the ingredients of a compound odour. If phrenologists have a definite measure of size, three barleycorns to one inch, instead of turning their barley into malt and getting obscured by words, without measured meaning; there is no relation between their measure, a fullish organ and a fullish faculty.

*Then, how can phrenologists 'pretend to judge scientifically of character from size of organs.* Undoubtedly, with 37 guesses at habits and dispositions, they must hit upon some feature; they cannot help it. But add the difficulty of judging character, to the difficulty of guessing size of organs, activity, exercise,—c., and see how the character business looks. We have already pointed out the chief difficulties of judging. Who decides? Few men are judges of character; most judge nastily from a single action, and finding the organ for this mentioned by the phrenologists, will forget to look at anything else. Then, besides this difficulty, consider the next,—the width of the faculties, any one will do for several things; a reformer and a murderer are both destructive. Sturge and Napoleon, both combative and destructive, one for peace the other for war; the organs and faculties are thus bits of india-rubber. Thus destructiveness, originally found in connexion with carnivorous stomachs and teeth, and intended to fulfil the command, "kill and eat," is exercised in murderers who do not eat their victim. A phrenologist says, killing a sheep and killing a man are both the same, namely, destructiveness; but though the law does not hang the sheep-killer with the murderer, because (while they are the same phrenologically) they are different. How then can these two things, the act of a butcher and the act of a murderer, come from the same original principle? Then further, the after evasions not exercised, no concentrativeness contracted by others. Indeed, there seems such an infinite number of corners in this system, that any head may be made to fit anything.

*Then the plain failures of phrenologists:*—The "Edinburgh Review," of October, 1856, says:—"We have known some, and have heard on good authority of many, cases of flagrant and most ridiculous blunders committed by phrenologists of the greatest eminence, which they had neither the candour to acknowledge, nor the boldness to deny." Dr. Holland says—"During some intercourse with Gall, and more frequently with Spurzheim, I had opportunities of noticing the failure of their judgment," "even in cases where the peculiarity of the external conformation, or some quality of mind, made it almost needful that the doctrine should rightly indicate the relations on

Vera gloria radices agit, atque etiam propagatur, ficta omnia celeriter, tanquam flosculi, decidunt; nec simulatum potest quidquam esse diuturnum.—NEPOS. (True glory strikes root, and even spreads; all false pretensions fade speedily, like flowers; nor indeed can any counterfeit be lasting.)

which it professes to be based." The following are some of the indications of the character guessing. *First*, the equal chance of affirmative or negative, as to each particular quality predicated. *Second*, the plea of a balance of some indications by others and opposing ones. *Third*, the want of exact definition of many of these qualities or faculties; making it difficult to arrest for error where there are so many ways for retreat. *Fourth*, the incidental discovery of character by other and more ordinary methods. Looking at the chances and facilities thus obtained, it may be affirmed that the number of true predictions in Phrenology is less miraculous than it would be were this number not to exist. The coincidences are not more frequent or remarkable than the assured average of chances would make them. The want of definition, as to what precise Quality belongs to any organ, is amazing. It would be too tedious to dwell at large; the incidental discovery of character by other and more ordinary methods is sufficiently obvious from the following illustrations.

We have all an instinctive or an instantaneous apprehension of the general character of persons, and the class of society they belong to, consequently their probable culture by those general appearances. A smock-frock and certain indescribable but easily recognised rusticated air may indicate a milk-man; from these signs you may feel his head, and surprise him with the information that he would be very sorry if his cow died. From his organ of combativeness you may predicate his impatience when the butter is spoiled in churning. A white neckcloth, together with black in its various conditions, smooth and sleek well brushed but napless, rather than of brown—c., together with various ties of the neckcloth, will, to a good judge, indicate either a preacher in the various grades of clergymen, Dissenter, Wesleyan,—c., or whether a waiter or a linendraper.

A skilful observer may soon distinguish these marks, especially as helped by manner, style of speech, kind of introductory observations, all which are dialects or provincial marks by which we guess at once at the world in which the subject's mind is imprisoned. Corduroy trousers will speak volumes, so will a fustian jacket; and if the patient dresses up to deceive you, observe whether he does not look as if he felt like Sunday, and as shut up in his Sunday coat; perhaps he turns up his cuffs to save them, and that reveals all. A shooting jacket will give the data to as good a character as any phrenologists ever gave from the bare sight of a bust without other means of guessing.

Before dismissing this argument, I may remind phrenologists that other sciences have equal claims; for to

say nothing of Nasology, Physiognomy, Chiromancy, and that fortune-telling which belong to gipsies, there is handwriting-ology, which satisfies many with their characters quite as well as Phrenology does others. There are many professors in the field, and amongst them several lady-character mongers. But it should be observed, no phrenologists believe in their science, for whilst they may on the strength of it educate a child for a profession in which he is beggared by incompetence, that is a small

Veritas visu et mora, falsa festinatione et incertis valescunt.—NEPOH. (Truth is established by scrutiny and deliberation; falsehood thrives by precipitation and uncertainty.)  
affair: none would lend a thousand pounds, nor even trust twenty on the security of an organ; but all require the conscientiousness called "legal security." It does for them to recommend to others, but in all material interests of direct pounds, shillings, and pence, they are unscientific—the education of children is of course immaterial. Admitting the phrenological method of escape, this counteracted by that,—c., it would not be difficult to maintain with equal ease the truth of any system of Phrenology in which the names of the organs are all reversed, and benevolence put into the place of philoprogenitiveness, and so on. The following are a few of the difficulties in the way of proving Phrenology by guessing character. *First*, we cannot easily catch them out when they are moving, because of the evasions we have mentioned. *Second*, they have no accurate means of proving that they are right, because of the difficulty we have shown in judging of character, through the many warping circumstances of envy, jealousy, friendship, favor, hatred, rashness. These and corresponding objections are in the way.

Phrenologists do not, of course, record their failures; and are often ignorant of their failure or success, whilst others can seldom judge; the persons examined are partial; so are their friends; often the examiner is interested; few can distinguish character with any clearness. None know themselves perfectly, and all know others worse; the person examined may begin to fancy he has what he never before dreamed of, or would have if cultivated, or if not counteracted by others; whilst people in general notice only that one out of 37 points in which they have known or misknown the individual. Nor are they very nice in discriminating whether the action which they remember really sprung from the principle in question.

*"They know what's what, and that's as high  
As Metaphysics art can fly."*

This impudent system aspires to measure all men, and to decide from bumps their fitness for the bar, the pulpit, the bench, clerkship,—c.

It was ascertained that the size of Dr. Chambers' brain was very small. Cuvier, who wanted only one organ, namely, comparison, for his comparative anatomy, had sixty-four ounces of brain; whilst Chambers, with his vast range of knowledge and noble character, had, I believe, but fifty-three ounces. Yet his size outmeasured the power of all phrenological "*mighty minds*" should it not be mighty brains.

This science of character mongering from head fumbling, may further be understood from the following observations of Coleridge and the "Edinburgh Review."

Coleridge, who, in his Table-talk, says of Spurzheim—"He is dense, and the most ignorant German I ever knew." Coleridge gives in his Odes to Reflection another noted instance of the failure of Phrenology. The very marked positive as well as comparative magnitude and prominence of the bump entitled benevolence on the head of the late murderer, John Thurtell, has woefully unsettled the faith of many

Formosos sæpe inveni pessimos, et turpi facie multos cognovi optimos.—OVID. (I have often found the good looking to be very knave;, and I have known many with ugly features most worthy men.)

phrenologists; at present, and according to the present testimony, we must be content to say that John Thurtell's benevolence was insufficiently modified by the unobtrusive and unindicated convolutes of the brain, that secrete honesty and commonsense. The organ of destructiveness was indirectly potentiated by the absence or imperfect development of the glands of reason and conscience, in this unfortunate person !!

The "Edinburgh Review" observes:—"It is a matter of notoriety that men with large beads are not generally of superior endowments, nor those with small deficient in understanding; that mothers are kind without the hinder protuberance; many men witty without triangular prominences beyond the temples; that, in fact, we never happened to meet with any one individual in whom a marked peculiarity of disposition or character was accompanied with the appropriate bumps; that we daily see remarkable enough bumps on the heads of very ordinary people; that most with whom we have conversed have made the same observations; that we have known and heard from good authority of many cases of flagrant and ridiculous blunders committed by phrenologists of the greatest eminence; that very many of its most zealous advocates seem to have been seduced into belief, by having had organs discovered for talents and virtues 'they had never been suspected of possessing.' "

One grand advantage which, however, makes phrenological characters all worthless, may partly be understood by what has been often noticed in finding organs of murder after a jury has convicted; for having a knowledge of certain characters from history, and the means already pointed out of eluding one prominence or supplying it by another, any phrenologist can make any set of organs appear to agree with any given character.

The phrenologists, in all great cases, take up great men whose points are known; they have, therefore, only to give the "go-bye" to bumps which do not bear on the known points; and if the required ones are small, to say they were in activity, and intensified by large concentrativeness, which on any emergency will multiply by ten any organ you wish to enlarge.

Swift is a fine instance, proving how little faith can be put in phrenological manipulation; how much those bumps *enlarge under the fingers* which are supposed to belong to faculties prominent in the subject. And the phrenological portrait of Swift gives out very large, and this is true of his character, but not of his head. The "British Quarterly Review" gives ten striking heads measured on mathematical principles; four of them murderers, Haggart, M'Kean, Pollard, and Lockey; and six not murderers, Burns, Swift, La Fontaine, King Robert, Heloise, and Stella: when it was found that one of the murderers, Pollard, had by far the best head of the whole—a head which ought to have been a Milton or a Shakspeare; but Swift was proved to have had less phrenological wit than any of them.

We evidently want something more consistent and logical than

Tu recte vivis, si curas esse quod audis.—PLAUT. (You live well if you make it your care to be what you seem.)

this fortune telling and character mongery, from whatever point considered. It is an inductive science of taking people in; turning philosophy to a poor account.

But now a word in reference to the classification of the faculties. We have already seen that the five external senses have no brainal organ, and that this is admitted by phrenologists; few persons, however, consider sufficiently what vast mental operations are connected with the exercise of the senses, as the mind reads and interprets their intimations. It is plain that we seldom, if ever, think without language; *therefore, our thinking is inward talking*; for, take away our words, and you destroy literature and knowledge, and render thought stagnant; consequently, *thought is mental language*; therefore, our faculties of thinking should all be comprised in that one faculty and organ. Things can never manifest the mind, therefore we have the short-hand notes or marks, names and words, as suggestions or reminders, and we reason upon those words or marks; therefore, language is nothing else but all faculties together, hence logic is but the grammar of thought, and lays down the rules of exact expression of what goes on within. This simple point upsets Phrenology altogether; for we find there a separate faculty for language, which is the process of every faculty. In devotion or veneration we pray, but, whether by audible voice or mentally, we think words. Now, to say that each organ or faculty does use the organ of language, is to introduce the utmost confusion, and language must be tired out to do all the work. Besides, its size should be in proportion to its exercise, therefore it should be as large as all the rest together; but it is not,—consequently, while language is our universal faculty, mental process, it is not done in that little organ. It must be remembered, then, that language is the proper work of every intellectual faculty, and it is associated minutely with all our moral sentiments, for language deals in all those styles, just as we have books on mathematics, classics,—c. Indeed, as all knowledge lies in books, *so all thinking lies in language, or thinking could not be expressed*; but we shall here confine our attention to one important point in connection with language, written or oral. First, observe, that all we hear is sound, therefore if there be no inward organ of hearing, there can be no inward organ of music or tune; for, take hearing away, and what tune can men appreciate? So also of size, as intimated to sight; and of color, the only thing directly seen, yet seeing is no brainal organ, but color, the thing seen, is judged of in the brain. Leaving this as a disproof of the organic arrangement, let us briefly try to estimate the faculties involved in language.

In speaking, language directly addresses the ear by sound; in writing, it addresses the eye by form and color; yet neither ear nor eye has, phrenologically, any thing to do with what addresses them alone. Every faculty has its objects, yet the form or sound of language is the object of the eye or ear; the sense or meaning of language is the object of the faculties conversant with the subject, as

Sapientia prima stultitia caruisse.—HOR. (The first step towards wisdom is to be exempt from folly.)

eneration has to do with the subject of language or religion. Then, what object is left for the organ of language, if the sound and form belong to ears and eyes, the sense to other organs? *Language must be without an object*, or what other object is there besides sound and the sense, neither of which belongs to language. The dilemma is increased at the next stage, when it is explained to phrenologists that language, as the sign of ideas, is necessarily the chief, if not the sole exercise of all the faculties; and, therefore, we should have only the organ of language, which should be so prominent as to push our eyes staring out of our heads. The explanation and proof of this are very simple, for the expression is only an audible or visible sign of the inward process, which process is consequently only language.

This line of reasoning we fixed confirmed by a work in which both a similar argument (though for a different purpose) and a beautiful illustration are contained, which is well worthy the attention of phrenologists; the title is "Easy Lessons on Reasoning," by Archbishop Whately. The faculty of abstraction,—at least, the ready exercise of it in the employment of signs, seems to be the chief distinction of the *human intellect* from that of brutes. There is, as is well known, often displayed much intelligence of another kind in cases where instinct can have no place; especially in the things which have been taught to the docile among domesticated animals. But the faculty of language, such as can serve for an instrument of reasoning, that is considered as consisting of arbitrary general signs, seems to be wanting in brutes.

They do possess in a certain degree the use of language, considered as a mode of *communication*; for it is well known that horses, dogs, and many other animals, understand something of what is said to them; and some brutes can learn to utter sounds indicating certain feelings or perceptions. But they cannot, or at least from their great deficiency of the power of abstraction, be taught to use language as an instrument of reasoning; that we do, necessarily, employ abstraction in order to reason, it will be perceived from the foregoing explanations and examples; for you will have observed that there can be no syllogism without a common term. And, accordingly, a deaf mute, before he has been taught language, either "finger language or reading," cannot carry on a train of reasoning any more than a brute. You will find accordingly, if you question a deaf mute who has been taught language after having grown up, that no such thing as a train of reasoning had ever power through his mind before he was taught. If, indeed, we did reason by means of those "*abstract ideas*" which some persons talk of, and if the language we used served merely to communicate with other men, then a person would be able to reason who had no knowledge of any arbitrary signs. But there are no grounds for believing that this is possible; nor consequently that "*abstract ideas*" (in that sense of the word) have any existence at all.

*The signs*, that is, common terms, we are speaking of as necessary for the "reasoning" process, need not be addressed to the ear. The

Nihil est quod non expugnet pertinax opera, et intenta ac diligens cura.—PLINY: (There is nothing which persevering industry may not overcome, with continued and diligent care.)

signs of numbers,—the figures 1, 2, 3, 4,—c., have no necessary connexion with sounds, but one equally understood by the English, French,—c., whose spoken languages are quite different. And the whole of the written language of the Chinese is of this kind. In the different provinces of China, they speak different dialects; but all read the same characters, each of which, like the figures 1, 2, 3,—c., has a sense quite independent of the sound.

And to the deaf mutes, it must be so with the kinds of language understood by them, whether "common writing" or "finger" language.

There has been some very interesting accounts published by travellers in America, and by persons residing there, of the girl Laura Bridgman, who, as is well known, has been from birth not only deaf and dumb, but also blind. The remarkable circumstance in reference to the present subject is, that when she is alone, her fingers are generally observed to be moving, though the signs are so slight and imperceptible that others cannot make out what she is thinking of; but if they inquire of her she will tell them. It seems that having once learnt the use of signs, she finds the necessity of them as an "instrument" of thought, when thinking of anything beyond mere individual objects of sense. And doubtless every one else does the same; though, in our case, no one can, as in the case of Laura Bridgman, see the operation; nor in general can it be heard, though some few persons have a habit of occasionally audibly talking to themselves, or, as it is called, "thinking aloud." But the signs we commonly use in silent reflection are merely mental conceptions of uttered words; and these, doubtless, are such as could hardly be understood by another, even if uttered audibly; for we usually think in a kind of short-hand, if one may so use the expression, like the notes one sometimes takes down on paper to help memory, which consists of a word or two, or even a letter, to suggest a whole sentence; so that such notes would be unintelligible to any one else. It has been observed also that this girl, when asleep, and doubtless dreaming, has her fingers frequently in motion; being in fact talking in her sleep, *i.e.* speaking mentally; she used outward signs, we inward ones.

This, then, is a fact better than all phrenological coincidences, shewing, that we cannot think to any extent without language, as the grand process and instrument of thought; that in cases of persons learning late, the outward method of expression is used along with inward motions of those signs; that this young woman used her fingers in thinking out; as many speak in dreams and in waking thoughts, and as those unaccustomed to reading much, or learning late, read with their lips as well as with their thoughts, moving the mouth with the word, showing that the inward process is one of words, which they, from want of facility, keep steady by the outward sign. Since then our main mental processes are language, (if we used brain in thinking,) we should want only the organ of language, therefore Phrenology is false, for it gives other organs.

Sapiens quidem pol ipse fingit fortuism sibi.—PLAUT. (The wise man surely earves out his own destiny.)

"We may reject Phrenology, because of Physiology and Philosophy. Physiology, which has found no

organs, and defined no methods of performing the functions, and which especially proves the most relative brain where there is the least intelligence. We may reject Phrenology, because of Philosophy, which teaches the spirituality of mind, and of mind's processes; which teaches the unity of the mind, and denies the division, compound mixture, and absurd nature of phrenological faculties. Philosophy teaches, that sentiments come not from organs, but from thought; and this accords with the entire course of history, in proving that advancement and education are from moral and spiritual truths, and from no physical organization; and thus places a man's character in no mould of his cranium, but in the judicious employment of his faculties in scientific, moral, and religious truth; gives him a lever to elevate his depressed fellow-countrymen, and the grand spiritual engineering that shall convert savages into civilized beings, and save from degradation those unfortunate races Combe consigns to hopeless cranial bondage; thus it is that a true knowledge of man is man's best friend,—a knowledge that gives power, whilst false views are the ignorance which increases their weakness, and makes them the prey of their own folly and of designing men."—*Edinburgh Review*.

## Chapter II.

*Animi cultus quasi quidam humanitatis cibus.*—PLAUT. (*Cultivation is to the mind what food is to the body.*)

I shall now submit, in this second branch of my essay, some observations more general in their character, and commence by at once stating that I hold Phrenology as a system of fortune-telling, which is fostered by an impertinent curiosity to measure other people, and a lurking desire to be measured and flattered ourselves, and the greater the dose the easier it is swallowed. It certainly did not rise in the highest circles of science. Spurzheim was a quack from top to bottom, and was not the only successful quack. The "Edinburgh Review" observes, that neither Spurzheim nor Gall ever made a single logical observation in their lives, and never could, and there is scarcely a good writer among phrenological advocates. Combe was a good writer, but his "Constitution of Man" was not God's, but his own. The apparent ease of Phrenology is its great recommendation; it is the only royal road to learning acknowledged; and, like a royal road to something else, cheats the people with the form instead of the power. Then, good things are so easily obtained and mastered; they who buy so very cheap, generally sell themselves into the bargain. It is the cheapness and supposed facility and ease

Ult sementem feceris, ita et metes.—COKE. (*As you sow, so shall you reap.*)

of this science which recommends it; people who have not time or inclination for the deep study of human nature, can readily feel on the human head, and so become cheated of a true understanding; especially may some rejoice in their splendid abilities, which are measured by a head they often admire at the glass, but seldom take the trouble to fill it by study of books; the study of bumps is easier; and since brain is the manifestor of mind, they manifest their mind in no other way than by their brains,—by the head on their shoulders, not by what issues thence. These are ready-made men; they were born so, or grew so, and have thirty-seven striking developments, that will leave grand monuments behind, but in no other shape than that of a bust, which is their next best way of developing mind. Well, the reformer is an Eiconoclastes, and his first work is image breaking, which the deluded worshippers of course call sacrilege: and when monks give a character of Luther, phrenologists will do us justice. Luther had destructiveness large, so had Rush, and so have we; however, we shall destroy no man's life, but lift up the skull of Phrenology to show there are no brains under,—that, in fact, it is only a bust, whose size is no measure of its power, which lies not in its own cranium, but in the unfortunate disorder of other people's. Gall had manifestly an inflammation in the organ of Phrenology; it was his monomania, and the disease has proved infectious. Having held a *post-mortem* examination on Gall, we know the nature and seat of the disease, as well as its remedy,—the only cure is gradual doses of logic and philosophy. It is said that Gall discovered the nature of the connection between mind and body; if so, he has kept it a secret. Then, there is his doctrine of concomitance between a powerful memory and a prominent eye; *ergo*, the prominent eye, or back lobe at the back, is the organ of verbal memory. Had not the same man any other peculiarity?—a prominent nose? Then why fix on the eye? The fact is the eye has nothing to do with it. Then as to the faculties mentioned by phrenologists as operating by themselves, such as love of children, by the bump at the back of the head,—why, how many can say, "*I never felt anything of it, and yet I love my children as much as most people do theirs.*" But it may be asked, is the faculty by which persons love their children without any reasoning power? Most persons love their children from principles of duty, social and moral obligations; and if we esteem men it is for their good qualities, and if we hate anything, I fancy it is for its bad qualities. All this is from the reason of things, but according to Phrenology it is from the brain. If a man loves his children, is it from some impulse behind, shoving him on to love them? Many love cats, dogs, canaries, and pets of various kinds. This organ of loving children must also, according to Phrenology, be the clog, cat, canary organ,—c. The fact is, the love of children is a parental instinct, and belongs to parents.

I deny every faculty of Phrenology; that is, I deny that there are such original simple elements in human

nature as the thirty-seven

*Froni prima multos: unia meus intelligit quod interiore condidit cura angulo.*—OVID. (First appearances deceive many: the penetration of but few enables them to discern that which has been carefully concealed in the inmost corners of the heart.)

phrenological faculties, which fire cross divisions, involving one another; and accident, compound mixtures, habits, and jumbles of various powers under one indefinite name. They are accretions of character, not elements of nature.

The original faculties of Phrenology remind me of the young-lady's question, "Papa, where do they catch red herrings?" "In the Red Sea to be sure." The faculties on the head map are most of them original red herring. We shall next have to inquire where scolloped oysters are found? and the answer is instructive to phrenologists. Scolloped oysters are not pure natives; so the phrenologists' faculties have been changed out of the primitive elements of human nature by Gall's absurd method of "cooking" a philosophy. Phrenologists also assert, that the faculties of the mind can only be exhibited through organized matter. This is a bold, unfounded assertion. Look at a flower; there is an exhibition of the mind. So in all nature; but it is not manifested by the organized matter called brain, nor by any organization of the manifester, any more than we learn the genius of the old masters in painting by their brains,—it is their works. How much mind has a deaf mute? The brain may be perfect, but no mind can be manifested till they learn to speak by fingers. Still with a pen the mind can be manifested, though the sight be taken away. It is, therefore, in such a case, the pen, and not the brain, that manifests the mind.

We may, therefore, deny that the brain is the exclusive medium through which the mental faculties are exhibited. There are no such regions and faculties as those described by Phrenology; and, therefore, it is false to give outlines of character from such means. Phrenologists find in the skull the brain, and they imagine they have found everything, and they talk of organized matter being the science of mind. Have they ever caught a soul, or the skeleton of a thought? They say the brain is the organ of thought, Has any one discovered that? No one has. Has any one proved it as a fact that there is an organ in the head? It is known who has discovered the circulation of the blood, which is an ascertained fact; but phrenologists cannot tell who have discovered an organ in the head. The offer made to the British Government by phrenologists sometime since to examine the heads of convicts and others, was, to the honor of the Government, rejected as monstrous. It is brutal to measure a man's character by Phrenology. It is an impudent system. Is a man to be rejected from a situation, and left to starve, because of the bumps on his head? What is to become of a clerk who can say—"My character is unstained; my former employers testify to my integrity?" No matter, here is your crime, a phrenological fact, a bump at the back of your head, or the absence of one. Combe attributes the failures of many merchants to not manipulating their clerks. This, whilst condemning many honest men to beggary, would encourage the character trade. With regard to criminals, the system does to

*Nam sapiens quidem pol ipsius fingit Fortunam sibi.*—PLAUT. (The prudent man really frames his own fortune for himself.)

prove a man a criminal after he has been convicted and condemned for crime. In the case of Rush, they knew his character before his head was examined. Let phrenologists tell us *who will be a murderer*, and not tell us what every one knows. Whilst phrenologists fetch murderers' busts to show the bumps that do the crimes, we can tell them what will elevate their characters and purify their consciences in defiance of all the bumps of their craniums. There is Africaner, the African chief, as testified by Moffat and others,—feel his head. Oh! he is a villain! exactly a bloodthirsty human demon. Feel again in a month's time : the same person? not at all; as meek as a lamb, he will not now hurt a mouse.

Where is the difference? he has the same head, but all his organs work backwards. Combe says that, men suffer from unsuitable alliances; but Phrenology is their guide in this respect, and gives a list of insurance questions, in no way related to Phrenology, but stolen from other sources. So in like manner they must feel the bumps of a lady, before they make the proposition to marry. The fact is, that Phrenology is nothing but a swell, a brag, and a boast, and must die the death it merits. Locke inquires into the origin on our ideas from experience and reflection; the experience gained by the five senses; reflection caused on, not by the agency of the brain, but by the understanding.

Bacon's logic of natural inquiries is the opposite of that of phrenologists. Phrenologists also assert that in sleep, the corporeal powers are at work, and that the mental powers cease. This is contrary to all we know, and must be denied *in toto*; the mental powers continue in operation, and the powers of the body cease to act. Withdraw sensibility from the body, and cause a loss of voluntary motion, whether by pressure on the brain or otherwise, and that does not affect the question of thought; it merely stops communication from the mind to the outward world. In sleep two things are effected; first, the pressure on the brain by which sleep is brought on, and the removal of that pressure on waking, when the nervous system is restored, with which also voluntary motion is restored, and the man becomes sane, for every man may be said to be insane in his nightcap. But phrenologists say, one organ is awake, then another is awake, yet we find ourselves as regular in dreams as in



waking thoughts. A man goes to China by suggestion, as one thought suggests another—not because one organ works upon another. *The English organ waking the China organ.*

Again, phrenologists endeavour to make too much capital from the heads of idiots, and we may observe that pretty good heads have been found on the shoulders of idiots. Many an idiot had a vast amount of brain; but according to Phrenology itself, the idiot had more brain than any other man uses. The brain, they say, is the organ of thought. What, part? The top, surely the idiot had a top left. If an idiot has more brain than others use, why should he not have the same mental powers as other men? It is utterly false to

Non semper ea sunt quæ videntur; decipit Frous prima multos.—PHAED. (Things are not always what they seem to be; first appearances deceive many.)

say that idiots are incapable, *de facto*, of becoming restored to a moderate share of common sense. There are institutions for the very purpose of effecting the improvement of idiotcy; and let us hear the report of Dr. Conolly, of one of these institutions, He states,—“That in some instances the improvement is so great, that in a few months they can hardly be recognised as the same unfortunate creatures before seen.” In such cases Phrenology says, “these men are beyond the pale of sense, shut them up.” Philosophy says, that by occupation and engagement of mind, these children might receive a fair amount of sanity, and be made equal to most phrenological children. Men formerly looked often upon madness as incurable, because the keepers were not in their wits; but now they understand the nature of it, they know what to do; but while the science of Phrenology shuts them up, men better informed aim at and succeed in making them often equal to others.

Let phrenologists answer the following questions:—

- What is an organ, and what its process?
- What part of the brain, and why not the whole?
- How do we know there is such an organ?
- Is it like our eyes and ears, which, first, are distinct from the brain; and, second, have external objects directly affecting them?
- Is it like our bodily passions; do these decide the mental character, or does the mind regulate them?
- Do the organs act on the mind, or the mind on them, or both; how do thoughts originate; and do not phrenologists make the mind the organ of the brain, changing with and in consequence of brained changes?
- Is the brain exercised in thought at all; and if so, why not the mind's vigor in proportion to bodily health, in which the brain generally shares?
- Why do we require a separate education for the brain, when all other bodily junctions work naturally, in proportion to general health, and how is the brain educated?
- Does not each sense give naturally its appropriate sensations, and do all the phrenological organs the same?
- Why are large organs fifty years of ripening into their proper action; is anything else so late of development?
- What becomes of the impulse in each, of itself, when it takes fifty years to push on to action; and is any crime ever permitted by this impulse, and without a reason; are not such peculiar cases treated as insanity?

It may properly be asked, had Rush and the Mannings no motive, for which motive they were hung? Phrenologists say, these faculties work of themselves, without reason; and we may therefore ask, how it was that Rush and the Mannings had the organ of destructiveness working for forty years, without having till then pushed them into action; It may positively be denied that the faculties acted with

Lepidi mores turpem ornatum facile factis comprobant.—PLAUT. (Good morals have no difficulty in seating off a lowly garb.)

reason, for Rush murdered for an estate, and the Manning's for money. If it had been from any irresistible impulse, the act would have been insanity; it would not have been a case of crime, and the jury would have acquitted them. The fact is, a true judgment cannot be given of men's character by phrenologists. Their judgment is the thing in question. We all see through passion, prejudice, love, and hatred, and, therefore, we can never look on character with impartiality. Let an historian who writes the character of Queen Elizabeth be a Protestant, and the Catholic disbelieves it. Let a Catholic write the character of Mary, and take it to a Protestant, and the result would be the same. It all depends on the person who has to judge of the character. Let a man fumble on the head of Cromwell, and denounce him to Charles as a king killer and canting hypocrite, and ask if that manipulation does not prove Phrenology. “Exactly so,” says Charles; “but let him tell a Roundhead so.” There is one who has given Cromwell's character who never felt his bumps, and that is Carlyle; and it would, doubtless, be difficult to find an impartial judge. We have never yet had an impartial jury, knowing men's motives and lives, and comparing a phrenological character with the known lives and motives. Phrenologists have not these facts to appeal to. But their appeal is to the indiscriminating mass, many of whose minds are

heated by present passion; whereas it requires judgment, cooled by time and distance, to estimate characters; hence the history of to-day must be written to-morrow. The shufflings, cuttings, and doubles of Phrenology, is such that it is impossible to catch them. For instance, they feel a man's head and find mathematics large. "Good mathematician?" say they. "Oh, no," says the man, "I never could solve a problem in my life." Feel again : "Mathematics large—concentrativeness small." "Ah ! one organ destroys the power of another." Again, they find mathematics small. "No mathematician?" "Indeed!" says the man, I flew through Euclid like lightning." "Ah! but I see you have concentrativeness large." They feel another head, and mathematics large, concentrativeness large. "Splendid mathematician?" they say. "Oh no," says the man, "I could never cast up a column of figures in my life." Then they say, "Ah! the organs are large, but they have never been educated." Can anyone deny this, or the excuses made? If so, refer to phrenological books. Besides these changes, there are many other methods; and with such loop-holes, any man can get through them. It is easy for phrenologists to escape; besides, they are not the proper persons to judge. And the person acted upon is not the proper person to judge, he having the organ of self-esteem; his friends are partial, or enemies are hostile. The manipulator only was left to judge; and, therefore, it is utterly impossible to get a fair judgment as to whether he was right or wrong, as they cannot find the man to give a fair judgment. If self-knowledge were not a difficult lesson, they need not even then ask a fumbler to feel their heads; but if self-knowledge be difficult to attain, how much more difficult

Qui se laudari quædet verbis subdolis, Fere dat poenas turpi poenitentia.—PHAED. (He who is delighted at being flattered with artful words, generally pays the penalty.)

must the knowledge of others be? If Phrenology be on inductive science, let phrenologists define what induction is. Every honest pursuer of science records his failures, but the phrenologists do not; therefore, they are not honest, but determined to prove that Gall's guesses were hits.

In one instance Spurzheim manipulated on the head of a young girl, and then told her to fetch her sister, who, it had been proposed, should also be examined. She accordingly went out, and came back again with the "development" of a new cap and dress, and the manipulator gave two different developments of character, not knowing that it was one and the same person. This, however, has not been put down as a failure. If all the failures were recorded, there would be a greater Golgotha against than in favor of Phrenology. Strange that so many persons should be led away with such paltry thumbing and fingering mechanism, which leads to nothing more or less than the most degrading materialism and irreligious tendencies; for example, phrenologists boldly assert that some are made for animal, some for moral, and some intellectual pursuits; which, in effect, is that some men are born beasts, and never can do otherwise.

But now a word as to the origin of Phrenology. Well, how did Gall find his organs Gall first noticed that men worshipped, and in order to find an organ for the faculty, he went into churches, and watched those that he thought prayed most sincerely, himself being a judge, and able to see through the cranium. He found that those who prayed most earnestly had bald heads, he being the judge of persons, He took baldness as the first attentive stop, and he began his plan and called the organ veneration. But he found that women, who were never bald, were nevertheless very devout, which somewhat put him in a difficulty; he, however, called the top of the head veneration. The first man hoaxed Gall, but that did not stop him. According to "Chambers' Information for the People," his common practice was to get together a number of low characters, and encourage them to give loose to their natural and unregulated instincts, and thus to judge of human nature from such a sty. Thus did the science begin. Gall was also in the habit of setting lads to fight, in order to see which had the organ of combativeness; from which, it may be concluded that he was not only a quack but a blackguard. So much for the origin of Phrenology.

Now, one word about *thick skulls*. Some persons have thick skulls, and in measuring, phrenologists say it is all brain, when it is *only* the thickness of the skull. Another fact of phrenologists in reference to philoprogenitiveness, to love children with. Sydney Smith says, that the Hindoos and the Chinese have a large endowment of the organ, and yet they are in the daily and national habit of murdering their children, so that it would seem that the organ of child-love works in this way of child-murder.

Again Combe, in his Constitution of Man, asserts that some races,

Virtuo in actione consistit. (Virtue consists in action.)

from their bad heads, cannot receive Christianity, whilst Christianity has belied the assertion and the science by finding deep moral emotions in spite of all small regions. As to their loftiest instinct, the worship of God it is expressly said by most writers that it may reverence anything, and therefore is no mark of character; nay, Spurzheim says himself that he found the organ of veneration large in an atheist.

Phrenologists also trace to this faculty a love of antiquity, and a tendency to approve of everything that is old. Is this religion? And should they not give an organ for venerating what is new? They give an organ for loving children, why not for loving parents? It would be easy to show, that on their principles of classifying organs we ought to have *two or three hundred more*. The confusion of their system is apparent in the fact, that

whilst each organ is said to have a primitive, distinct, and original faculty, as our ears and eyes are distinct, yet they influence one another, take cognizance of each other's work, and contain each other's objects. For instance, concentrativeness, which has had so many functions ascribed to it, is now employed in keeping the other organs at work. But how does it know anything of their business, being in a separate and distinct line? Must it not have all their faculties to regulate their operations? And by what method of connexion does it reach and influence the others? Every faculty is said to have its object, but the object of this faculty is to urge on the work of the others. Adhesiveness does the same kind of thing, makes us stick to matters with which adhesiveness has no connexion. Acquisitiveness gets money—what for? It cannot spend it! The money is all spent, on the gratification of the other organs. A child cries for a penny to gratify alimentiveness. Then the organ of thieving, as Gall names it, is the most generous of all organs. Combativeness again, has on work, but to knock down what offends other organs, and destructiveness kills it; yet all this is on business of theirs; if we offend benevolence, what has combativeness to do with that separate, original, and independent process? Yet we are told, "if offended, self-esteem instantly wakes up destructiveness;" but what does self-esteem know about destructiveness, or destructiveness about self-esteem? They are perfect strangers, and in different lines of business. Therefore, a consistent theory cannot be framed to carry on the mental process by organs of separate independent powers. The wheels will not work; they do not fit into each other. Caution, like secretiveness, regulates all the other faculties, that they should act with propriety or policy; yet caution and secretiveness know nothing of the proper work of the others, but again are separate and independent powers. The eye might as well tell the ear how much to listen to. Well might the British Association for the Advancement of Science reject this degrading science of Phrenology, as a science.

We have learned, I think, the first point; the ground on which the science rests cannot be defined, that is a fundamental closed. The

*Virtutis laus omnis in activue consistit.*—CLAUD. (All the merit of virtue depends upon the activity with which it is exercised.)

something; is something that phrenologists do not understand. Next the size, the brain has been shown to be equally slippery. What is the size? Have they any definite measure, whilst a whole course of physiological facts, though vainly and boldly denied by phrenologists, show that relative size is not the measure of power; and further measured again, is undefined by phrenologists, for does any organ measure a faculty? Was the faculty of Newton the exact size of his mathematical organ? Mind to the amount of a thimbleful! Magnificent! The size of a boy's marble. What a comprehensive view of the mind is thus obtained. They may pack twenty of the greatest intellects into an ordinary sized hamper. As there are so many gallons to the hogshead, so there are so many geniuses to a bucketful. There is, it will be perceived, a palpable incongruity between the measure, and the thing to be measured. A pint measure holds a pint; then an organ should hold a faculty. Then, in judging of character, so many things are to be known, so many counteracting exceptions; the organs are so pliable, and character is so difficult to be judged, that the whole is guess work and fortune telling. It is plain how little phrenologists are acquainted with those philosophical questions, which should test their system, and that inductive logic by which it should be built up. We have seen that there is a hopeless confusion amongst the pretended faculties, doing one another's work, yet being separate and independent, and corresponding with and influencing one another, without knowing each others existence, nature or process.

*Vel capillus habet umbram suam. (Even a hair has its shadow.)*

*Men's character can only be known by their conduct.* We find that the science of Phrenology cannot explain a single mental process, so as to convey an idea to the mind and carry the work through. It may here be observed that there are three points to be explained by an organic method; perceiving outward things, reasoning about, and coming to a conclusion. And sentiments depend on intellect, which depend on training, and therefore the intellectual and moral character is independent of brainal endowments. Hence work is the great basis of intellectual power. Organs are not books to teach them, and no man has done anything without a proportionate work. Here is a chance for everybody; and the steady workers will always outstrip pretended natural advantages. Milton worked his eyes out; the greatest men kill themselves by labor, and are great at the expense of their brain's health, which agrees with the health of the body. Virgil was seven years at his *Georgics*, and they are therefore unrivalled. Martyn was seven years in making *Notes* on that work, and these *Notes* are the lasting standard on the subject. And great works done quickly, have been done only by diligent labor. If, therefore, we wish to succeed in anything, we must not depend on "head bumps;" but on the diligent use of our

*Quicquid sibi imperavit animus, obtinuit*—NEPOS. (Whatever the mind enjoins on itself as an object, it attains.)

eyes, ears, hands, and tongue. These are the manifesters of mind, and without them, work cannot be done. Let work then be our motto, truth our aim, whatever size the head may be. Work is power, and all knowledge and ability are the capital it requires. Nations rise by great truths and principles, not by great brains; education of ourselves and others, by clear and earnest truths, not head. The hope of mankind must be fixed on work. The

larger their heads, the emptier they are, if nothing be put into them; and those who rely on and cultivate organs by any mere phrenological method, will have an attic to let unfurnished. This is the secret of great and little minds—great and little work. And let it be remembered that prejudice, superstition, ghosts, and lying wonders will not be removed by touching the organ of wonder, but by lessening the organ of ignorance, and introducing that dawn of truth before which all shadows flee.

In the reciprocal influence of the soul upon the body, and the body upon the soul, there is a wisdom displayed we cannot search into, and the result of our profoundest investigations into this exquisite union must be admiration and astonishment. If we consider the body separately, we find it everywhere displays the power of the Creating Hand; each limb is ordered in the most convenient manner for utility as well as beauty; no change that man can devise will be of benefit to him, so wisely is the human frame organized and constituted. Its internal arrangement is still more wonderful. The body has different ends to answer, different functions to perform; it is the medium through which the soul secures cognizance of external objects. For this great purpose, we find it furnished with the organs of sight, of hearing, of taste, of feeling, and of smell, each in itself worthy the highest admiration. We may truly be said, to be the prodigies of the Divine power and wisdom.

Phrenology is not merely useless but injurious in relation to morality, education, and religion. First, Phrenology is logically materialism, which is evident from its inadequacy to account for mental phenomena, as well as from its spirit and tendency. It is subversive of morality, by introducing a fatalism unlike philosophical necessity, (which refers our feelings and actions to moral and intellectual motives,) but a fatalism of physical necessity, which renders destructiveness (and more so in excess or abuse, *i.e.* when large) and all other evil or good principles, as necessary feelings of the mind as any other bodily sensations; that makes the feeling of combativeness as proportionate to the size of the organ, and intensity of its operation, as the feeling of pain from putting the hand into the fire. There being this grand difference, that we may, if we will, withdraw our hand, but we cannot withdraw any organ, so that, phrenologically, we are no more moral in any of our mental emotions, than in feeling cold or hot in proportion to the state of the atmosphere.

It is not a help but an obstruction to education; for it teaches no new way of affecting organs by exercising or restraining them,

Taber quisque fortunæ suæ. PLIXY. (Every man is the architect of his own fortune.)

but decides on our capability, and explains our vices or virtues by the type of our head, which to a great extent is unvarying. It contradicts all principles of religion, by first removing responsibility, by secondly depending mainly on physical means, instead of on those moral and spiritual truths which Christianity presents : "Sanctify them through thy truth."

Let us then be satisfied with, and make best use of the faculties with which the All-wise Creator has furnished us. We are possessed of senses, through the medium of which we may acquire information and ideas of surrounding objects. Our eyes enable us to perceive different objects by the rays of light being reflected from them; by this means also we become acquainted with the different colors; by our ears we know the different sounds which vibrate on the air; by the senses of taste and smell different odours and properties of bodies become known to us; and by the sense of feeling we receive the sensation of heat, cold,—c.

And let us reflect how miserable we should be if deprived of these gifts. If bereft of sight, how should we be preserved from the dangers which surround us, or be able to provide for our support. We should no longer derive pleasure and improvement from contemplating the wonders above our heads, beneath our feet, and everywhere around us; the spectacle of the heavens, the beauties of the country, or the great objects of nature, or the delight we receive from the presence of our fellow-creatures, would be then even as a blank to us. Without the sense of hearing we could not enjoy the reciprocal communication of thought, nor be wrapt in oblivion of care by the soothing sounds of plaintive melody, or be excited to joy and Measure by some jocund strains. Without taste and smell we should be deprived of a thousand agreeable sensations, and be subject to numerous inconveniences; and without the sense of feeling we should be rendered incapable of arriving at any degree of perfection in the arts and sciences, or of providing for our necessities. May we never despise or abuse the value of our senses, which have been given us for the noblest purposes.

How we should dishonor the liberal bounty of Heaven in the admirable union of the soul and body, if we allowed ourselves to be deceived by taking for our guide the materializing doctrines of phrenologists; forgetting that the true spirituality of mind teaches that knowledge and sentiments come from thought, and not from outward formations on the head. Wretched indeed is the man who has no higher delight, no more exalted feelings, than to trust to such objects, and who is so unacquainted with the exhaustless treasures of a cultivated mind. May we ever be enabled, through Divine favor, to make a proper use of our faculties, and of all the mercies by which we are everywhere surrounded, and never lose sight of the great end for which we were created. Chambers evidently is of opinion that fashion has something to do with determining "the matter of a bad or good head. He thus speaks :—

Labor omnia vincit improbus.—VIRG. (Incessant labor conquers everything.)

"All nations, even in their infancy, have recourse to such customs and fashions as gratify their feelings of vanity. It is not alone in civilized society that fashion exercises her tyranny; she extends her influence over even the most uninformed of the human race. The natives of almost all countries, at an early period of their history, have undertaken to fashion particular parts of their bodies into a happier mould. In infancy, especially just after birth, all the bones of our frame are soft and pliable, and admit of being compressed into shapes such as was never designed by our Maker. The head, the configuration of which, in early infancy, is changed with great facility, has been submitted to many alterations in figure. The Scythians, as a sign of their nobility, chose to have it shaped like a sugar-loaf, which was effected by binding the infant's head with cloth bands. A remarkable length of head was, by other nations, conceived a beauty. This the ancient Portuguese produced in the same artificial manner. The Germans esteemed a short head the best; and we are informed that the German mothers took especial care to lay the children in their cradles in such a manner that the back part of the head should be compressed. Other nations preferred round heads, a fashion which was affected by the Greeks, and also by the Turks, who considered it the most commodious form for the turbans they wear; and the Turkish skull, at the present day, is observed to be remarkably round. In the province of Old Port, in the West Indies, the square head being admired, that form was obtained by compressing the infant's head between boards, which enclosed it on all sides like a square wooden box. The forehead has, in like manner, been made the subject of many capricious fashions. The Mexicans judged those to be most beautiful who had little foreheads. The Spaniards, on the contrary, accounted a high forehead a happy distinction; wherefore the ladies drew back their hair, to extend its height beyond its natural dimensions. The Russians admired broad foreheads, to acquire which, they compressed the head from above, so as to increase its breadth. The Italians, on the other hand, endeavoured by artificial means to render the forehead more prominent than natural. A very receding or sloping forehead has been, and is still, considered a beauty by many of the African tribes, and this they give their children by making them wear a flat compressing instrument, which has often been exhibited in Britain."

Although we hold that the outward formation of the head is not the index of man's character, yet we regard the head as the most remarkable and conspicuous part of the body, whether considered as to the beauty of its form and appearance, or as the supposed centre of sensation and seat of the mind.

The organs of sight, of hearing, of smelling, and of tasting, are all placed in this wonderful part; and upon the face, where smiles every beauty, all the movements of the heart, all the feelings are pourtrayed, the secret sentiments of the mind are legible, and the passions of the soul displayed. The lips, as they move in smiles, or assist the tongue

*Spectemur agendo.*—PLAUT. (Let us make our character known by our actions.)

in giving harmony and diversity of tone to the voice; the teeth, as they add to the beauty of the countenance, and divide and comminute the food with the different glands in the mouth, which secrete the saliva so necessary to digestion, are all admirably and wonderfully formed. Let us then be perfectly satisfied that the present organization, not only of our head, but of every part of our body, is best adapted for our condition in life, and let us bow down with reverence and gratitude before our Maker who has thus so wonderfully formed us, and who has given us senses, which, however excellent from nature, may all be improved by cultivation, and a mind the expansibility of which seems to be unlimited; and seeing, then, that it depends upon ourselves whether our mind is to be luminous and our senses acute, or whether it is to be contracted, and they beautified and callous. Let us pray to the God of nature and Father of our spirits, that we may never lose sight of these truths, nor never neglect improving those talents, which our Maker in his infinite mercy and condescension has entrusted to our care; and, above all, whilst thus cultivating our own minds in those rich materials of knowledge which no earthly power can bereave us of, may our hearts ever pulsate to the happiness of our fellow-creatures. We shall then be able to regulate our passions, to disregard sensuality, and to rise superior to all trifling and sordid emotions.

To make the materializing doctrines of phrenologists our guide, would indeed be a helpless and a miserable delusion, while the minutest study, not only of ourselves but of the whole of the great volume of nature, is sufficiently noble without such pretended assistance as phrenologists propose.

Of all the species of knowledge we can acquire, none is more important, more agreeable, or more interesting, than that we gain from studying the works of nature; and properly to answer the end for which we were created, it is essential to become acquainted with our Maker by the proper consideration of his word and works, by which He is manifested to us as the Creator of all things, and as the common Father, Lord, and Benefactor of creation.

By the great volume of nature, we learn those truths which declare to us the immense grandeur and glorious attributes of God; we are taught to know and properly estimate our limited powers and faculties, and become better acquainted with the obligations we owe for the blessings we receive.

We judge of the greatness of men by their actions and their works, but who is like unto Thee, O Lord? Thou art great, thy name is celebrated, and thy works proclaim thy infinite power, wisdom, and grandeur.

Let us then, in these reflections, see and feel ample motives for contentment, and not be like the camel, as in the Latin proverb—"Camelus desiderans cornua etiam aures perdidit;" that is, "the camel begging for horns lost its ears also." The moral being, that we should be thankful for the faculties with which Providence has

Lingua mali loquax malæ; mentis est indictum.—PLAUT. (An evil tongue is the proof of an evil mind; because, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Luke vi 4, 5) endowed us, and not wish for those which are inconsistent with our condition.

Such, I conceive, is the presumption of those who seek to rely on the outward formation of the head for men's characters.

Let all men, even those whom phrenologists would consign to the murderer's cell, never indulge in such contemptible delusions, nor let them ever fear of being so abandoned by God, who loves all his creatures, and let us ever submit to his holy will, and bless all his dispensations, and be convinced that he will accomplish his merciful designs, for he is omnipotent in counsel, abundant in means, and infinite in wisdom.

And let us not forget that our happiness and progress depend upon our own application in the various pursuits of life, the examples we follow, the connexions we form, the opportunities that occur for exercising our powers being embraced, and the faithful use and developing of our faculties. And ever remembering that God, our Father, by his wisdom and goodness, ordered all these things for our present and eternal happiness; and let us ever have for our motto the expressive words—

"Should all the forms that men devise,  
Assault my faith with treacherous art,  
I'll call them vanities and lies.  
And bind the Gospel to my heart."

## Physiognomy.

In reference to Physiognomy, which professes to enable us, *ex vultibus hominum mores colligere*, to judge of men's minds from their countenance, we cannot do better, we think, than simply give the very appropriate quotation of Sir David Brewster, as it appeared in a recent issue of the "Evening Star :"—

"The leading argument in favour of the new physiognomy called 'the symbols of the human form,' is derived 'from the nearly universal assent to it implied in the practice of judging of men by their personal appearance.' Addison, for example, asserts that every 'one forms to himself the character and fortune of a stranger from the features and lineaments of his face;' and that 'when he meets with a man that has a sour, shrivelled face, he cannot forbear pitying his wife.' Fielding conceived that 'it is owing to want of skill in the observer that physiognomy is of so little use in the world.' Cowper tells us 'that faces are as legible as books,' and that his 'skill in physiognomy never deceived him.' Sir Thomas alleges that there

*Multo melius ex sermone quam lineamentis, de moribus hominum judicare.*—PHUT. (It is much better to judge of men's characters from their words than their features)

are 'characters in our faces which carry in them the mottos of our souls,' and that the countenance proclaims the heart and inclinations 'Now, all this is common physiognomy, in which we all profess to be adepts, but we never believe that the 'features and lineaments' from which we form our judgments are original in the human face, or 'divinely' placed there for any special purpose. That the emotions of the past and present leave permanent traces on the human countenance is often true. Among all classes of society we encounter faces which we instinctively shun, and others to which we as instinctively cling; but it is out of our power to discover the causes of these abnormal features, or the moral and intellectual condition which is supposed to underlie them.

'I do not like thee, Dr. Fell,  
The reason why I cannot tell;  
I do not like thee, Dr. Fell,'—

must be the language of every modest physiognomist, who feels how false the world would have interpreted the sad and ruffled expression which may have occasionally darkened his own honest and happy countenance. In judging of the temper and character of a stranger, or of a neighbour, how often have we found our estimate to be false. The repulsive aspect has proved to be the result of physical suffering, of congenial malformation, of domestic disquiet, or of ruined fortunes, and under the bland and smiling countenance, a heart

deceitful, vindictive, and 'desperately wicked,' has frequently been concealed. The countenance, too, which in youth and manhood was noble and benign, we may have seen scarred in the battle of life, and furrowed with the deep lines which the baseness of friends and the injustice of the world never fail to imprint. And when the manly aspirant after wealth and fame has been cruelly worsted in the race of ambition, and has displayed on the outer man the impress of the emotions that disturbed him, how often have we seen him, when the world had smiled upon his lot, resuming the joyous expressions of his early days, which misfortune had but temporarily disguised."

*THE MIND IS ITS OWN PLACE AND OF ITSELF  
"CAN MAKE A HEAVEN OF HELL, A HELL OF HEAVEN."*

Sæpe taceus vocem verbaque vultus habet—OVID. (The silent features have often both words and expression of their own)

An Address to the People of Otago.

by Thomas Parsons, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

Dunedin Mills, Dick,—co, Printers, Stafford-Street. MDCCCLXVII.

## To the People of Otago.

As I feel, on a second attempt, that I can neither serve you, nor myself, by settling here, I will briefly pass in review the state of things which I should have to wage war against, if I remained, and in a contest against which I could not hope, with such aid as I could expect from you, who allow it, to meet with anything but defeat. I entreat your indulgence to the plainness and homeliness of my style.

The following correspondence will be a convenient introduction to what follows :—

### [COPY.]

"Dunedin,

3rd August, 1867.

*"THE OTAGO DAILY TIMES AND WITNESS (LIMITED), ats CAMERON.*

*"Dear Sir,—To emancipate you from the difficulty in which you are placed by your client's stipulating with you that Mr.—shall lead in this case, I hasten to return you my retainer and fee."—Yours truly,*

*"THOMAS PARSONS.*

*"To—, Esq., Solicitor, Dunedin."*

### [EXTRACT.]

"Dunedin,

3rd August, 1867.

*"My dear Sir,—I send you on the other side a copy of a note which will inform you of the unpleasant predicament in which I have been placed. Will you kindly say whether I can accept a retainer, or offer my services gratuitously to the other side? There is nothing in the case to make Lord Eldon's remarks in Earl Cholmondeley v. Lord Clinton, 19 Vesey 274, apply. Can we do nothing to form a bar, proper, here? With a limited liability press; and limited liability churches, limited liability kirks, and limited liability synagogues imminent, what is to become of our descendants?—Yours faithfully,*

*"THOMAS PARSONS.*

*"The Honorable James Prendergast, Attorney-General, Wellington, N.Z."*

### [COPY.]

"To the Editor of the 'Otago Daily Times.'

"Sir,—I enclose copies of my correspondence with your solicitor and the Attorney-General, respecting the matter in which I have returned your Company's retainer and fee; and shall esteem it a favor if you will publish it, or hand it to a contemporary to do so, lest tittle-tattle place me in a more humiliating position than required. I trust our grandchildren will discover that the empire of reason does not lie exclusively in words. It will not be my fault if I do not rout your 'loves' the demurrers, and introduce brevity and simplicity. I omit names.—Yours,—c.,

"THOMAS PARSONS.

"3rd August, 1867."

**[COPY.]**

"To the Editor of the 'Evening Star.'

"THE OTAGO DAILY TIMES AND WITNESS COMPANY, LIMITED.

"Sir,—I enclose a copy of my letter to the Editor of the Daily Times, 'asking him to allow me, through his columns, to explain the course I took to prevent his Company from invading bar etiquette. I also enclose copies of the correspondence referred to in the letter to him. He has not published them, and I now solicit of you the favor I sought of him in vain. The etiquette of the bar is the servant of the public, as will be understood if we ever acquire a proper bar here.—Yours,—c.,

"THOMAS PARSONS.

"5th August, 1867."

Neither of the newspapers complied with my request to publish. The non-compliance of the 'Star' was not, perhaps, unreasonable. It is not, however, my humiliation, but yours, that your bar has men to accept the superseding retainer.

Were an English solicitor—who had been convicted of a grave offence in England and who would expose himself to a very heavy punishment if he attempted to practice as a solicitor there—to come here to-morrow, he would be entitled to be admitted as a barrister, without any inquiry into the truth of his imputation, if he only imputed to the counsel who conducted the prosecution against him and the judge who tried him there, conduct unworthy of their positions. I mean no reflection on anybody. It is the fault of all of you, and not of those I seemingly reflect on only, that such a state of things exists. It has become the *genius loci*.

As respects the case of Cameron against the 'Daily Times' newspaper, the case of Cox v. Feeney (so much commented on by Mr. Justice Chapman during the argument and in his judgment, and which his researches had failed to find and which was so new to him) was of my finding; and is that on which (as will appear from my opinion of the 16th July last) I advised the newspaper's defence. Neither the learned judge nor the newspaper's counsel, however, seem to have discovered, since neither of them referred to it, the *banco* cases of Kelly v. Tinling, 1 Law Reports, Q.B., 699, found by me after advising, in which Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's *nisi prius* views were supported by the whole court; just as, in the late case of another action against the same newspaper by some bank before I came here, and in which a verdict for £500 damages was obtained against the newspaper, three *nisi prius* decisions of Chief Justice Cockburn in favor of the defendants, which had been several years in the regular reports, were wholly overlooked.

Take, as another type of the state of things here, the recent privilege cases—Robinson v. Reynolds, Every v. Same. More simple cases never occupied the attention of a judge. No personal injustice has, however, been caused by the decision, as the warrant of commitment was, beyond question, bad. The only thing to be lamented is the loss of a fine opportunity of expounding the constitutional canons that govern in a community like this.

The learned judge (Mr. Justice Chapman), after stating part of the 53rd section of the Constitution Act (20 and 21 Vic., c. 53) thus:—"It shall be competent for the General Assembly" (the Governor, Legislative Council and House of Representatives) "except and subject as hereinafter mentioned to make laws for the peace, order and good government of New Zealand," added, after some intervening remarks, "I am of opinion that it is not



competent to any court of the colony to entertain the question whether an Act of the General Assembly is or not for the peace, order, and good government of the colony—of that the General Assembly is the sole judge. Indeed, the words only constitute the common form of expression by which a general power to make laws is conferred." It is difficult to conceive how so much error could be crowded into so small a space as this latter sentence. The words used where a general power to make laws is intended to be conferred, are those of the Constitution Statute of the Colony of Victoria (18 and 19 Vic., c. 55, Schedule 1, section 1, Adamson Vol. 2, p. 1517) and like acts, "to make laws in and for Victoria *in all cases whatsoever*." The power created by the 53rd section of the Constitution Act of New Zealand is a limited power, giving to and imposing on the judicial tribunals of the colony the right and duty of seeing that all colonial legislation under it is, not only for the peace, order, and good government of the colony, but that (where it is within the exception) it is passed in the mode prescribed for such exceptional legislation. The privilege case was a mere question of the construction of an Act of Parliament (the Constitution Act). The section (52) immediately preceding the 53rd, referred to by the learned Judge, provides that no standing order or rule adopted by either the Legislative Council or House of Representatives (though approved by the Governor and allowed by Her Majesty in the same manner as Acts of the General Assembly) shall be of force "to subject any person not being a member or officer of the Council or House to which it relates, to any pain, penalty, or forfeiture, "and the enactments succeeding the 53rd section (containing those referred to in the exception in such 53rd section) provide that any Bill for the alteration of any of the provisions of the Act (the Constitution Act)" shall be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon." The "Privileges Act, 1856" was not so reserved, and, this defect not being cured, but on the contrary being corroborated by the provisions of the Imperial Act 28 and 29 Vic. 63, the solo question was whether such Privileges Act did not (having regard to such 52nd and 53rd and the 19th and 24th sections of the Constitution Act) in attempting to confer on Provincial Councils the power of subjecting persons, not members or officers of the Legislative Council or House of Representatives, to pains, penalties, and forfeitures (its penal enactments are numerous and severe, besides those under consideration), attempt to alter a provision or provisions of the Constitution Act without pursuing the form prescribed by such Act for accomplishing such alteration. Instead of examining and disposing of this question, which would have been a real service to the colony, the learned Judge, though the matter was twice pressed on his attention during the arguments, passed it over entirely unnoticed. There is no English authority for the learned Judge's position that the courts of the colony are not competent to entertain the question whether an Act of the General Assembly is or not for the peace, order, and good government of the colony; but there is much English authority against such position, and the effect of the learned Judge having abdicated his function of seeing that the legislation of the General Assembly is as required not only for the peace, order, and good government of the colony, but not contrary to the exceptions and restrictions imposed on it, may be to occasion much litigation and trouble hereafter. I submit that it is the bounden duty of the tribunals of the colony not only to see that colonial legislation is proper, but to annul what is improper. It is easy to give away people's liberties, but difficult to get them back again. I submit that the General Assembly is not the judge of its own power, and that nothing can be more idle than to assert that it is so. Where a statutory power is given to one body to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of a colony, and to another body to administer such laws, the right and duty are necessarily given to and imposed on such second body to see that no law calculated to cause it rife, disorder, or ill government in the colony is permitted to prevail. The people of this colony are entitled to the full benefit of the English common law, and of all English statute law, existing at the foundation of the colony (so far as such statute law is applicable to the colony, and has not been since legally altered by proper colonial legislation), and of all laws properly made by the colony, subject only to all proper colonial legislation hereafter to take place under the limited power of legislation possessed by the colony and subject to the unlimited power of legislation vested in the Imperial Legislature; but this colony is not subject to *two supreme* legislative authorities—the Imperial and a colonial. We fortunately have not, at present, a supreme colonial legislature, and cannot therefore go straight to destruction. The learned Judge has, unintentionally no doubt, done injustice to the learned Sir F. Dwarrris, where he (the learned Judge) says "even Sir F. Dwarrris, who has diligently collected these dicta," (some views previously noticed by that learned author in reference to English Acts of Parliament against natural justice) "concludes by stating that the general and received doctrine certainly is that an Act of Parliament of which the terms are explicit and the meaning plain cannot be questioned or its authority controlled by any court of justice." It will be found that the learned Dwarrris does not "conclude" with the doctrine adverted to. He only notices it (p. 484), and that, seemingly, reprehendingly, for he modifies it by adding (immediately following the words quoted by the learned Judge), "Yet Sir Edward Coke manfully if not convincingly defended his opinion" (to the contrary of such doctrine), "and successfully contended that the case" (one against natural justice) "must be correctly *interpreted* to be *exempted* out of the provisions of the statute; that a contrary construction could not be within the meaning of the act. The law therefore was—to be properly construed—not to apply to such cases; but the law itself was not to be held void." From which addition it is pretty clear that the learned writer

thought, as every reasonable man thinks, that, even as respects Imperial legislation, "the law itself" (that is, any law against natural justice) "will be held to be void," whenever Cokes enough to achieve the task shall arise. None of the balderdash and affectation of learning imported into the "privilege" cases had, however, anything to do with them. The law applicable in construing such Acts of Parliament as the Constitution Act of New Zealand, is the same as that applicable in construing an act conferring partial legislative powers for draining the Lincolnshire fens, or the like: constitutional doctrines have nothing whatever to do with it There is not the very slightest analogy between the Imperial Legislature (which is the unbounded sovereignty of the State, embodied in the English Common Law,) and the Legislature created by Imperial legislation, conferring on a colony the limited power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the colony, like the Constitution Act. The power of the Imperial Legislature is the boundless power of English Common Law; whereas that of the Colonial Legislature is only such as can be found in the terms creating it, as indirectly shown by numerous English authorities, and amongst them, *Keilly v. Carson*, *Fenton v. Hampton*, and *Doyle v. Falconer*, before the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No instance has arisen (which is much to be regretted) in which the English Courts have been called on to adjudicate expressly, particularly, and directly on the question; but the necessities of the United States of America have called for adjudication on the subject in that country; and there can be no doubt that their doctrine is the true and correct one. Dwaris states it, in the paragraph of his work immediately following that quoted by the learned Judge (Mr. Justice Chapman), thus: "There" (in the United States) "they hold that as there is a written Constitution designating the powers and duties of the Legislature ". . ." an act of the Legislature may be void as being against the Constitution. The judicial department, say they, is the proper power in the Government to determine whether a statute be or not constitutional. The interpretation or construction of the Constitution is as much a judicial Act, and requires the exercise of the same legal discretion as the interpretation or construction of a law. To contend that the courts of justice must obey the requisitions of an Act of the Legislature when it appears to them to have been passed in violation of the constitution, would be to contend that the law was superior to the Constitution, and that the judges had no right to look into the latter, and to regard it as the paramount law. It has accordingly become a settled principle in the legal policy of the United States that it belongs to the judicial power, as a matter of right and of duty, to declare every Act of the Legislature made in violation of the Constitution, or any provision of it, null and void."

I submit that it is, in like manner, a matter of right and duty on the part of the judicial power of this colony to declare every Act of the Legislature of this colony made in violation of the Constitution Acts, or any provision of them, null and void; and to see that the lawful rights of the people of this colony are no further restricted than by the English Common Law, Imperial legislation applying to the colony, and the laws of the colony made properly and within the power conferred on the Legislature by the Constitution Acts.

I now pass to a more ordinary matter—that of the general character of your administration of justice and conduct of affairs connected therewith, both public and private, and will take as the first typo in this matter the case of *Chalmers v. Stafford*. ('Daily Times,' June 15). There was no question for a jury in that case. The jury and witnesses were all unnecessarily brought from their homes and businesses; no question of fact but only one of law—namely, that of the construction of the agreement, arose in the case. The firm who penned the contract (letter) for the vendor (*Stafford*), were far better lawyers and men of business than the learned judge, the jury, or lawyers concerned. If the learned judge had turned to that letter, (the contents of which were, or ought to have been before him), he would have discovered that the agreement between *Stafford* and *Roberts*, conferring on the former the power to sell the half of the station and the sheep was referred to in the letter, and thereby, by an elementary principle of English law, constructively incorporated in it; and consequently, *Chalmers* having constructive notice of such agreement, could only require under his contract with *Stafford*, what the latter was entitled to under his with *Roberts*.

I will next take, as another type, *Davies v. Connor* ('Daily Times,' 14th August). Here, Mr. Justice Richmond after an elaborate enquiry into transactions of the late partnership between the plaintiff and defendant, had found a balance due from the former to the latter, instead of due to the former as claimed by him, and the report of the Registrar, in accordance with that Judge's finding, had been completed and was filed on the 27th June, and the plaintiff's solicitor who was also plaintiff's barrister, did not give notice of his motion to vary it until the 23rd July. By Act of Parliament the rule in such case (249) is that, "When any certificate or report of the Registrar shall have been signed, and adopted by the judge, the same shall be filed in the office of the court, and shall henceforth be binding on all the parties to the proceedings, unless discharged or varied in open court *upon motion* within one calendar month." A "motion" or "upon motion" is only one operation, and like every other operation, comprises its beginning, its end, and all its parts, and the plaintiff having wasted 26 days of the allowed month before he gave his notice of motion to vary the certificate or report, and the month having ended before the motion was ended, the mover ought to have been held to have been out of court, but Mr. Justice Chapman, upon some principle which I cannot comprehend, but which appears to me to have a

strong enmity to logic and justice, held otherwise, and seemed to think that where the plaintiff's solicitor is also the plaintiff's barrister, he may, as the former, give notice that he is going to do something which, as the latter, he is not ready to do; and thus, having delayed for 26 days as the former, to give the notice of motion, he may, as not being prepared, as the latter, to make it, indefinitely defer making it, and begin it nearly three weeks after the time at which it ought to have been ended. I have been for nearly 50 years such an dolator of Justice, that she has commissioned me to say that this decision is against her canons, and to add that *semper parata* is her motto.

I would take *Donkin v. Taine* as another type; *France v. Suisted* (I mean what has been done in it up to this time—its institution and course of prosecution) as another type, and pass in review several other types which have presented themselves during my short sojourn here, but that the task is repulsive and that those I have given ought to be enough to lead to amendment.

Were I to present you, in the transaction of your legal matters out of court, the picture would be still darker.

The main acquaintance you have with justice is the cost of law, against which state of things, in such a community, I could not hope to struggle successfully single-handedly, and therefore (and I think you will have no just ground to call me coward) I run away the second time. I am only a mere lawyer—indeed only a chamber counsel—incapable of making a long speech about nothing—in fact, incapable of making one at all. Truth and justice reside in brevity, but Beelzebub is no friend to brevity, and would, against any power I could supply, overwhelm truth and justice in spume and noise.

I pen this in the service of your children, as I did not like to run away again without a word. If you had not sunk quite so low, I could have served you.

Unfortunately I have to encounter little better in returning to Victoria, and even if the state of my health permitted (which it does not) of my returning to the English bar (where I made a good income) I should not be able, notwithstanding the esteem I left behind me on quitting it, to get back my practice, against the aversion there entertained (and I am inclined to think justly) to immigrants from colonial bars.

I decline place, and I decline foulness. Nothing remains but to compound with destitution. The contest with Satan has become too wearisome, and, what is worse, beyond my dilapidated faculties. He is getting me under. His arms grow longer, mine shorter. I have no longer health or strength to give him one from the shoulder at every turn, and he increases the turns, and I am vanquished.

Yours faithfully,

Thomas Parsons.

*Dunedin,*

*22nd August, 1867.*

Mills, Dick—Co., Printers, Stafford Street, Dunedin.