

these adroit and specious reasoners. Their love for the mass of the people is but skin deep. Scarcely it and you will find the same degree of sincerity and honesty as that possessed by the typical quack medicine vendor on the market place. It gave us a shock to see a good old Irish name on the address label of the Socialist paper. We would advise our friend to be careful of the same. Socialism and the other lams are but the mushrooms of a day. They come in and go out like the hobbie skirt and the merry widow hat. It is the part of prudence to be suspicious of people who advocate a political economy that will supply something for nothing.

**WAKE UP!**

Recent happenings in the criminal world will doubtless start an agitation for the suppression of the revolver. An excellent citizen of Ottawa, while on government duty in Windsor, was ruthlessly shot dead by a man whom he turned back from the Canadian border. Several other cases of a similar character have recently occurred. The sale of deadly weapons should be absolutely prohibited save to persons whose avocation in life would justify such protection. We have a law against the carrying of deadly weapons, but it might just as well be not on the statute book. Rarely do we hear of a person being punished for such a crime. It is only when criminals are being searched in the police courts that the discovery is made. Suspicious characters coming into and those already residing in the city should, it seems to us, be overhauled once in a while by the detectives. The neglect of the administration of the law throughout the whole country in this matter, as well as in regard of dishonest trading, has become a byword. This laxity—this Rip Van Winkleism—pertains to all the provinces and under Liberal and Conservative administrations alike. The excuse made by prosecuting attorneys that they take action when complaint is made is frivolous. We should have a few William Burns throughout the country to find out things. Scandalous conditions prevailed in Detroit and it was left for the Burns staff of detectives to lodge a dozen aldermen in goal for grafting. They voted a piece of city property to a railway company and received a cash reward therefor. Burns and his men caught them in the act. No one, we think, will hazard the opinion that all the cities of Canada are entirely free from the corrupt city official. How are they elected? We will be asked. And our answer is: consult the lodges. We all know the man who looms high in civic affairs who is known as a "joiner," who belongs to all the oath bound secret societies and expects their votes when the ballot box is open for business. All the brothers cast their ballots for him; and there you are! What are we going to do about it? We do not know. Some will say public opinion will cure the evil. But what can be done when an unhealthy public opinion manages to outstrip the healthy but dormant public opinion? That everything that looks like a man should have a vote is largely accountable for present conditions. There should be some qualification. At present the man who has a record in the police court has the same voice in the government of the country and the city as the most estimable citizen who annually pays thousands of dollars into the city coffers. Let us not be understood as favoring the disfranchisement of the citizen who is in humble circumstances. If he has no property qualification he should at least have a qualification of personal worth—intelligence, honesty, sobriety, etc. Besides this, we desire to repeat what we have often said before—that the man who offers and the man who receives a bribe for his vote should be disfranchised for a number of years.

**AS TO GIN**

We notice an advertisement of Coates Plymouth gin in the Quebec Telegraph. We are told that it has a dry and palate delighting flavor that good judges demand, and that it is superb for rickety and cocktail. We have heard of cocktail before. It is a mixture of different varieties of intoxicants, but we stand dumb-founded at "rickety." That is beyond us. We hazard the opinion that if a man or woman partakes even moderately, before retiring, of Mr. Coates' Plymouth gin, his or her palate next morning will have anything but a delightful flavor. The advertisement gives us the further information that Coates is the original Plymouth gin made in the Back Friars distillery, Plymouth, in 1763. Whilst the business manager of the Quebec Telegraph may be within his right to advertise Mr. Coates' brain-disturber and stomach-sickener, we must take decided

objection to his setting off the advertisement with a picture of a Black Fraiz with a glass in one hand and a bottle of Mr. Coates' gin in the other, looking quite happy under the influence. We trust our contemporary will take down this disreputable sign-board. If he does not do so his Catholic subscribers will have cause of complaint. As to the merits of the article advertised we have our own opinion. If a "traveller from New Zealand" were to visit the slums of old London and take note of the havoc made on human nature by the consumption of gin—not excluding Mr. Coates' brand—he would come to the conclusion that manufacturers of this beverage are no better than they ought to be.

**"NEWS" FROM ROME**

When people scan news from Rome in the daily papers it would be well to keep an open mind as to its correctness. When there is a dearth of horrible happenings all over the world, and when it becomes advisable not to disturb the peaceful relations existing between nations, some of the associated press people, more especially those who carry the Masonic sign in continental centres, have recourse to Vatican rumors to keep the press pot boiling. Incidentally we may say that it is one of the curious features of our time that some little insignificant fellow behind the fountain pen in an editorial room often-times possesses the power to set numbers of people by the ears. There are several causes. First, dearth of real news in the market, and the necessity of sending over the wires the usual bulk of matter to make a day's work. Secondly, the inordinate craving for sensation, the desire to give people at the breakfast table a full measure of horrible and extraordinary things to think and talk about. Some time ago the report was spread over the world that the Pope intended to suspend the Ne Temere decree. Now we have the information that the report of the Pope's intention to do so is absolutely unfounded, nor, adds the despatch, "is it likely ever to be revoked, as it embodies provisions which have governed church procedure for two centuries."

**AN EYE OPENER**

It is possible that those crazed factionists in Belfast will bring upon themselves serious monetary loss by their savage fanaticism. In some parts of Ulster Orangemen is not unlike an attack of rabies. Sir Edward Carson, Lord Londonderry and others will be held to strict account for their criminal conduct in inflaming the passions of these misguided, ignorant people. A despatch from Belfast tells us that owing to continuous disputes between Orangemen and Catholics over the Home Rule agitation, which has resulted in many Catholics being prevented from working, the shipbuilding firm of Harland & Wolff has already closed down some of its departments. It is announced by the firm that it will be unable to continue other departments, which will ultimately result in the whole of the work stopping unless the disturbances are discontinued. In a statement to its employees the firm says: "Matters have arrived at such a crisis in the Belfast shipyards that many of the men have been intimidated; some of them skilled men, who it is impossible to replace, and the firm is reluctantly obliged to close down a considerable portion of its plant." Some of the Catholic workmen were, on July 27th, assailed with bolts and nuts as they went to work, by a crowd of youths. A number of them were injured. So we may take it that Orangemen both abroad and in Canada is a bad business, and those who promote its extension we may characterize as undesirable citizens. The claim that Orangemen are the defenders of civil and religious liberty is merely a cloak to cover the dark doings and the selfish strivings of the ward boss who appraises Orange votes as a valuable asset in time of need.

**"HISTORICAL" ARCHDEACONS**

Last week we referred to the appointment by the Dominion Government of the Venerable Archbishop Armitage of Halifax, to be the Nova Scotia representative on the Advisory Committee connected with the Archives. We have since learned that the representative appointed for New Brunswick is the Venerable Archbishop Raymond of St. John. Apparently, the Archdeacons of the Church of England are in wild demand as Archbishops. It will be interesting to see how many more are appointed. We have no objection in the world to the appointment of these gentlemen if they are the best men available for their respective localities. If they bring knowledge and learning and impartial judgment with them, let the procession continue. We suspect, however, if the committee is made up wholly of Archdeacons, some people may be vulgar enough to suspect that it is not the especial fitness of the appointee so much as his "pull" that determines the question of selection.

What sort of prosperity will Home Rule give Ireland when the very discussion of it results in the crippling of Harland and Wolff's shipbuilding plant, one of the greatest industries in the country?—Toronto Mail and Empire.

FOR AN honest and candid expression of opinion, not tinged with religious or political bias, we would never think of pushing the button at the door of The Mall and Empire editorial sanctum. Why was he not honest enough to say that the Orange Association is responsible for all this lawless and brutal conduct in Belfast? Likewise were he given to speaking the truth in many a fashion, he would say that former British governments sowed the dragon's teeth of division amongst the Irish people and now we are having the unlovely harvest. He knows very well, too, that the Orange faction has for centuries been given the ascendancy in Irish political life, and now that there is a prospect of equal rights for all and special privileges to none the Orange lodges have become as a hornet's nest.

**TRADING WITH OUR TALENTS**

Last week we pleaded for greater Catholic activity in civic life. Now if we are to acquit ourselves in the civic arena with credit to ourselves and honor to our Church we must trade with our talents, in other words, we must learn the rules of the game. We must train for the contest. Conversing with a leading citizen of a certain Ontario town we expressed our surprise at the small number of Catholics who held public positions or offices in the municipality. He explained their absence to mean a want of ability to fill these positions. We ventured to dissent from that opinion. Brains are not the monopoly of any religious persuasion. "Beauty lingers everywhere," the poet says, and it is likewise with mental gifts. They are given in greater or less degree to everybody, but some people make better use of them than others and as a general rule non-Catholics are not the people who bury their talents in the earth. They have a multiplicity of clubs, lodges, and societies of various kinds; they are loyal to these societies, and at the meetings they become accustomed to giving their thoughts expression. Thus it happens that they acquire the habit of public speaking, and are not rendered speechless when they face an audience. We, Catholics, on the other hand, are for the most part content to sit and listen, and then when the time comes for us to speak we are unable to do so with any ease or fluency. We are very much in the position of the man who had long been a silent member of a certain committee, until being possessed with the ambition to be as good as the others, he decided to make a speech. He consulted the secretary as to how it was to be done. "The easiest thing in the world," said that functionary, "you have but to get up, face the audience, and the words will come." He followed instructions. "Mr Chairman and gentlemen," he began, and then there was an awkward pause. He tried again with no better success. A third time he attempted it only to fail. The audience was getting impatient; the speaker was getting excited. "The secretary is a liar," he fairly bellowed. "He told me if I stood up to speak the words would come, but he jabsers they won't." Many of us seem to be of the same opinion as this would-be orator. We think the words will come, but they will not without encouraging them by constant practise. A Catholic society will afford us this practise if we only make up our minds to utilize it. Let us support it loyally; let us attend the meetings and make up our minds that we are going to speak. We shall thus achieve two objects—we shall help to keep up interest in the society and we shall be fitting ourselves to put our ideas intelligently before a larger audience when the occasion arises.

Given at Rome, at the Palace of the Holy Office, June 21st, 1912.

ALDYSIUS CASTELLANO,  
Notary of the H. R. and U. I.

**THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION**

ON THE AUTHOR, DATE OF COMPOSITION AND HISTORICAL TRUTH OF THE GOSPELS ACCORDING TO MARK AND ACCORDING TO LUKE

The Pontifical Biblical Commission has decreed to answer thus to the following questions proposed:

I. Whether the clear evidence of tradition wonderfully harmonious from the earliest ages of the Church and supported by numerous arguments, viz., by the explicit testimonies of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers, by the citations and allusions occurring in their writings, by the usage of the ancient heretics, by the versions of the books of the New Testament, in the most ancient and almost universal manuscript codices, and also by intrinsic argument from the text itself of the Sacred Books, certainly compels us to affirm that Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and Luke, a doctor, the assistant and companion of Paul, are really the authors of the Gospels which are respectively attributed to them?

Answer. In the affirmative.

II. Whether the reasons, by which some critics endeavor to prove that the two first Gospels of the Gospel of Mark (Mark, XVI, 9-20) were not written by Mark himself but added by another hand, are of a kind to justify the statement that these verses are not to be received as inspired and canonical, or at least prove that Mark is not the author of said verses.

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

All things whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, at the palace of the Holy Office, June 21st, 1912.

ALDYSIUS CASTELLANO,  
Notary of the H. R. and U. I.

**DECREE**

ON DISPENSATION FROM THE IMPEDIMENT OF DISPARITY OF CULT GIVEN WITHOUT THE DUE GUARANTEES

In a plenary meeting of the S. Congregation of the Holy Office held on Wednesday June 12th, 1912, on the questions:

I. Whether a dispensation from the impediment of disparity of cult, given by a person having faculty from the Holy See, when the prescribed guarantees have either not been asked or have been refused, is to be held as valid or not?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

II. Whether the very rare and altogether singular documents in which the Canticole of the Magnificat is attributed not to the Blessed Virgin Mary but to Elizabeth, can and should at all prevail against the harmonious testimony of nearly all the codices both of the original Greek text and of the versions, as well as against the interpretation clearly required no less by the context than by the mind (animus) of the Virgin herself and the constant tradition of the Church?

Answer. In the negative.

III. Whether, with regard to the chronological order of the Gospels, it is lawful to abandon the opinion (sententia) supported as it is by the most ancient and supported also by the most numerous tradition, which testifies that, after Matthew who first of all wrote his Gospel in his native language Mark wrote second and Luke third; or is this opinion to be regarded as opposed to that which asserts that the second and third Gospels were composed before the Greek version of the first Gospel?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

IV. Whether it is lawful to set the date of the composition of the Gospels of Mark and Luke as late as the destruction of the city of Jerusalem; or whether, from the fact that in Luke the prophet or Our Lord concerning the overthrow of this city seems to be more definite, it can at least be held that his Gospel was written after the siege had begun?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

V. Whether it is to be affirmed that the Gospel of Luke preceded the book of The Acts of the Apostles (Acts, I, 1-2); and since this book, of which the same Luke is author was finished at the end of the Roman imprisonment of the Apostle (Acts, XXVIII, 30-31) his Gospel was composed not after this date?

Answer. In the affirmative.

VI. Whether, in view both of the testimony of tradition and of internal arguments, with regard to the sources which both Evangelists used in writing their Gospels, the opinion can prudently be called in question which holds that Mark wrote according to the preaching of Peter and Luke according to the preaching of Paul, and which at the same time asserts that these Evangelists had at their disposition other trustworthy sources, either oral or already written?

Answer. In the negative.

VII. Whether the saying and doings which by Mark according to the preaching of Peter are accurately and almost graphically narrated, and which in the minds of the faithful are regarded as the beginning from eminently trustworthy witnesses, viz., who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word (Luke, I, 2, 3), are most faithfully set forth, have a just claim to the full and historical credence which the Church has ever given them; or whether, on the contrary, the same saying (facta?) and doings are to be regarded as devoid of historical truth at least in part, either because the writers were not eyewitnesses, or because in both Evangelists lack of order and discrepancy in the succession of facts are not unfrequently found, or because, since they came and wrote later, they must necessarily have related conceptions foreign to the mind of Christ and the Apostles, or facts more or less infected by popular imagination, or, finally because they indulged in preconceived dogmatic ideas, each according to the scope he had in view?

Answer. In the affirmative to the first part; in the negative to the second.

**ON THE SYNOPSIS QUESTION OR THE MUTUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS**

The Pontifical Biblical Commission has also decided to answer thus to the following questions proposed:

I. Whether, observing absolutely all things that are to be observed according to what has been already laid down, especially as regards the authenticity and integrity of the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, the substantial identity of the Greek Gospel of Matthew with its primitive original, and the order of time in which they were written, it is lawful for exegeses, in order to explain the similarities or dissimilarities (similitudines aut dissimilitudines) between them, to dispute freely among all the varying and opposing opinions of authors and to appeal to hypotheses of oral or written tradition upon the dependence of one of the one or both that precede (rel etiam de precedentibus)?

Answer. In the affirmative.

II. Whether what has been laid down above is to be considered as observed by those who, unsupported by any testimony of tradition or by any historical argument lightly embrace the hypothesis commonly known as that of the two sources, which strives to explain the composition of the Greek Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke mainly by their dependence on the Gospel of Mark and on the Logia, and can they, therefore, freely advocate it?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

On June 20th, 1915, in an audience graciously granted to the two most Rev. Secretaries Consultors, Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius X, raised the following questions and ordered that they be made public.

Rome, June 26th 1912.

FULCRANUS VIGOUROUX, G. S. Sulp.,  
LAURENTIUS JANSSENS O. S. B.  
Secretaries Consultors.

My God, how sad a thing is time when it goes on coming; and how right was that saint who said: "Let us throw our hearts into eternity."

III. Whether likewise it is lawful to doubt of the inspiration and canonicity of the narrations of Luke on the intensity of Christ (Luke, I, 1), or of the apparition of the Angel comforting Jesus and of the bloody sweat (Luke, XXII, 43-44); or whether at least it can be shown by solid reasons (as ancient heretics used to think and certain more recent critics hold) that these narrations do not belong to the genuine Gospel of Luke?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

IV. Whether those very rare and altogether singular documents in which the Canticole of the Magnificat is attributed not to the Blessed Virgin Mary but to Elizabeth, can and should at all prevail against the harmonious testimony of nearly all the codices both of the original Greek text and of the versions, as well as against the interpretation clearly required no less by the context than by the mind (animus) of the Virgin herself and the constant tradition of the Church?

Answer. In the negative.

V. Whether, with regard to the chronological order of the Gospels, it is lawful to abandon the opinion (sententia) supported as it is by the most ancient and supported also by the most numerous tradition, which testifies that, after Matthew who first of all wrote his Gospel in his native language Mark wrote second and Luke third; or is this opinion to be regarded as opposed to that which asserts that the second and third Gospels were composed before the Greek version of the first Gospel?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

VI. Whether it is lawful to set the date of the composition of the Gospels of Mark and Luke as late as the destruction of the city of Jerusalem; or whether, from the fact that in Luke the prophet or Our Lord concerning the overthrow of this city seems to be more definite, it can at least be held that his Gospel was written after the siege had begun?

Answer. In the negative to both parts.

VII. Whether it is to be affirmed that the Gospel of Luke preceded the book of The Acts of the Apostles (Acts, I, 1-2); and since this book, of which the same Luke is author was finished at the end of the Roman imprisonment of the Apostle (Acts, XXVIII, 30-31) his Gospel was composed not after this date?

Answer. In the affirmative.

VIII. Whether, in view both of the testimony of tradition and of internal arguments, with regard to the sources which both Evangelists used in writing their Gospels, the opinion can prudently be called in question which holds that Mark wrote according to the preaching of Peter and Luke according to the preaching of Paul, and which at the same time asserts that these Evangelists had at their disposition other trustworthy sources, either oral or already written?

Answer. In the negative.

IX. Whether the saying and doings which by Mark according to the preaching of Peter are accurately and almost graphically narrated, and which in the minds of the faithful are regarded as the beginning from eminently trustworthy witnesses, viz., who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word (Luke, I, 2, 3), are most faithfully set forth, have a just claim to the full and historical credence which the Church has ever given them; or whether, on the contrary, the same saying (facta?) and doings are to be regarded as devoid of historical truth at least in part, either because the writers were not eyewitnesses, or because in both Evangelists lack of order and discrepancy in the succession of facts are not unfrequently found, or because, since they came and wrote later, they must necessarily have related conceptions foreign to the mind of Christ and the Apostles, or facts more or less infected by popular imagination, or, finally because they indulged in preconceived dogmatic ideas, each according to the scope he had in view?

Answer. In the affirmative to the first part; in the negative to the second.

**SPIRITISM UNVEILED**

Written for the Intermentum Catholic.

It has been clearly demonstrated that belief in the reality of demonic intervention is integral in Christianity, that is, inseparable from a profession of faith in Christian teaching. This being so, a denial of this reality, or of the existence of Satan and his intervention at times, in mundane affairs, would be virtually a denial of Christian faith.

Hence the efforts of unbelievers, under the guise of science, especially medical science, to reject the evidence of demonic intervention, or physiological and other natural principles. They strive to reason, explain, or deny everything pertaining to demonology, deny the existence of Satan, and hold that evil spirits are simply creatures of disorderly brains, that apparitions or ghosts are only hallucinations, resulting from a species of madness, and that magic was mere quackery, jugglery or sleight-of-hand. The object of all this, which is evidently anti-Christian, was to alienate Christians from faith in Christ, and it succeeded admirably, because it was preached in the name of science, progress and enlightenment.

The enemies of Christianity may accept the mysterious phenomena, commonly regarded as diabolical, but they will explain them, and the miracles of the Bible, and those to which the Church gives her sanction on natural principles, and if they are unable to explain them on any known natural principles, they are sure to make them the basis of an induction of a new natural principle; or, in other words, invent some new principle to explain them.

This was what Baron Karl von Reichenbach, 1788-1869, the German scientist, did. To explain the extraordinary phenomena he invented a principle, element or force, which he called Od. His pupils may do this, or they may organize their real spiritual and superhuman origin, but will ascribe them to good, not to evil spirits, or what is equivalent to this, maintain that what the world has hitherto worshipped as good is evil, and that what it has been taught to avoid as evil, is good, that is, that Satan takes the place of God.

But the doctrines which the spirits teach and confirm with lying wonders are what the apostle terms "the doctrines of devils." Believers are almost unanimous in declaring that there is no devil and no hell. Some admit the existence of a Supreme Being, but God's personality is so obscured, that He appears only in the distance as an infinite abstraction. This dominant sentiment of the age is what the spirits strive to inculcate, especially in the sciences where Satan is least disturbed. When and where they are not held in check by a lingering respect for Christianity, they become intemperate and furious radicals, preach progress without divine assistance, and development without any created germ from which to start, yet their teachings are undeveloped germs which exist in the minds of their mediums. Not infrequently do they deny every professed Christian doctrine, and what they admit they are sure to pervert. In general their teachings in regard to Christianity is, that it is effete, and its day, and that now there is a grander and more sublime form about to be developed, and that they are the harbinger of the new form, though old in its origin, dating back to Satan's rebellion against his Creator, is to free the world from the teachings of Christianity, to liberate them from bondage to the Bible, to creeds and dogmas, the old patriarchal systems and governments, and place the religious social and political world on a new energetic plane, and moved by a more energetic spirit of progress and enlightenment. This, so far as known, is the object to be attained by spiritism. The work begun by Christ is in itself incomplete, and their mission is to bring it to a successful issue.

Spiritists assume that one of the special objects is to convince the world of the immortality of the soul. This, as has been shown, they fail to do. But, conceding, for the sake of argument, that their pretensions be what they claim, it may be asked in what form, what condition, what sense does the soul, liberated from the body, survive? The mediums, however, addicted to it, may have been to demon-worship, believed in this immortality of the soul, but the life and blissful immortality brought to light by Christian revelation, and intended for the just, they did not believe, and the spirits do not teach or affirm it. The spirits are entirely ignorant of the sanctified souls enter into which the sanctified souls enter when they leave this world, and are purified from all stains contracted in the flesh.

The only immortality is the immortality of the rebellious angels who lost their celestial abode. But even for such immortality they offer no proof. On the testimony of advocates of the cult they are lying spirits. Hence their word is worthless, and their identity with souls once united to human bodies, and which they pretend to personate, is not and cannot be established.

There are, no doubt, many marvelous phenomena, termed spirit manifestations, but how prove whether the spirits are the souls of the dead, or really evil spirits personating them? Spiritists are necromancers, that is, diviners with the spirits of the dead. Necromancers are as old as history. They are alluded to in Genesis. Moses forbade necromancy. In all ancient and modern pagan nations necromancy, which is defined by Webster as "they are of revealing future events by means of a pretended communication with the dead," is found to be a very common species of divination. The African magicians found at Cairo, practice it even to the present day, as testified to by reliable English and French writers, though by seeing medium, not as in the case with spirits, by rapping, talking, and writing mediums. They are real diviners, attempting, by means of evoking the dead, to divine secrets, whether of the past or the future, unknown to the living. They practice what the world has always called divination, and that species of divination termed necromancy. This is very clear and undeniable. Therefore, they do that which Christianity condemns, and holds to be unlawful, that is, dealing with evil spirits. This, however, is

nothing to their purpose, for they place the authority of the spirits above that of Christ, and do not hesitate in substituting spiritism for Christianity.

A lawyer and judge, who, after the death of his wife, became a member of the cult, and had written a good sized volume in its defence, was asked by an intimate friend as to the evidence on which he based his conclusion, that the communicating spirits were really the souls of men and women, who once lived in the flesh. He answered, "They themselves expressly affirm, and prove it, by proving that they have knowledge of the earthly lives of the persons they say they are, and which we should expect them to have in case they were those very questions."

The friend against said, "The question, you will perceive, my dear judge, is one of identity—a question with which, as a lawyer and judge, you must have often had occasion to deal. Is the evidence you assign sufficient?" To this query he replied, "I say it is."

The next question was, "Do you find the spirits always tell the truth?" His answer to the question was, "No, I have said in my book, they frequently lie." "Then," said the inquirer, "the simple fact that a spirit says he is Franklin or William Penn is not a sufficient proof that he is?" To this objection the reply was, "I concede it. But I do not rely on his word alone. I examine the spirit, and I conclude he is identically Franklin only when I find that he has that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the identity, unless you know beforehand that the spirit could not have that intimate acquaintance with the earthly life of Franklin which I should expect to find in the case he really were Franklin." Pressing still further the objection the friend said, "But that intimate acquaintance does not establish the