

# The Dominion Review.

VOL. III.

JULY, 1898.

NO. 7.

## IS CHRISTIANITY FOUNDED UPON A MYTH?

BY THE REV. CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL, D.D., PRESIDENT OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.\*

CHRISTIANITY is often defined as a system of belief founded upon Christ. The definition should be more explicit. Christianity is a system of belief founded upon the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. That is to say, the Resurrection of Christ is the cornerstone of Christian belief. If that cornerstone be removed out of its place, or if it crumble away into dust, the system of belief founded thereupon is disintegrated and destroyed. St. Paul, the chief apologist of Christianity, clearly takes this position: "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain; your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we witnessed of God that He raised up Christ, whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable." (First Epistle to the Corinthians, 15: 14-19.)

From this strong statement of St. Paul, in which he appears to stake Christianity itself upon the historical reality of Christ's Resurrection, there has been a disposition to recede from time to time, even on the part of some undoubtedly earnest Christians. The literal fact of the Resurrection has become veiled beneath a philosophic conception of immortality and an ethical appreciation of the influence of Christ. But on Easter morning one confronts the fact of a Risen Christ rather than an abstract conception of immortality; one is brought back to the concrete; one is forced to make with St. Paul the great confession of faith, "Now is Christ risen from the dead," or, with St. Paul to look full in the face the tremendous alternative: "If Christ be not risen." For in the end of the nineteenth century, as in the end of the first century, Christianity stands or falls by the fundamental thesis of a rising of Jesus Christ from *absolute* death to *absolute* life. "According to the divine instinct of the first age," says one of the greatest of living scholars, "the message of the Resurrection sums up in one fact the teaching of the Gospel. It is the one central link between the seen and the unseen. We cannot allow our thoughts to be vague or undecided upon it

\* This article was specially prepared by Dr. Hall for the Easter number of the *New York Times Illustrated Magazine*.

with impunity. We must place it in the very front of our confession, with all that it includes, or we must be prepared to lay aside the Christian name. The elements of dogma and morality are indeed inseparably united in the Resurrection of Christ, for the same fact which reveals the glory of the Lord reveals at the same time the destiny of man and the permanence of all that goes to make up the fulness of human life. If the Resurrection be not true, the basis of Christian morality, no less than the basis of Christian theology, is gone. The issue cannot be stated too broadly. We are not Christians unless we are clear in our confession on this point. To preach the fact of the Resurrection was the first function of the evangelists; to embody the doctrine of the Resurrection is the great office of the Church; to learn the meaning of the Resurrection is the task not of one age only, but of all." (Westcott, Bishop of Durham, "The Gospel of the Resurrection," pp. 7, 8.)

It is well to remind ourselves on Easter morning that the constant testimony of Christianity from the beginning until now asserts in detail the supernatural character of the facts attending the rising of Christ from the tomb; and the absolute certainty of his death, as having preceded these alleged supernatural occurrences. Being condemned before the Roman tribunal, He was conveyed to Calvary; there He was elevated upon the cross, being nailed thereto by soldiers appointed for the purpose. Upon the cross He was exposed to the public gaze for six hours of suffering, during which He repeatedly spoke, and near the end of which an extraordinary darkness overspread the scene. At length with a great cry He bowed His head and expired. To make certain that no life lingered within Him, His *heart* was pierced by a spear. He was then removed from the cross. His body was prepared for burial in a manner that would *prevent respiration* in a living person, after which He was laid in a tomb. Within that tomb, the entrance to which was closed, He lay for *one day and two nights*. At dawn after the second night his tomb was found open. His body had disappeared, its burial wrappings remained in sight, and two beings described as angels were seen within the tomb as if guarding the spot where lately He had reposed. Amid the paths of the garden one of His followers encountered him, and on being called by name recognized Him as the one who had been dead. Then, for forty days, from time to time, He presented himself to His disciples and conversed with them; on some occasions He joined Himself to a few of the group, at other times He associated Himself with the whole company; on one occasion He was seen by more than five hundred persons. Forty days having past, He withdrew Himself miraculously from their presence and *ascended into heaven*. Such, in outline, is the character of the event upon which, we are solemnly assured by St. Paul (*with whom nineteen centuries of belief concur*), depends the validity of Christianity. If Christ be not risen from the dead, the system of faith bearing His name is vanity and the adherents of the system are of all men

most pitiable  
believer to  
(depends) h  
various den  
view of the  
founded up  
despised an  
history, tha  
the sky, onl  
stars, so the  
size the cal  
It is mo  
more people  
how doubt  
of approach  
nable citade  
elders "gav  
by night and  
13.) It was  
by accusing  
continued, s  
Wolfenbittel  
French illu  
and fraude  
But the pu  
of the apost  
we hear the  
made by the  
natural elem  
many assails  
Ernest Rena  
to attribute  
This stateme  
editions of th  
of Lazarus, a  
passages wer  
During thi  
time to time  
corroborated  
of Christ. T  
Mythical. T

most pitiable. It need occasion no surprise and no alarm to any Christian believer to learn that the reality of Christ's Resurrection (upon which Christianity depends) has been called in question or denied, earnestly and repeatedly. The various *denials* of the Resurrection operate rather as a *confirmation of faith*, in view of the fact that, through eighteen centuries of such denials, the religion founded upon this belief has grown *from obscurity to universality*, from a despised and rejected opinion to a faith that has changed the course of human history, that has *reconstructed civilisation*. As the clouds, ever sweeping across the sky, only accentuate the stability and constancy of the sun and the fixed stars, so the perennial and variable assaults upon the Resurrection only emphasize the *calm security* in which reposes this primary *fact* of the Christian faith.

It is most interesting and impressive on this latest Easter morning, (when more people in the world than ever believe in the Resurrection,) to remember how doubt and denial, like besiegers of a castle trying in succession every avenue of approach, have sought by one method after another to invade this *impregnable citadel* of Christianity. The assaults began when the chief priests and elders "gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, 'Say ye, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept.'" (Gospel of St. Matthew, 28 : 12-13.) It was renewed by Celsus in the second century, who undertook the attack by accusing the Gospel witnesses of untruthfulness and wilful deception. It was continued, substantially on the same lines, by Reimarus in the eighteenth century Wolfenbittel Fragments, by some of the English deists, by Voltaire, and the French *illuminati*, who did not hesitate to impute to Christ Himself deceitful and fraudulent intentions.

But the pure and beautiful character of Christ and the intense moral earnestness of the apostles have been sufficient refutation of this mode of attack ; seldom do we hear the suggestion of deceitful intent on the part of the Lord's followers made by those who assail the reality of His Resurrection and the other supernatural elements of the Gospel record. The ethical beauty of Jesus is lauded by many assailants of Christian belief, by none with more rhetorical ardor than by Ernest Renan, (although it should be remembered that Renan did not hesitate to attribute thoughts and motives to Christ inconsistent with perfect morality. This statement may be proved by those who will examine passages in the earlier editions of the Vie de Jesus relating to Christ conniving with deceit at the grave of Lazarus, and to other and darker shadows associated with Gethsemane. These passages were, some of them, expunged from later editions.)

During this century two lines of attack (among others) have been renewed from time to time against the supernatural occurrences reported in the Gospels and corroborated in the Epistles, with more particular reference to the Resurrection of Christ. These lines of attack are commonly called the Rationalistic and the Mythical. The distinction between them is important and should be carefully

noted. The former undertakes to explain alleged miraculous occurrences on purely natural grounds, admitting a historical basis of fact, but claiming that false interpretations were put upon ordinary facts. For example, the bright light shining around the shepherds on the night of Christ's birth was probably a meteor or the rays of a lantern that happened to be passing by; Christ's walking on the sea of Galilee was, in reality, His walking on the high bank of the shore; the healing of the blind man was accomplished by means of an "efficacious eye salve." Under this principle of interpretation the alleged Resurrection of Christ is easily explained. He was not really dead, but was in a deep swoon; being supposed to be dead He was placed in the tomb, where the pungent odors of the spices assisted Him to regain consciousness. The leader of this rationalistic interpretation was Dr. Paulus, of Heidelberg. (See his "Life of Christ," published in 1828.) This theory of the Resurrection conveys to us the picture of an exhausted and wounded man feebly walking forth to seek His discouraged and scattered friends. But such a return of Christ from the grave could scarcely account for that tremendous change in the demeanor of His disciples from dismay and panic to that joyous and triumphant energy wherewith within two months after the Resurrection they were uttering everywhere the message of the new faith. It is significant that the most effective answer ever given to the rationalistic theory of Paulus touching the Resurrection was given by Strauss, who upon another line of attack was equally earnest in combating the Christian view. "One who had thus crept forth half dead from the grave, and crawled about, a sickly patient, who had need of medical and surgical assistance, of nursing and strengthening, but who, notwithstanding, finally succumbed to His sufferings, (for on this theory Jesus subsequently must have died like other men), could never have given the disciples the impression that He was the conqueror over the grave and death, and the Prince of Life. Such a recovery could only have weakened, or at least given a pathetic tinge to the impression which he had made upon them by His life and death; but it cannot possibly have changed their sorrow into ecstasy, and raised their reverence into worship." (See Strauss's "Leben Jesu," quoted by Christlieb; "Modern Doubt," &c., p. 456.)

The line of attack which is known as the Mythical theory of interpretation is quite different from the rationalistic method to which I have just alluded. That regards the records of the Gospel as referring to actual events upon which mistaken interpretations have been placed; and claims that alleged miraculous occurrences can be fully accounted for on purely natural grounds. The objective point of the rationalistic school is to eliminate the supernatural element from the New Testament records. On the other hand, the mythical theory of interpretation contends that the records of supernatural occurrences are myths, fictions, or legends subsequently introduced to serve the purposes of the Christian system of belief. The distinction between the two lines of attack cannot be more clearly

shown than  
rationalistic  
unconscious  
theory asser  
of His Res  
desperate b  
great apolo  
first edition  
Renan, mem  
Christianity,  
sively consc  
differentiatio  
Testament in  
The positio  
that the myt  
substantiate  
following ser  
edition of Str  
"In orde  
selves into th  
thrown by hi  
stantly impres  
Messiah; but  
ideas, had for  
was past, the  
them a psycho  
date of Jesus  
Messiah the c  
the disciples t  
had disturbed,  
Master—to im  
When once th  
the great event  
surrounded an  
furnished." (C  
position of Res  
relating to the  
it can be comp  
sixth chapter o  
disciples like li  
Jesus, to the hi



shown than in connection with the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. The rationalistic theory denies that He died, and claims that He merely became unconscious, and that He regained consciousness on the third day. The mythical theory asserts that He died on the cross like any other man, and that the myth of His Resurrection was an afterthought circulated by His adherents as a desperate but successful expedient for the recovery of a lost cause. The two great apologists of the mythical theory were Dr. David Friedrich Strauss, whose first edition of the "Life of Jesus" appeared at Tübingen in 1835, and M. Ernest Renan, member of the Institute of France, whose "History of the Origins of Christianity," (in which the life of Jesus, the Apostles, and St. Paul were successively considered on lines somewhat parallel with those of Strauss, but with differentiations of style and method), constituted a brilliant summary of New Testament interpretation from the point of view of French materialism.

The position of Strauss in reference to the alleged Resurrection of Christ is that the myth of the Resurrection was invented by the disciples in order to substantiate before the world their earlier belief in Him as the Messiah. The following sentences, taken from the English translation of the fourth German edition of Strauss's "Life of Jesus," set forth his view :

"In order to form a correct judgment on this subject, we must transport ourselves into the situation and frame of mind into which the disciples of Jesus were thrown by his death. During several years' intercourse with them he had constantly impressed them more and more decidedly with the belief that he was the Messiah ; but his death, which they were unable to reconcile with their Messianic ideas, had for the moment annihilated this belief. Now when, after the first shock was past, the earlier impression began to revive, there spontaneously arose in them a psychological necessity of solving the contradiction between the ultimate fate of Jesus and their earlier opinion of him—of adopting into their idea of the Messiah the characteristics of suffering and death. What was more natural to the disciples than to reinstate their earlier Jewish ideas (which the death of Jesus had disturbed) through the medium of an actual revivification of their dead Master—to imagine him as returning to life in the manner of a resurrection ? When once the idea of a resurrection of Jesus had been formed in this manner, the great event could not be allowed to have happened so simply, but must be surrounded and embellished with all the pomp which the Jewish imagination furnished." (Quoted from Vol. III., pp. 370, 371, 374, ed. London, 1846.) The position of Renan concerning what he describes as "the origin of the legends relating to the Resurrection," is fully stated in his book on "The Apostles," but it can be comprehensively ascertained from the closing sentences of his twentieth chapter on the Life of Jesus. "The cry, 'He is risen !' ran among the disciples like lightning. Love gave it everywhere facile credence. The life of Jesus, to the historian, ends with his last sigh. But so deep was the trace which

he had left in the hearts of his disciples and of a few devoted women, that, for weeks to come, he was to them living and consoling. Had his body been taken away, or did enthusiasm, always credulous, afterwards generate the mass of accounts by which faith in the Resurrection was sought to be established? This, for want of peremptory evidence, we shall never know. We may say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalen here enacted a principal part. Divine power of love! Sacred moments in which the passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected god!" (Quoted from pp. 356-7, American ed., 1893.) Such, fairly indicated in the work of its own chief apologists, is the mythical theory of the event upon which the whole structure of the Christian Church is built. The myth of the Resurrection, according to Strauss, originated in the luxuriant imagination of a few Jews; according to Renan, the Parisian, "the passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God."

But it is to be borne in mind that the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection constitute but a small part of the Biblical testimony concerning contemporary belief in the actual rising of Jesus Christ from the dead. The Epistles of the New Testament represent *first century thought* on this subject; and, lest it be supposed by any that an enthusiasm for Christian truth leads one to overstate the credibility of the Epistles as historical documents, it is well to remember what degree of historical credibility is conceded to some of the Epistles by the leaders of the mythical theory of the Resurrection. In his work on St. Paul (p. 9, American ed., 1881), Renan, after asserting the legendary character of the earlier part of the Book of the Acts, says: "The Acts, up to this so legendary, suddenly becomes quite substantial; the last chapters, composed in part of the account of an eye-witness, are the only complete historical narrative of the first years of Christianity in our possession. Finally, by a privilege very rare in such a subject, these years offer us dated documents of absolute authenticity—a series of letters, the most important of which are proof against all criticism, and which have never undergone any interpolations." These "dated documents of absolute authenticity, which are proof against all criticism and which have never undergone any interpolations," are described by Renan (p. 10) as the "Epistles unquestionable and unquestioned, namely, the Epistle to the Galatians, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Romans." As to the dates of these "unquestionable and unquestioned" documents, Bishop Westcott says ("Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 108): "The most extreme opinions fix them between A.D. 52-59, that is, under no circumstances more than 30 years after the Lord's death (A.D. 30-33). There can be no doubt as to the authority of their evidence as expressing the *received opinions* of Christians at this date, and there can be no doubt as to the opinion itself. In each of the Epistles the literal fact of the Resurrection is the implied or acknowledged groundwork of the Apostle's teaching." An explicit statement concerning the literal death and the literal

Resurrection  
sources of  
you first of  
according to  
on the third  
then to the  
whom the g  
appeared to  
thirty years  
letter as a hi  
theory of th  
For many  
world. It co  
stated by its  
fact to which  
witness is to-  
Never dawned  
that tremen  
arisen from t  
And this g  
realize that th  
Resurrection.  
who argues a  
sufficient to p  
the alleged fa  
his favor, then  
putting th  
establish a co  
proof rested u  
called upon to  
the case has a  
in its favor.  
The burden of  
them to dispos  
is not risen, an  
The accumu  
truth that Chri  
Bible, from the  
the Resurrectio  
tioned validity  
the key to the

Resurrection of Christ occurs in one of these "unquestionable and unquestioned" sources of information (I. Ep. to Corinthians 15 : 3-7) : "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried ; and that he hath been raised on the third day, according to the Scriptures ; and that he appeared to Cephas ; then to the twelve ; then he appeared to about five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep ; then he appeared to James ; then to all the Apostles." Such are the words written within thirty years after the fact by one whose existence as a historical person and whose letter as a historical document are declared by the great apologist of the mythical theory of the Resurrection to be "unquestionable and unquestioned."

For many years the mythical theory of the Resurrection has been before the world. It could not be stated more powerfully or more eloquently than it was stated by its brilliant advocates, Strauss and Renan. Yet the great and simple fact to which the "unquestionable and unquestioned" Corinthian Epistle bears witness is to-day the faith of *more people than ever before* in the world's history. Never dawned an Easter morning whereon more human minds gave assent to that tremendous proposition of the "unquestioned Epistle" : "Now is Christ arisen from the dead."

And this growth of faith in the historic Resurrection must increase as Christians realize that the *burden of proof rests* not on them, but *on those who deny* the Resurrection. The "burden of proof" signifies the obligation resting upon one who argues a question of fact to produce evidence in support of his argument sufficient to produce a presumption in his favor. And when the party supporting the alleged fact has produced sufficient evidence to establish a presumption in his favor, then the burden of proof shifts to the other side, and the party disputing the alleged fact is required in his turn to bring evidence sufficient to establish a contrary presumption. The time has gone by when the burden of proof rested upon those who believe the historic Resurrection, when they were called upon to bring evidence to prove that Christ has risen. Upon that side of the case has *accumulated* a mass of evidence sufficient to establish a presumption in its favor. It is no longer the duty of a Christian to prove the Resurrection. The burden of proof has shifted to those who deny the Resurrection. It is for them to dispose of the accumulated evidence, and to prove against it that Christ is not risen, and that Christianity is founded upon a myth.

The accumulated evidence upon which is established a presumption of the truth that Christ died and rose again may be classified as proceeding from the Bible, from the Church, and from Christian experience. The evidence borne to the Resurrection in those parts of the Bible universally admitted to be of unquestioned validity as historic documents is explicit and ample. The Resurrection is the key to the New Testament. On him who pronounces the Resurrection a

myth rests the burden of proving that the Scriptures, admittedly historical, either falsify the fact or disclose a stupendous and unparalleled delusion. In the fact of the Church, the historic Church, lies a mass of evidence presumptive of the historic Resurrection. For the Church, scattered at his death, *sprang into power within a few short weeks* of that event, and from henceforth remained unconquerable. It could not be stamped out by the iron heel of emperors, nor conquered by ferocious persecutions, nor paralyzed by heresies, nor destroyed by schisms, nor quenched by the unhallowed apostasies of some of her members. The Church has lived and grown in the earth; it has educated nations, it has created home life, it has taught mercy and charity for the afflicted and the fallen. Whence came this Church, the greatest power for good the world has ever seen? On him who denies the Resurrection rests the burden of proving that the Church was founded on a fiction, or was born of a lie.

In the fact of Christian experience, which professes to draw its life from a risen Christ, lies a mass of evidence presumptive of the historic Resurrection. Millions of persons, believing Christ risen, have been moved with similar experiences through that belief: the same conviction of sin, the same aspiration for holiness, the same desire for usefulness, the same spiritual fellowship with the Son of God. Upon those who deny his Resurrection rests the burden of proving that these continuous and far-reaching experiences of human hearts are colossal self-delusions, the mind-wanderings of supersensitive men, the "passion of hallucinated women."

Thus, on Easter morning, they who believe in the Risen One may yield themselves to their glorious faith without feeling called upon to prove what they believe. The burden of proof is on the critics of Christianity. It is for them to account for Christianity on some theory more credible than that which underlies the Catholic faith. Safely may we test the reasonableness of supernatural religion by Hume's test of a miracle: "To establish a miracle, the testimony should be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish." (Quoted by Prebendary Wace in "The Gospel and His Witness," p. 44.) To account for Christian experience and for the Christian Church without the Resurrection of Christ from the dead requires a theory more miraculous than the theory of the Catholic faith. Christianity founded upon a myth would be ten thousand times more wonderful than Christianity founded upon a Christ who rose from the dead. It is not we Christians who must prove that he rose. Let them who deny his resurrection prove that he did not rise.

A MO

THE most  
haps, not  
for sectari  
impossibil  
great leng  
on its bro  
estimate,  
the Roman  
some cent  
of our day  
to be burn  
and the Ch  
which ena  
boast of th  
ing—surel  
say when v  
the Protest  
land—the r  
is deeply fu  
of every sh  
most focus  
with its st  
integrity n  
yet, of late  
able decay  
of its forme  
box o' whu  
the many  
McGiffert, a  
the Atlantic  
old church  
—almost sy  
And thus w  
his heretica  
which his fo  
fert, followi  
whose Confe  
of the crude  
Next to th  
Punishment  
would seem

## A MODERN DEFENCE OF CHRISTIAN DOGMAS.

BY J. SPENCER ELLIS.

The most striking feature of the Christianity of the present day is, perhaps, not so much the great diversity of sects into which it is divided, for sectarianism is a leading feature of all religions, as the apparent impossibility of any one of those sects maintaining its integrity for any great length of time. The Catholic Church still writes "Semper eadem" on its brow, as if it expected the rest of the world to take it at its own estimate, and fail to perceive its gray hair and palsied limbs. Probably the Roman Church would in many things be the same to-day as it was some centuries ago—if it had the power; but time has passed, the world of our day is not the same world as that which allowed its bravest sons to be burnt alive for conscience' sake by both Protestants and Catholics, and the Church is not likely ever again to possess the supreme power which enabled it to commit the crimes of the Inquisition. But if the boast of the Roman Church proves to be a delusion, and we see it answering—surely if slowly—to the evolutionary trumpet-call, what shall we say when we contemplate the evident and rapid disintegration shown by the Protestant sects? Even the staid old State-protected Church of England—the rival to Rome in its claim to authority and changelessness—is deeply furrowed by heresy, and to-day comprises within its fold men of every shade of opinion, from practical Atheism or Pantheism to the most foolish phase of Romanism. Probably the Presbyterian Church, with its sturdy and unflinching Scotch backbone, has maintained its integrity more effectually than any other of the Protestant sects; and yet, of late years, even the old Kirk has shown many signs of its inevitable decay and dissolution, which in the end may be more rapid because of its former restraint. The failure of the long struggle against "the box o' whistles;" the attempt to modify and humanize the Confession; the many recent trials for heresy of such men as Drs. Campbell, Briggs, McGiffert, and others of the more learned of its divines on both sides of the Atlantic, have all given evidence of the growth of new ideas in the old church which must unquestionably lead to "reform" and "schism"—almost synonymous terms when used in reference to religious bodies. And thus we have the strange spectacle of Dr. Briggs, condemned for his heretical utterances, finding an asylum in the broader church from which his forefathers had separated, and his fellow-professor, Dr. McGiffert, following closely in his footsteps; while the President of the College whose Confession they both reject undertakes the task of defending one of the crudest and least defensible of the dogmas of the orthodox faith.

Next to the childishly ridiculous and barbarous doctrine of Eternal Punishment, the doctrine of the Resurrection is probably that one which would seem at first sight to be the least likely to gain the assent of an

impartial and intelligent man, as well as the one which would seem to be least necessary to the support of the modern orthodox views. And yet we find the Rev. Charles Cuthbert Hall, President of the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary, deliberately upholding it as the corner-stone of the Christian faith, and doing this in such a way as to lay his defence open to the most damaging reply.

In the first place, Dr. Hall sets at naught the arguments of certainly the most sensible and humane defenders of Christianity, who base their claims upon "the sublime teachings" of Jesus. These latter, too, have Jesus himself on their side, for he is said to have cried, "It is finished!" on the cross; and we are constantly reminded that his one great work—the Atonement—was completed, and that thereafter all man needed was to accept this Sacrifice in order to attain eternal bliss. Surely, it is bad policy, even if Paul did set the example, to stake Christianity upon the truth of one dogma, and that such a debatable one as the Resurrection. It is like putting all your eggs into one basket. For of the three Christs that have been presented to us—the Living Christ, the Dying Christ, and the Risen Christ—to which can we attribute the largest share in producing that wonderful effect upon the world that is claimed for the Founder of Christianity? With the first we have the Teachings and Example, which are held by some to be so grand as to be in themselves sufficient to attest Christ's divinity, and to be the very origin and motive force of our present civilization; with the second we have the Sacrifice, which should hardly be necessary if the teachings and example were of the divine character ascribed to them; but for the third there seems to be no efficient *raison d'être*. A god who could come down from heaven, utter divine homilies and parables, and procure his crucifixion to appease his own anger, would surely be able to get back to heaven without going through the formality of a second incarnation. The "saints who die in the Lord" go to heaven, we are told, without more ado; and Jesus, it is said, told the Penitent Thief that he would be with him in Paradise on the very day of the Crucifixion. There is no apparent use for the Resurrection, more especially as it is now contended that the saints are to have, not a bodily, but a spiritual resurrection. St. Paul's argument loses its force, and the value of the Resurrection disappears, even as an addition to the evidences of Christ's divinity. It could only have been of avail with men who believed in a bodily resurrection and asked for evidence of its possibility.

There is another logical defect in the argument as used both by Paul and by Bishop Westcott, in the passage cited by Dr. Hall. Even if the resurrection of Christ could be demonstrated, its use to prove the resurrection of dead men—saints or otherwise—would be illogical. That an immortal god rose from the dead is no valid argument to prove that mortals can imitate him. If man be immortal, then there need be no doubt on the matter, and Christ's example is not needed. But this assumes the very thing to be proved. For, in the case of an immortal

man as in  
immortal  
say with  
this tangl  
"death,"  
death and

If it be  
rality is g  
late ourse  
very chan  
that "Chr  
system of  
imagine lo  
up such a

If all th  
with as its  
crucifixion  
theological  
know so n  
rational ex  
Jesus was s  
Luke 23: 1  
found no fa  
call this "

relates the  
only as bot  
He should  
of the incid  
opposed to  
as related;  
very clearly  
instance, he  
This chang  
But the acco  
the word "si  
still, it is sig  
aspect, that  
the soldiers  
he was alrea  
might be ful  
In the sam  
body in "a c  
that the body  
tion"; as if  
but his own i  
It is very a

man as in that of an immortal god, we are compelled to ask: Can an immortal being die? Can a being that dies be immortal? Shall we say with the Spiritualists, "There is no death"? Well, we must leave this tangle as it stands, for evidently we do not know what is meant by "death," which in Dr. Hall's hands assumes the two forms of *absolute* death and (we suppose) relative death!

If it be true, as Dr. Westcott says, that "the basis of Christian morality is gone if the Resurrection be not true," then may we congratulate ourselves upon having obtained something definite in regard to a very chameleon-like article. We are confirmed in our previous opinion, that "Christian" morality has no sort of connection with any useful system of morality that has ever been formulated by rational men. Just imagine learned D.D.s like Drs. Westcott and Hall deliberately setting up such a crude and hollow scarecrow as this!

If all the history taught at the Union Theological Seminary be dealt with as its President deals with the New Testament accounts of the crucifixion, and if, as seems likely, a similar method is pursued at other theological schools, it is not to be wondered at that the ordinary preachers know so many things that are "not so." Ignoring anything like a rational examination of the circumstances, Dr. Hall crudely says that Jesus was "condemned before the Roman tribunal." Pilate's words in Luke 23: 14 are: "Behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man whereof you accuse him." Does Dr. Hall call this "condemnation?" The way in which this reverend doctor relates the rest of the circumstances of the narrative stamps him, not only as both ignorant and credulous, but as unscrupulous in his methods. He should know, as was recently shown in these pages, that the whole of the incidents related in regard to the trial and execution of Jesus are opposed to both Roman and Jewish law, and could never have occurred as related; but the way in which he manipulates some of them shows very clearly that he is not above altering them to suit his purpose. For instance, he states that the "heart" of Jesus was pierced by a spear. This change is made in order to intensify the evidence of Christ's death. But the account in John 19: 34 (the only account of this incident) uses the word "side"; and, although the alteration would be of little value, still, it is significant of the doctor's method; and it has this unfortunate aspect, that it directly contradicts the Gospel account, which states that the soldiers did not break the legs of Jesus, because they perceived that he was already dead. Spearing the side was done "that the scripture might be fulfilled."

In the same way Dr. Hall converts the story of Joseph wrapping the body in "a clean linen cloth" (Matt. 27: 59) into a positive statement that the body was wrapped "in a manner that would prevent respiration"; as if it had been completely embalmed. Dr. Hall has no authority but his own imagination for these alterations.

It is very amusing to see the positive way in which this learned doctor

relates the circumstances of the death and burial of Jesus, overlooking the fact that there are four differing and conflicting accounts of them. He relates, for instance, as a fact, that Jesus "on one occasion was seen by more than five hundred persons," regardless of the fact that this report is only vouched for by a writer who makes no pretence for having ever himself seen Jesus. And then, utterly ignoring the Copernican astronomy, he crudely states that "Forty days having passed he withdrew himself miraculously from their presence and ascended into heaven!" So nice and so complete a story! You know, of course, that heaven is in the sky and hell under the ground.

Then, having accepted the fact of the Resurrection on the authority of Paul, as being the one essential to the Christian religion, we are given to understand that it is an additional corroboration that it has been believed for nineteen centuries! and meet the still more startling assertion that the many *denials* of it that have been made operate as a *confirmation*! Surely there must be something peculiar with a theory which can accept both denial and acceptance equally as evidence in its favor. The peculiarity seems to savor of lunacy.

We may pass over without remark the claim that Christianity has "reconstructed civilization." Such a claim seems amusingly out of place in the mouth of the President of a college; but what are we to think of the mental calibre of a man who does not see the folly of his whole theory when he describes it as having advanced from "obscurity to universality." Undoubtedly it *was* obscure, and equally undoubtedly it is *not* universal. Either of these facts should be sufficient, without any other, to prove the folly of attributing divine qualities or powers to its Founder. Surely a god coming to this earth with the object of "saving" its inhabitants would not have done so in an *obscure* way. Why begin with a few ignorant fishermen in a little corner, if he wished to save the whole of mankind? The only reason we can see is, that if a more public plan had been adopted there would have been no need for sky-pilotage, and consequently no fees for sky-pilots. No other rational explanation can be given. That it has taken nineteen centuries to make the gospel *known* to little more than a fourth of the human race is an equally unanswerable argument against either the will or the power of the reputedly almighty and loving god who designed the Plan of Salvation. No one but a lunatic or a special pleader would dare to make use of such a foolish and flimsy argument. To say that, spite of all attacks, the Resurrection still remains in "calm security" is to shut one's eyes to the fact that no man but a paid preacher of the most bigoted sects would attempt to defend the vaunted dogma. It is almost universally put before men by Christian apologists, not as a proved fact, but as a dogma that must be believed.

We need not concern ourselves, either, with the claim that, because the Christian system has survived the assaults of those who, from the very beginning until to-day, have questioned the alleged facts upon which

it is said  
millions  
of Chris  
discuss th  
Renan, et  
many god  
position,  
trouble us  
rounded t  
passing by  
of Paulus  
He deman  
no difficult  
against wh  
want of pe  
have been  
of the spe  
ence. Ha  
speculation  
We now  
support th  
paragraph  
author sup  
that becau  
tionably"  
alleged. E  
In the fir  
Paul's Epis  
subject of  
generation  
claims for t  
to give dire  
the Biblical  
the direct  
In the se  
to the thesis  
page Dr. Ha  
"The Act  
The last chu  
the only com  
in our posse  
these years  
of letters, th  
and which h  
To person  
passages as r



It is said to be founded, it is an "impregnable citadel." The fact that millions of men have suffered death in these attacks points to the nature of Christianity's strength and the reasons for its survival. Nor need we discuss the "pure character of Jesus," or the laudations of it by Mill, Renan, etc. If purity of character proves divinity, then there have been many gods in the world, both before and since A.D. 1. The childish exposition, too, of the "Rationalistic" and "Mythical" attacks need not trouble us. A man who could imagine that the "bright light that surrounded the shepherds" was caused by "a lantern that happened to be passing by" (!) would be a peculiar sort of a Rationalist. The theories of Paulus, Strauss, and Renan are alike of no use to the Rationalist. He demands tangible evidence of the alleged fact, which there should be no difficulty in supplying; but the utmost he can get is Renan's sentence, against which the Christian apologist has no effective reply: "This, for want of peremptory evidence, we shall never know." There could never have been any doubt of the fact had it really occurred. The real value of the speculations of Paulus and Renan lies in the fact of their existence. Had the Resurrection been in any sense an historical fact, such speculations would have been impossible.

We now come to the remarkable paragraph in which Dr. Hall seeks to support the Gospel narratives by other Biblical "testimony." This paragraph is taken up with two phases of argument. In the first, the author supports his thesis by the evidence of Paul, and seems to imagine that because Renan considered some of Paul's epistles to be "unquestionably" genuine, their testimony must be accepted as proving the facts alleged. But our friend's argument is fatally defective.

In the first place, he does not contend, and it cannot be contended, that Paul's Epistles give anything more than "first century thought" on the subject of the Resurrection—the "received opinion" of Christians—a generation after the alleged occurrence. This is the utmost Dr. Hall claims for them; yet he contends that the Gospel narratives, professing to give direct testimony to the events recorded, are but a small part of the Biblical evidence! By his own admissions, they are the whole of the direct evidence.

In the second place, the evidence given by Acts is directly contrary to the thesis that this was the disciples' opinion. One remarkable passage Dr. Hall quotes from Renan:

"The Acts, up to this so legendary, suddenly becomes quite substantial. The last chapters, composed in part of the account of an eye-witness, are the only completely historical narrative of the first years of Christianity in our possession. Finally, by a privilege very rare in such a subject, these years offer us dated documents of absolute authenticity: a series of letters, the most important of which are proof against all criticism, and which have never undergone any interpolations."

To persons who read the Bible religiously, or who read only such passages as may be pointed out to them by critics for special purposes,

such opinions as those given by Dr. Hall and those quoted from Renan may have the appearance of being well founded. Examined, however, by the light of a true rationalistic method, the internal evidence of the Acts itself is sufficient to show clearly their untenableness. Let us keep in mind that it is the "unquestioned and unquestionable" historical narratives we are examining. One leading feature of these latter chapters will be seen to be the various attempts made by the Jews to procure the condemnation of Paul by the Roman governors and officials, and every reader must see the similarity of these narratives to the Gospel accounts of the trial of Jesus before Pilate. In the 17th chapter, however, we have an incident that gives a somewhat more reasonable aspect to one of these attempts:

"12 And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat.

"13 Saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law.

"14 And when Paul was now about to open his mouth, Gallio said unto the Jews, If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you;

"15 But if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters.

"16 And he drove them from the judgment seat."

If it be remembered that the Roman Governors had to render a strict account of their governorship, and that to condemn a man for an alleged offence against the Jewish law, but which was no offence under the Roman law, would have been a flagrant violation of a governor's duty, the absurdity of the stories related in this "historical narrative" will be clear. In the present instance, it will be seen that Gallio acted with more firmness than is attributed in the Gospels to Pilate and in Acts to Felix and Festus, and refused to pander to the bigoted fanaticism of the Jews. But the succeeding incident is unbelievable:

"17 Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment seat. And Gallio cared for none of these things."

The absurdity of such a statement is apparent. It is as if Police Magistrate Denison, because he refused to settle a question of disputed theology between a Methodist preacher and his people, should allow the Catholics to seize Bishop Sullivan and to nearly kill him in the police court, "caring for none of these things." The contradictory character of these New Testament narratives is clearly the result of their unhistorical character. They must have been written by men but very partially acquainted with the real history and special circumstances of the time in which the alleged facts were laid. They may be founded on facts of a sort, but facts that are buried in the traditions and religious myths of an ignorant and superstitious people.

The wa  
 orical c  
 instead  
 uses the a  
 be definite  
 the assum  
 in i  
 an almost  
 aw-court.  
 "2 And  
 path days  
 "3 Ope  
 risen again  
 you, is Chr  
 Now, it i  
 or fifteenth  
 prophetic  
 action or o  
 very time, v  
 hundred" v  
 still alive, a  
 bring them  
 strange that  
 ital import  
 The Gosp  
 ples in the  
 some doub  
 were remove  
 who had nev  
 "(1) And  
 having passe  
 certain disci  
 thost since v  
 heard whet  
 into what, th  
 sm. (4) Th  
 repentance, s  
 ter him, tha  
 baptized in th  
 pon them, th  
 ngues and p  
 If this acco  
 ohn's "gosp  
 ine" till Pa  
 chapter of the  
 evidence of ey

The way in which Dr. Hall uses Renan's name in support of the historical character of the Acts is characteristic of the Christian apologist. Instead of giving direct evidence in favor of his affirmation, he simply uses the admissions of an opponent. It may be true that the Acts can be definitely dated, but the task has not yet been accomplished. But the assumption that this would in any way validate the assertions contained in it, except as matters of opinion, is totally illogical. There is an almost entire absence of such testimony as would be required in a law-court. As for the recorded opinions, let us read 17 : 2 *et seq.* :

"2 And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.

"3 Opening and alleging, that Christ *must needs have suffered* and risen again from the dead ; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ."

Now, it is clear that, whenever this was written—in the first, tenth, or fifteenth century—the proof relied upon by Paul was Biblical proof, prophetic utterances, not the evidence of eye-witnesses of the Resurrection or of the re-appearance of Jesus after the Crucifixion. At this very time, we are told, some of the Apostles and many of the "five hundred" who are said to have seen Jesus after his resurrection were still alive, and can any sane man believe that Paul would have failed to bring them forward to give their evidence had it been true? Is it not strange that at the very moment when this evidence would have been of vital importance, it was apparently not even thought of?

The Gospel of Matthew tells us that when Jesus appeared to the disciples in the Galilean mountain where he had promised to meet them, some doubted," and we are left in the dark as to whether their doubts were removed. But in the Acts we are introduced to some "disciples" who had never even heard of Jesus. Chapter 19 begins :

"(1) And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, (2) He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, *We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost!* (3) And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. (4) Then said Paul: John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. (5) When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. (6) And when Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came down upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. (7) And all the men were about twelve."

If this account can be relied upon, these disciples had only heard of John's "gospel of repentance," and knew nothing of the "Jesus doctrine" till Paul came to preach it to them. Even in the concluding chapter of the Acts, we find the same want of anything like substantial evidence of eye-witnesses. In ch. 28 : 23 it is related that Paul, having

called together the chief of the Jews in Rome, appointed with them day upon which he should be allowed to expound the doctrines of the new sect, which, they told him, was everywhere spoken against :

“ 23 And when they had appointed him a day, there came many of him into his lodgings ; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning until evening.”

Not a word is here said of any direct evidence, which, after nineteen centuries have elapsed without any such evidence being forthcoming, we are asked to believe actually existed in the shape of living witnesses of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. How Renan came to the conclusion that the last chapters of the Acts are “ quite substantial,” it is not for us to decide. What we require is satisfactory evidence that will bring to us the same conviction. Dr. Hall may satisfy some persons by such citations ; but, in our view, they only add more confusion to an already hopelessly confused story.

In the concluding paragraphs of his essay, Dr. Hall makes some claims which should be clearly invalid even to the mind of a child. There are “ more people than ever before ” who believe in the story of Christ’s resurrection from the dead, will that *belief* avail one iota as proof of the alleged *fact* ? It would have been equally valid at any period of the world’s history as proof of the truth of the then-prevailing religious dogmas. Such arguments are beneath contempt, but in the mouth of a college president they bear a sinister aspect.

The very labored attempt to throw the burden of proof on the opponents of theological dogmas stamps Dr. Hall as a gentleman who has not risen above the tactics of a rural youths’ debating-club. That it could not avail him to any extent, except in an utterly ignorant circle goes without saying ; for the whole of our knowledge supplies sufficient evidence to condemn his alleged fact as one that could not possibly be proved by any evidence that has ever yet been heard of as supporting it. The story of the Resurrection is one that contradicts all our actual knowledge ; and the only evidence that could be adduced to demonstrate its possibility would be such as would appeal directly to each individual. It would necessarily be such as to reverse his conception of the universality and uniformity of natural law ; and, in short, would be effective only when it had eliminated its victim from the category of sane men.

To assert that the various arguments he adduces forms a presumption in favor of the truth of the Resurrection, and that, consequently, the *onus probandi* lies upon those who deny it, is to ignore the overwhelming presumption already established against it by universal experience, and to reverse which requires, not a mere presumption, but direct and valid and incontrovertible evidence.

Dr. Hall uses the “ accumulation of evidence ” argument in a way that leads us to ask if he has ever read anything of the history of the world, and especially of the Church which he describes as “ the greatest

power for  
itself is su  
very corru  
did not bel  
to believe  
fanatical b  
could not l  
into power  
to “ feroci  
churches ?  
marked th  
of its bene  
truth of it  
them ? D  
character o  
many have  
followers ?

Is it not  
miraculous  
when by su  
that its ver  
truth of th  
Dr. Hall  
an attempt  
as effective  
all religion  
as Christia  
and disapp  
The Budd  
ness by ph  
in possessi  
testimony ;  
is this : th  
his concie

Dr. Hall  
schoolmast  
in the Uni  
the present  
upon a my  
They argue  
ing a mira  
things of g  
how religio  
he finds—  
that there  
and every

power for good the world has ever seen." Let us ask him, if the Church itself is such a valid evidence of that Resurrection which he says is its every corner-stone, how was it that its most numerous sect, the Arians, did not believe in the divinity of Christ, and therefore had no necessity to believe in his resurrection? How was it that the more bigoted and fanatical believers in a "man-god" so relentlessly persecuted those who would not believe such an absurd dogma? If the new religion "sprang into power within a few short weeks," how was it that it was subjected to "ferocious persecutions?" Is that usually the fate of "powerful" churches? If, as Dr. Hall states, heresies, schisms, and apostasies have marked the growth of the Christian Church, what evidence do they afford of its beneficent effects? Do they bear witness to the reasonableness or truth of its doctrines, or add to the weight of the evidence in favor of them? Does it not rather point to the inherent weakness and illogical character of the dogmas that distinguish the Christian religion, that so many have revolted against them even among the most ignorant of its followers?

Is it not, too, arguing in a circle, first to claim the alleged divine or miraculous origin of the Church as its all-sufficient warrant, and then, when by such means the Church has become firmly established, to claim that its very existence and its alleged good influence are proofs of the truth of the dogmas it propounds?

Dr. Hall's appeal to Hume's "test of a miracle" is about as foolish as an attempt at argument as one could find anywhere. It would be fully as effective to prove the truth of any other religion. The believers in all religions that have ever existed have had just the same experiences as Christians. They have had their hopes and fears, their satisfactions and disappointments, convictions of sin and aspirations for holiness. The Buddhist devotee who thinks he expiates some imaginary unworthiness by physical torture or self-immolation, only differs from a Christian in possessing a stronger faith in his religion and exhibiting weightier testimony to his earnestness. The truth underlying all such experiences is this: that the most truly happy man is he who is *honest and true to his convictions*.

Dr. Hall has evidently never heard of Evolution; and the modern schoolmaster has a rare opportunity of getting in some needed work in the Union Theological Seminary. It is hardly necessary to say that the present-day opponents of Christianity do not assert that it is founded upon a myth, however many myths there may be in connection with it. They argue for no such miracle, nor do they see the necessity for positing a miracle as the foundation for any religion. Religions have been things of growth, and the aim of the Rationalist has been to point out how religions have grown and developed one from another. And when he finds—as find he must, if he makes any sort of reasonable inquiry—that there is nothing new in the Christian religion; that every doctrine and every ceremony had its counterpart in other religions; and that its

progress and development have been marked by features whose origin can be more or less distinctly traced to the circumstances in which it has been placed in the various localities where it has been adopted,—he must unhesitatingly renounce the claim that the Christian religion was brought into existence as a well-defined system by a certain man or god at a certain definite time, as one that is opposed alike to reason and to fact. Dr. Hall might know that the very "Easter morning" he speaks so lovingly about is a feast-day originally kept in honor of a Pagan goddess Eoster; and the whole of the floral adjuncts of the ceremonies of the time are the fitting pagan accompaniments, which at one time were denounced by their more austere Christian opponents, but which were finally adopted by them from their inherent beauty and attractiveness.

It is certainly remarkable that, while not a particle of solid evidence can be found for even the existence of Jesus himself, men of learning should be wasting their time in discussing his resurrection. In regard to the alleged fact of the existence of Jesus, which has been admitted by many rationalists, Moncure D. Conway's words are very weighty; "The world has been for a long time engaged in writing lives of Jesus. But when we come to examine them, one startling fact confronts us: all of these books relate to a personage concerning whom there does not exist a single scrap of contemporary information—not one. By accepted tradition, he was born in the reign of Augustus, the great literary age of the nation of which he was a subject. In the Augustan age historians flourished; poets and orators, critics and travellers abounded. Yet not one mentions even the name of Jesus Christ, much less any incident of his life. Of Jesus we have not one notice—not the faintest, slightest sentence or word on which history can fix as certain evidence that he ever lived at all." In the face of such a fact, how childishly absurd it seems for a college president to be asking us to admit a presumption in favor of the alleged resurrection from the dead of this unknown personage—a presumption opposed to all the experience of the world!

As evidence of the evolution of Christian doctrines from preceding pagan religions, a few quotations may not be out of place bearing upon this matter of the Resurrection. Addison's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* gives us the ancient Greek faith in regard to Esculapius, the Great Physician, Son of God, and Savior:

"Once, as the sacred infant she surveyed,  
The god was kindled in the raving maid;  
And thus she uttered her prophetic tale:  
'Hail! great Physician of the world! all hail!  
Hail! mighty infant, who in years to come  
Shalt heal the nations and defraud the tomb!  
Swift be thy growth, thy triumphs unconfined;  
Make kingdoms thicker, and increase mankind.  
Thy daring art shall animate the dead,  
And draw the thunder on thy guilty head.  
Then shalt thou die, *but from the dark abode  
Shalt rise victorious, and be twice a god!*'"

How th  
words of  
called th  
Huni in  
two lady f  
is a descri  
"On a  
rites in ho  
and bewai  
fictitious l  
mourners  
murmured

This an  
ancient pa  
on one oc  
vigils of E  
ing. Nat  
those who  
drawn up  
ful power  
is clear th  
of Jesus i  
resurrectio  
In his E  
this conter  
"I find  
Roman He  
to represe  
tions. Hi  
Lord' Ad  
Volumes  
the existen  
Savior ma  
on "Egyp  
"It is a  
trusted an  
as he arose  
In face o  
the Resurr  
Osiris, Hor  
whose adv  
pious laity

How this reminds one of the ecstasies of Mary in Luke 1, and the words of the angel Gabriel in Luke 2: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest," etc. Theocritus (translated by Leigh Hunt in "A Jar of Honey") gives a charming account of the visit of two lady friends to the annual festival in honor of Adonis, of which this is a description from Julius Firmicius (4th century):

"On a certain night (while the ceremony of the Adonia, or religious rites in honor of Adonis, lasted) an image was laid upon a bed (or bier) and bewailed in doleful ditties. After they had satiated themselves with fictitious lamentations, light was brought in: then the mouths of all the mourners were anointed by the priests (*with oil*), upon which they gently murmured:

"Trust, ye saints, your God restored.  
*Trust ye in your risen Lord!*  
 For the pains which he endured  
 Our salvation have procured."

This anointing the lips with oil is a circumstance which connects the ancient pagan rites with those of the Christians. Eusebius tells us that on one occasion the Christians were about to celebrate "the solemn vigils of Easter," when they were dismayed at finding that *oil* was lacking. Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, who was present, "commanded those who had charge of the lights, speedily to bring unto him water drawn up out of the next well." This water Narcissus, "by the wonderful power of God, changed into *oil*, and the celebration continued." It is clear that this was simply the pagan ceremony, continued in honor of Jesus instead of Adonis. The commemoration of the death and resurrection of a god was continued; the name only had been changed.

In his Hebrew Lexicon, Dr. Parkhurst admits the practical truth of this contention, for he says:

"I find myself obliged to refer Tammuz, as well as the Greek and Roman Hercules, to that class of idols which were originally designed to represent the promised Savior (Christ Jesus), the desire of all nations. His other name, Adonis, is almost the very Hebrew word 'Our Lord' Adonai, a well-known title of Christ."

Volumes might be compiled of extracts from various authors to prove the existence in many different forms of the belief in a dying and risen Savior many centuries before Christ. As Mr. Bonwick says, in his work on "Egyptian Belief":

"It is astonishing to find that at least five thousand years ago men trusted an Osiris as the 'Risen Savior,' and confidently hoped to rise, as he arose, from the grave."

In face of such facts, what evidence can Dr. Hall give us to prove that the Resurrection of Christ is any less a fiction than the resurrection of Osiris, Horus, Mithras, Bacchus, Balder, and the numerous other gods whose adventures have filled the mouths of priests and the gullets of the pious laity in every age of the world?

## BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY MAJOR-GEN. J. G. R. FORLONG, F.R.S.E., F.R.A.S., ETC.\*

### II.

THE facts, so far as seen, regarding Jainism and Buddhism, assure us that Gotama started a great ethical Reformation—a gospel of culture, genuine piety, anti-Pharisaism, and common sense, which enunciated, six hundred years before our gospels appeared, that “It is not the eating of unclean food which defiles, but evil deeds and habits . . . that plaited hair and fine garments are but the cleaning of the outside, while within may be all low yearnings.” This, the Deva-dattas around the tomb of Kasyapa at Sravasti still claim to be their Bodha’s teaching some 1,000 years B.C., and it was more or less that of later Bodhas or Tirthankaras.

We must not conclude that Gotama’s name Sakya denotes a Scythian origin, nor that he was an Aryan. There were no doubt Sakyas all along the Indus border, as there were also Malas and Yavana, or “foreign” Malas, and from these sprang the Emperor Chandra Gupta, who ruled over all Maghs, Mugs, and Malas in the Magadha Empire 315 to 291 B.C. Gotama was from the same stock, and all were evidently Jains-Dravidas Malas, who entered India by the Makran coast—that by which Alexander and his general Nearchus left India.

Gotama did not travel much beyond the Magadha Empire, though there are many legends to the contrary. He confined himself to the mid-Gangetic valley and watersheds, principally in and around Oudh, where was his birthplace in the Lubine Garden, near to the groves in which he studied the philosophies of the Kapila schools, and from which he probably fled, but vainly, for peace of mind.

Aryans only appear to have reached the mid-Gangetic States in the 7th century, or perhaps 800 B.C., and, according to Prof. Rhys-Davids, “they only settled there at the end of the 6th century B.C. (Bud. c. ii.), or about the time of the birth of Gotama—a fact which opens up, if it does not upset, numerous important questions having a wide bearing on all sub-Vedic writings.” For from the cradle-land of Gotama, the early literary centre of India, came most of the Scriptures of Indo-Aryans, which, if prior to Sakya-Muni, must, like all the philosophic schools founded by the sage Kapila, have had their origin in the brains of Dravidian or Dramilian Pandits, like the learned “Dramila Chanakya,” to whom was dedicated, 350 years after his death, the beautiful cave temple of Kankeri. As we wrote seventeen years ago (“Rivers of Life,” 2, 228, 460, 478), “Turanians have ever been the inventors of religions which Shemites and Aryans have adopted and adapted to their own idiosyn-

\* Condensed from “Short Studies in the Science of Comparative Religions.” By Major-General Forlong. London: Quaritch.



crasies;" and this is as true on the Ganges as on the Euphrates and the Nile, as Mr. J. Fergusson also shows in his later works on architecture. In 2100 B.C.—the alleged time of the second Bodha, Konaga Muni—the Sabas or Sabeans of Arabia were disputing with Turano-Kasis the high plains of Babylonia and moving seawards to India and even to Ceylon. According to tradition, about 800 B.C., a counter-move took place westwards, which seems to have eventually led to the colonization of Abyssinia, and, according to Drs. Glasar and Sayce, to the very name Ethiopia, from Atyub, "myrrh and frankincense," the chief product of Masat, in the Eastern Hadhramant.

In the 12th century B.C. Ayodhia—then called Kosala and Saket—was the important capital of Mala-land, our kingdom of Oudh. Hindus were then maturing their astronomical theories and calculations, while the Chinese taught the obliquity of the ecliptic and were stretching out their hands to Baktria; and in the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. were absorbing the Buddhist-like teaching of the Tao, or "Way of Life and Peace." This was inculcated by the sage Lao-tsze, who seems to have caught up a sort of Hinduized Jaino-Bodhist philosophy, which he adapted in his Taoist Bible to Chinese modes of thought. He was followed by the philosophical schools of Confucius, who rejected his animistic theories, and placed reliance rather on an Agnostic and practical piety.

It is as impossible to find a *beginning* for Jainism and Buddhism as for a world or a creation out of nothing, but there have been among Jaines and Buddhists many great teachers; the last Jaina saint being the famous Maha-Vira, and the last Buddha, Gotama Sakya Muni—his *alter ego* in some respects. The long list stretches back to perhaps 4,000 to 5,000 B.C., with about as much traditional detail as in the case of the great gods of Egypt prior to Osiris; the "heroic period" of Babylon, 3,200 to 4,200, or that of the Hebrew Patriarchs. These Buddhas or saints are also as firmly believed in as in the case of the Hebrew Fathers; and so also was the coming Messiah, Maitraya, "Lord of Light and Loving Kindness"—the *Agita* or "Unconquerable." But, alas, there never was in India an enduring tablet literature, nor any Ezra to gather up the fragments of legendary history. We must be content with what can be gleaned from Pitakas, Jatakas, the Mahavanso, its commutations, etc., and casual passages in various good works and magazines, and in many native writings of more or less doubtful authority, couched in more or less extravagant language.

Few persons have ventured to affix dates to the twenty-four great Jaina Virthankars—the immortal saints or Bodhas, called the "Saviors of the race"—beyond Nemi, the 22nd, where Dr. Stevenson says chronology runs wild." Yet the last three and the first may be considered, from some detail known about them, to be real personalities, and the last two, Parsva and Maha Vira, as genuinely historical.

In Parsva and Maha Vira we have two distinctly active and able men, who recognized unwritten Scriptures called Purvas, "ancient," or Pu-

ranik—wise and sacred teachings to which they no doubt mainly contributed, and which must have been prior to all Sutras, Sastras, Upanishads, and probably Vedas. These Purvas, says Mr. Jacobi (S.B.E., ii. xlv.), “were gradually lost.” We learn, however, that “they were incorporated in the 12th Anga, the Drishti-vade which was lost previous to 360 B.C. . . . but a detailed table of its contents has survived in the 4th Anga.” We have probably the substance of all the Purvas in the various Sutras of the faith; for great ideas, rites, and worship do not die like words. Now, from these Purvas, Maha Vira as well as Gotama would have before him an organized Holy Scripture, which had satisfied the wants and aspirations of untold generations, and which was ample to guide the founder of a philosophic Buddhism.

### III.

JAINISM thus appears as the earliest faith of India. Gotama Buddha evidently recognized three of the ancient Jaina Saints, but under their Pali or Sanskrit names of Kaku-Sanda, Konaga-Muni, and Kasyapa (the most loved of Jaina names), when he (Gotama) said: “These precede me, and I teach similarly to them.”

It is contrary to the immutable laws of Evolution that a religion so philosophical, searching, full of goodness, piety, high feeling and resolves as that of Gotama Buddha could spring like a Minerva fully armed from the Jovine head of even the sage of Budha Gaya. As is well known to Oriental scholars, there have been many who saw in the Jaina Bodhists the fore-runners of Gotama Sakya-Muni.

Great importance is attached to all the great leaders and their prominent followers being descendants of Kasyapa—a solar title, and one given to Rishabha, the first Osirian, as we may designate one whose emblem was the bull or solar Apis. So in the case of Maha-Vira, Gotama's ancestor, who in the Kalpa Sutra is said to have followed “twenty-one Tirthankaras of the royal tribe of Ikshvaku and family of Kasyapa, and two of the family of Gotama.” The Brahman of those days was merely what his name originally implied—a man of prayer, the skilled performer of the village rites, and the family priest.

Brahman asceticism seems to have grown out of the more primitive Jainism, and only in Aryan times to have developed the Yoghi and Sanyasian monachism. Brahmans themselves admit that Jainism was contemporaneous with their gods. In those days caste had not assumed the hard-and-fast lines of the later times of Manana Sastra. Nor even in Buddha's early days was the Brahman the proud, powerful, and tyrannical priest of the Aryan ascendancy. He was apparently only a pious man, who mixed with the poor, the sick, and the sad. “No one is known as a Brahman,” says Gotama, “by family or plaited hair, but by his truthfulness and righteousness. . . . He only is a Brahman who, committing no evil or offence, endures reproaches, bonds, and stripes.”

Only on these grounds were Gotama and earlier Bodhas or Buddhas

alled Brah  
ore or less  
nd the ro  
ference be  
ery to mak  
his reign  
ons are res  
At the bir  
osts sang a  
e earth. “  
aps “ seam  
ch teacher  
nd after fu  
ng years o  
ddahood,  
2, at Pava,  
aha-Vira l  
rganized so  
The favor  
ll who follo  
ress their F  
nsect, bird  
ril or abuse  
ril by subn  
e sanctione  
hese from o  
erish othe  
continent, an  
worldly affai  
Buddha a  
ogism, hyp  
indus so m  
aha, the Fo  
e was a div  
As Mr. Th  
with most p  
complicated  
t his pleasu  
isit the tem  
dopted a hi  
ally and bod  
rrupted an  
ighth centu  
ndia. Not  
with the phi  
o Jainism a

called Brahmans, for by birth they were Kshatriyas, and in their faith pure or less Jains, and so must also have been the ancestors of Asoka and the royal Ikshvakus of the Indus. So slight seemed to Asoka the difference between Jains and Buddhists, that he did not think it necessary to make a public profession of Buddhism till about the twelfth year of his reign (247 B.C.); so that nearly all, if not all, of his rock inscriptions are really those of a Jaina sovereign.

At the birth of both Buddhas (Maha-Vira and Gotama) the heavenly hosts sang and rejoiced. Many wonders were seen in the heavens and on earth. "The Almighty" bestowed on Maha-Vira a divine robe, perhaps "seamless," like that which it is said Sakra himself wore; and with teachers went forth on their mission on attaining full manhood, and after fulfilling their duties as householders. In his 43rd year, after long years of meditation or study, Maha-Vira is said to have reached Buddhahood, and then went forth to teach and preach. He died, aged 82, at Pava, amid a blaze of miracles, when visiting King Shastrapala. Maha-Vira left millions of converts and thousands of apparently well-organized schools, institutions, and monasteries.

The favorite leading doctrines of this great Jaina revival were—that all who followed Maha-Vira "must live pure in heart and conduct, suppress their passions and desires, and neither destroy the life of animal, insect, bird, fish, or plant, nor hurt them." They were not to resist evil or abuse, but turn their cheek to the smiter, and so try to overcome evil by submission and goodness. Maha-Vira fasted long and often, yet he sanctioned no bodily tortures, although he voluntarily submitted to these from others. His disciples had to be assiduous in every virtue, to cherish others rather than themselves, to live apart from the world, be continent, and, if possible, be unencumbered with wives, families, or worldly affairs.

Buddha and Buddhists have always resisted or repudiated Jaina asceticism, hypnotic states, and everything occult and supernatural; but Hindus so much admired the teachings of goodness attributed to "Rishabh, the Founder of Jainism," as they called him, that they admitted he was a divine Avatar.

As Mr. Thomas justly says ("Jainism," p. 5): "The more simple faith must *per se* be primarily accepted as the predecessor of the more complicated;" and what more simple than Jainism? The devotee can at his pleasure dispense with acts of worship, and the layman need only visit the temple at his leisure. Not so, however, the Buddhist. He has adopted a highly-elaborated and rigid monasticism—far-reaching, mentally and bodily. Buddhism is too exacting for the masses, who early corrupted and broke away from it, as did most Indian peoples by our eighth century, whereas Jainism still holds its own, especially in Western India. Not that it is a poor or shallow faith; nay, it must be classed with the philosophic religions of Confucius and Gotama, who imparted to Jainism and Buddhism alike a pious spirituality—if we may say

this of a faith which is without spirits as popularly understood. Jainism has forestalled Christianity in its solemn Paryushana, or Lenten periods of humiliation and prayer; in its past and future Messianic stages and hopes; and in its doctrines of confession and priestly absolution. But it rejects the relic-worship of Christianity and Buddhism, and sees only in its grand elaborate Chaityas, temples of the holy spirits of its great and pious dead. In these it claims to have held useful and religious services many centuries before Buddhism and Brahmanism had been heard of, and gives substantial proofs thereof, which the learned missionary Dr. Stevenson fully admits in his "Kalpa Sutra." It opens and closes all its services and sacred writings by invoking "Om and EM," the most ancient supreme *dual in uno*—"the Male and Female Principles of all life:" that is, the Great Creator in his Androgynous and Elohistic character.

Avoiding as much as possible "the Unknown," Jainism teaches, says Dr. Stevenson, that "the world—consisting of mind or intellect and matter—has existed from all eternity, undergoing an infinite number of revolutions produced by the inherent physical and intellectual powers of nature, without the intervention of any external deity—no such Being existing distinct from the world, though certain of the world's elements, when properly developed, obtain deification." Jainas believe that saints rise from manhood to deity by virtue of purity, meditation, and mental powers; that there are heavens and hells for temporary rewards and punishments; that pure and regenerated persons may attain to god-hood; and that when, by great efforts, we have freed ourselves from all worldly desires and passions, we may enter into a state of Nirvana—that is, "perfect bliss, perfect knowledge, and freedom from all pain and mutation"—a state not necessarily dependent upon death.

In Jainism there are two classes, clergy and laity, embracing male and female celibates. The clergy live apart in monasteries and nunneries. All are required to attend strictly to the following duties and avoid five great sins:

The Duties—Dharmas or Laws, called Eternal, Maha-Vrates, or Great Duties—require the intuitive feeling embraced in the maxim, *Laborare est orare*. They are: 1, Mercy on and towards all that is animate; 2, Almsgiving; 3, Veneration of living sages and their temple images; 4, Confession of sins and faults; 5, Observance of religious rites. The Five Sins—A-dharmas—to be avoided are: Killing, lying, stealing, adultery, and worldly-mindedness. The first Dharma entails abstention from outdoor work for nearly three months of every year when insect life abounds—often a source of great vexation for the civil engineer. Jainas then usually wear respirators and drink water only through muslin; the 5th compels the Jaina to observe the four autumnal months in Lenten humiliation, religious reading and meditation, fasting and pilgrimage. Fortunately, this is in the rainy season, when work must be suspended.

(To be continued.)

## THE DOOM OF CHRISTIAN SPAIN.

BY G. W. FOOTE, EDITOR "FREETHINKER."

A TRANSATLANTIC wit, the other day, said that Spain probably wished she had never discovered America. Certainly her presence in the Western hemisphere was always a curse to everyone concerned. From the time when the great Columbus introduced slavery there, down to the present, when Spanish government in Cuba means wholesale torture and murder, Spain has been a perpetual blight to her colonies and dependencies. In their own country the Spaniards, at least in the provincial districts, appear to possess a good share of the simpler virtues. They are said to be temperate, truthful, honest and hospitable. But the same may be said of the Turks. Yet the Turks are a curse to all who fall under their power, and this is equally true of the Spaniards. Both races have been trained up under despotism and superstition, both are capable of the wildest fanaticism, both are proud of their very deficiencies in civilization, and both have a certain savagery in their natures which flames into unspeakable cruelty in the face of opposition.

Spain has a noble language, and in many respects a noble literature. She gave to the world one of its immortal books in "Don Quixote." For a hundred years after the discovery of America she was immeasurably the most powerful country in the world. But her decline was as rapid as her ascent, and she is now at the very foot of the ladder of European civilization.

What is the reason of this terrible downfall? The answer is simple enough. Spain is the victim of Christianity. Catholicism is Christianity to the evolutionist, and Spain is the typical Catholic country. Shut out by the solid barrier of the Pyrenees from free intercourse with the rest of Europe, and imbued with the belief that the greatest of all earthly objects is the maintenance of the Catholic religion, she has been a standing object-lesson in the blessings of Christianity when unchecked by other influences. To the Spaniard religion is not an amusement, or a social decoration, or an artificial aid to morality; to him it is a passion that inflames his whole nature, and makes all other things look comparatively trivial; all other things, that is, but the lust after ill-gotten wealth, which somehow or other has always been singularly compatible with the strongest faith and the most ardent devotion.

Protestants will of course deny that Roman Catholicism is Christianity. They have the real article themselves. But if there had been no Catholicism there would have been no Protestantism. Historically, as Michelet observed, Protestantism is as an estuary, and Catholicism as the main sea. It is from the Catholic Church that every Protestant sect derives its doctrines, and from the same

Church that all Protestant sects derive their Bible. Christianity contains certain fundamental ideas, and it is these, and not selected texts from a large and self-contradictory Scripture, that the evolutionist and the historian have to deal with. These ideas in the course of ages found practical expression in certain institutions, and those institutions are all marshalled under the Catholic Church. Nor is Protestantism, as some Rationalists affirm, a better religion than Catholicism. There is less of it—that is all. It is only better as a mild attack of fever is better than a severe attack of fever. And many Protestants have it very mildly. With hosts of them it is a slight recurrent disorder, coming on once a week. Others have just enough religion to amuse them, and get a little æsthetic tittillation at church or chapel instead of at the theatre or the music-hall.

Protestantism with supreme power would make as great a desolation as Catholicism with supreme power. Scotland under the Presbyterian yoke was as ugly a place to live in as Spain under the Catholic yoke—in some respects far uglier. Give the clergy power, and it doesn't matter whether their doctrines are fifty or a hundred; their tyranny is just the same, they hate and persecute science and freethought, and make their teaching the alpha and omega of human wisdom. Those who think that Protestantism in itself was more favorable than Catholicism to the growth of natural knowledge and the free play of the human mind are simply ignorant of the facts of history. All the early Protestant "reformers" were absolutely opposed to any freedom of travel beyond the point they had reached themselves. They imprisoned, tortured, and burned heretics with the greatest alacrity. Only by a kind of accident did freethinking creep upon the scene. The appeal to a multifarious book like the Bible divided Protestants among themselves. They kept each other in check, and made a ring which bolder spirits gradually entered. Equilibrium, so to speak, was maintained by antagonistic forces that could not destroy each other. Was it not Voltaire who complained that in England he found twenty religions and only one sauce? But did he not soon perceive that this was the secret of English freedom? In France there was one church big enough to swallow all others, and it did so; while in England there were twenty churches, all hating each other, but all obliged to keep a certain measure of peace and toleration. And in the midst of that peace and toleration there was a chance for a more daring originality.

Protestantism never had a career in Spain. It was suppressed in less than ten years after its first appearance there. She is the Catholic nation *par excellence*. Even her most distinguished literary men have been devout Catholics. Cervantes became a Franciscan monk three years before his death. Lope de Vega was a priest and an officer of the Inquisition. Moreto, the great dramatist, wore a monk's dress during the last twelve years of his life. Calderon was chaplain to Philip IV. A long list of lesser lights is given by Buckle in his chapter on Spain. "The Church," as Buckle says, "retained her hold over the

highest  
one in  
and mos  
prejudic  
the nece  
country  
heretics.

Spain  
from the  
than all  
is detru  
hundred  
landed i  
the Chri  
civilizati  
seen sinc  
Christi  
Granada  
more o  
religious  
pious fan  
of the C  
polluted  
Jews. E  
Various  
To conve  
—the vil  
shrinks a  
them per  
people w  
and tears

Spain's  
lands, wh  
hundred  
simply di  
Mother C  
For thirty  
lievers.  
multitud  
disposed  
battle. I

highest as well as the lowest intellects." "Everyone," he adds, "believed; and no one inquired. Among the better classes all were engaged in war or theology, and most were occupied with both." Literary men ministered to the prevailing prejudice. "The quantity of Spanish works," Buckle says, "written to prove the necessity of religious persecution is incalculable: and this took place in a country where not one man in a thousand doubted the propriety of burning heretics."

Spain was marked out as a home of superstition. Not only was she shut off from the rest of Europe by the Pyrenees, but she suffered more from earthquakes than all the rest of Europe (excepting Italy) put together; and wherever nature is destructive man tends to be fearful, credulous and priest-ridden. For eight hundred years, too, Spain was the scene of a holy war. The Mohammedans landed in the south in 711, and gradually established an empire there, pushing the Christian Spaniards back to the north. Everyone knows what a brilliant civilization the Moors established, how superior it was to anything Spain has seen since their power was finally broken at the end of the fifteenth century. The Christian empire was restored after the capture of Malaga in 1487, and of Granada in 1492. For twenty generations the Christian Spaniards had been more or less engaged in fighting the Mohammedan Moors. The struggle was religious as well as political, and the conquerors were thoroughly steeped in pious fanaticism. Rulers and people alike prided themselves on being soldiers of the Cross. They were determined that the soil of Spain should not be polluted by the feet of heretics or infidels. Their first move was to expel the Jews. Every son of Abraham who refused to deny his faith was driven out. Various estimates are given of their number, varying from 160,000 to 800,000. To convert them or exterminate them was the special business of the Inquisition—the vilest and bloodiest tribunal ever established on earth. Imagination shrinks appalled at the record of the sufferings of these unhappy Jews. Most of them perished miserably. But holy Spain was freed from the descendants of the people who crucified Christ, and that was cheaply effected at any cost of blood and tears.

Spain's holy sect was next turned against the Dutch Protestants in the Netherlands, where she had carried her empire. Charles V. slaughtered from fifty to a hundred thousand heretics there. He was not naturally cruel or vindictive; he simply did what he thought was his duty; he carried out the behests of Holy Mother Church. His successor, Philip II., continued the good work after him. For thirty years he tortured, hung, burnt, and buried alive the damnable misbelievers. How many of them he murdered is unknown, but some idea of their multitude may be gathered from the fact that the infamous Alva, in five years, disposed of eighteen thousand in cold blood, besides those that were slain in battle. Philip II. was a disgusting, selfish, vain and callous brute; but the

Spaniards loved him to the day of his death. He embodied their ideal. He was the wrath of God against heretics

Next came the turn of the Moriscoes, the remnant of the Moors in Spain. They did not become Christian fast enough, and the Church resolved on their extirpation. The Archbishop of Toledo proposed to cut the throats of all of them—men, women, and children. But milder counsels prevailed, and an order was issued for their expulsion. "About one million," Buckle says, "of the most industrious inhabitants of Spain were hunted out like wild beasts. . . . Many were slain as they approached the coast; others were beaten and plundered; and the majority, in the most wretched plight, sailed for Africa. During the passage, the crew, in many of the ships, rose upon them, butchered the men, ravished the women, and threw the children into the sea." Many who landed were slain by Bedouins, and others perished of famine in the desert. Of one batch of 140,000 no less than 100,000 died after horrible sufferings. But the infidels were all cleared out from Spain. That was the great thing. Thank-giving sermons were preached, and Spain was assured that she would now receive the choicest blessings of heaven. But she was to receive the reward of cruelty and folly. The industrious Moriscoes being gone, arts and manufactures declined, fields were left uncultivated, large districts were depopulated, and famine fell upon the richest parts of the land. Cities diminished in population; that of Madrid fell from 400,000 to 200,000 in less than a century. Spain sank into a sleep, as Buckle says not the sleep of repose, but the sleep of death.

The one great power left in Spain was that of the Church. She had the love and the support of the wretched people whom she had betrayed and degraded. Throughout the eighteenth century her wealth increased in the midst of national impoverishment. As late as 1788 a minister of the crown stated that the ecclesiastical revenues had in many cases doubled in value within fifty years. The Inquisition was still maintained, and only succumbed to the roar of Napoleon's cannon. Reaction set in again, as it did all over Europe, when Napoleon was chained up at St. Helena, and the Church has been triumphant ever since. Spain is loyal and superstitious. She has built some ironclads, but essentially she is now what she was when Buckle wrote—"The sole representative now remaining of the feelings and knowledge of the Middle Ages." Her civilization is only skin-deep; her heart is with the past, which she deems glorious, but which is only shameful.

*(To be continued.)*

... in hi  
... some intell  
... friendly rel  
... religions.  
... gratitude fo  
... endeavored  
... and, as he  
... ed him.  
... great forest  
... crawling in  
... the sinister  
... he perpetu  
... and prey o  
... diseases to  
... the contort  
... and the wil  
... him that he  
... some reason  
... were not al  
... that his ven  
... powerful.  
... and to sacri  
... savage man  
... For ages  
... y evil spir  
... ed in fright  
... the loudest  
... eat upon  
... most unear  
... the aid of se  
... To pacify  
... oor barbar  
... these spirits  
... heart he wo  
... or him to c  
... supposed th  
... sight of so g  
... as with the  
... of the fears  
... ease the go



## THE GODS.

BY COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

## III.

Man, in his ignorance, supposed that all phenomena were produced by some intelligent powers, and with direct reference to him. To preserve friendly relations with these powers was, and still is, the object of all religions. Man knelt through fear and to implore assistance, or through gratitude for some favor which he supposed had been rendered. He endeavored by supplication to appease some being who, for some reason, and, as he believed, become enraged. The lightning and thunder terrified him. In the presence of the volcano he sank upon his knees. The great forests filled with wild and ferocious beasts, the monstrous serpents crawling in mysterious depths, the boundless sea, the flaming comets, the sinister eclipses, the awful calmness of the stars, and, more than all, the perpetual presence of death, convinced him that he was the sport and prey of unseen and malignant powers. The strange and frightful diseases to which he was subject, the freezings and burnings of fever, the contortions of epilepsy, the sudden palsies, the darkness of night, and the wild, terrible and fantastic dreams that filled his brain, satisfied him that he was haunted and pursued by countless spirits of evil. For some reason he supposed that these spirits differed in power—that they were not all alike malevolent—that the higher controlled the lower, and that his very existence depended upon gaining the assistance of the more powerful. For this purpose he resorted to prayer, to flattery, to worship, and to sacrifice. These ideas appear to have been almost universal in savage man.

For ages all nations supposed that the sick and insane were possessed by evil spirits. For thousands of years the practice of medicine consisted in frightening these spirits away. Usually the priests would make the loudest and most discordant noises possible. They would blow horns, beat upon rude drums, clash cymbals, and in the meantime utter the most unearthly yells. If the noise-remedy failed, they would implore the aid of some more powerful spirit.

To pacify these spirits was considered of infinite importance. The poor barbarian, knowing that men could be softened by gifts, gave to these spirits that which to him seemed of the most value. With bursting heart he would offer the blood of his dearest child. It was impossible for him to conceive of a god utterly unlike himself, and he naturally supposed that these powers of the air would be affected a little at the sight of so great and so deep a sorrow. It was with the barbarian then as with the civilized now—one class lived upon and made merchandise of the fears of another. Certain persons took it upon themselves to appease the gods, and to instruct the people in their duties to these unseen

powers. This was the origin of the priesthood. The priest pretended to stand between the wrath of the gods and the helplessness of man. He was man's attorney at the court of heaven. He carried to the invisible world a flag of truce, a protest and a request. He came back with command, with authority and with power. Man fell upon his knees before his own servant, and the priest, taking advantage of the awe inspired by his supposed influence with the gods, made of his fellow-man a cringing hypocrite and slave. Even Christ, the supposed son of God, taught that persons were possessed of evil spirits, and frequently, according to the account, gave proof of his divine origin and mission by frightening droves of devils out of his unfortunate countrymen. Casting out devils was his principal employment, and the devils thus banished generally took occasion to acknowledge him as the true Messiah; which was not only very kind of them, but quite fortunate for him. The religious people have always regarded the testimony of these devils as perfectly conclusive, and the writers of the New Testament quote the words of these imps of darkness with great satisfaction.

The fact that Christ could withstand the temptations of the devil was considered as conclusive evidence that he was assisted by some god, or at least by some being superior to man. St. Matthew gives an account of an attempt made by the devil to tempt the supposed son of God: and it has always excited the wonder of Christians that the temptation was so nobly and heroically withstood. The account to which I refer is as follows:

"Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. And when the tempter came to him, he said: 'If thou be the son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' But he answered, and said: 'It is written: man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city and setteth him upon a pinnacle of the temple and saith unto him: 'If thou be the son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, lest at any time thou shalt dash thy foot against a stone.' Jesus said unto him: 'It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Again the devil taketh him up into an exceedingly high mountain and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and saith unto him: 'All these will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.'"

The Christians now claim that Jesus was God. If he was God, of course the devil knew that fact, and yet, according to this account, the devil took the omnipotent God and placed him upon a pinnacle of the temple, and endeavored to induce him to dash himself against the earth. Failing in that, he took the creator, owner and governor of the universe up into an exceeding high mountain, and offered him this world—this grain of sand—if he, the God of all the worlds, would fall down and worship him, a poor devil, without even a tax title to one foot of dirt

it possible  
 gen to thi  
 the devil—  
 esse, tryi  
 ls there  
 ossly absu  
 These de  
 ould speak  
 st out in t  
 deal with  
 rist. The  
 e disciples  
 ad deaf spi  
 m." Wh  
 t (being d  
 hich Christ  
 s disciples,  
 spirit out.  
 at prayer a  
 ould believ  
 ese pious p  
 In the old  
 he people h  
 wed as a m  
 erils, had e  
 eligions hav  
 il spirits a  
 rtificate of  
 arkness was  
 blest senti  
 the respect,  
 and spirits.  
 This belie  
 as surround  
 nomena a  
 ose affectin  
 irits. It b  
 e spirits we  
 ere good or  
 the author  
 e idea of a  
 asy writers  
 at all unive  
 the fact th

it possible the devil was such an idiot? Should any great credit be given to this deity for not being caught with such chaff? Think of it! the devil—the prince of sharpers—the king of cunning—the master of guile, trying to bribe God with a grain of sand that belonged to God! Is there in all the religious literature of the world anything more grossly absurd than this?

These devils, according to the Bible, were of various kinds—some could speak and hear, others were deaf and dumb. All could not be cast out in the same way. The deaf and dumb spirits were quite difficult to deal with. St. Mark tells of a gentleman who brought his son to Christ. The boy, it seems, was possessed of a dumb spirit, over which the disciples had no control. "Jesus said unto the spirit: 'Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him.'" Whereupon, the deaf spirit (having heard what was said) cried out (being dumb) and immediately vacated the premises. The ease with which Christ controlled this deaf and dumb spirit excited the wonder of the disciples, and they asked him privately why they could not cast that spirit out. To whom he replied: "This kind can come forth by nothing but prayer and fasting." Is there a Christian in the whole world who could believe such a story if found in any other book? The trouble is these pious people shut up their reason and then open their bible.

In the olden times the existence of devils was universally admitted. The people had no doubt upon that subject, and from such belief it followed as a matter of course that a person, in order to vanquish these devils, had either to be a god or to be assisted by one. All founders of religions have established their claims to divine origin by controlling evil spirits and suspending the laws of nature. Casting out devils was a certificate of divinity. A prophet unable to cope with the powers of darkness was regarded with contempt. The utterance of the highest and noblest sentiments, the most blameless and holy life, commanded but little respect, unless accompanied by power to work miracles and command spirits.

This belief in good and evil powers had its origin in the fact that man was surrounded by what he was pleased to call good and evil phenomena. Phenomena affecting man pleasantly were ascribed to good spirits, while those affecting him unpleasantly or injuriously were ascribed to evil spirits. It being admitted that all phenomena were produced by spirits, the spirits were divided according to the phenomena, and the phenomena were good or bad as they affected man. Good spirits were supposed to be the authors of good phenomena, and evil spirits of the evil—so that the idea of a devil has been as universal as the idea of a god.

## IV.

Many writers maintain that an idea to become universal must be true; that all universal ideas are innate, and that innate ideas cannot be false. The fact that an idea has been universal proves that it is innate, and

if the fact that an idea is innate proves that it is correct, then the believers in innate ideas must admit that the evidence of a god superior to nature, and of a devil superior to nature, is exactly the same, and that the existence of such a devil must be as self-evident as the existence of such a god. The truth is, a god was inferred from good, and a devil from bad, phenomena. And it is just as natural and logical to suppose that a devil would cause happiness as to suppose that a god would cause misery. Consequently, if an intelligence, infinite and supreme, is the immediate author of all phenomena, it is difficult to determine whether such intelligence is the friend or enemy of man. If phenomena were all good, we might say they were all produced by a perfectly beneficent being; if they were all bad, we might say they were produced by a perfectly malevolent power; but, as phenomena are, as they affect man both good and bad, they must be produced by different and antagonistic spirits,—by one who is sometimes actuated by kindness and sometimes by malice; or all must be produced of necessity, and without reference to their consequences upon man.

The foolish doctrine that all phenomena can be traced to the interference of good and evil spirits, has been, and still is, almost universal. That most people still believe in some spirit that can change the natural order of events, is proven by the fact that nearly all resort to prayer. Thousands, at this very moment, are probably imploring some supposed power to interfere in their behalf. Some want health restored; some ask that the loved and absent be watched over and protected; some pray for riches, some for rain, some want diseases stayed, some vainly ask for food, some ask for revivals, a few ask for more wisdom, and now and then one tells the Lord to do as he may think best. Thousands ask to be protected from the devil; some, like David, pray for revenge; and some implore even God himself not to lead them into temptation. All these prayers rest upon, and are produced by, the idea that some power not only can, but probably will, change the order of the universe. This belief has been common among the great majority of tribes and nations. All sacred books are filled with accounts of such interferences, and our own Bible is no exception to this rule.

If we believe in a power superior to nature, it is perfectly natural to suppose that such a power can and will interfere in the affairs of this world. If there is no interference, of what practical use can such power be? The Scriptures give us the most wonderful accounts of divine interference: Animals talk like men; springs gurgle from dry bones; the sun and moon stop in the heavens in order that General Joshua may have more time to murder; the shadow on a dial goes back ten degrees to convince a petty king of a barbarous people that he is not going to die of a boil; fire refuses to burn; water positively declines to seek its level but stands up like a wall; grains of sand become lice; common walking-sticks, to gratify a mere freak, twist themselves into serpents, and then swallow each other by way of exercise; murmuring streams, laugh

ing at the  
dering to  
easier than  
girls; won  
event fres  
imported  
years; bi  
pense; be  
wigs; mu  
dead peo  
witches an  
God himse  
tailor and  
The vei  
shadows o  
mixed and  
really inh  
his dream  
monsters.  
naiads, go  
deities are  
and wing  
—with the  
all the slir  
tas of the  
It is end  
in the long  
rounded, a  
phantoms  
—that he  
wonder tha  
aid. No w  
door, and  
hear his bi  
The sav  
faith in his  
of spirits.  
spirits, and  
nite and su  
he offers w  
that he obt  
after the a  
cannot by  
investigate  
himself.

The peo

ing at the attraction of gravitation, run up hill for years, following wandering tribes from a pure love of frolic; prophecy becomes altogether easier than history; the sons of god become enamored of the world's girls; women are changed into salt for the purpose of keeping a great event fresh in the memory of men; an excellent article of brimstone is imported from heaven free of duty; clothes refuse to wear out for forty years; birds keep restaurants and feed wandering prophets free of expense; bears tear children in pieces for laughing at old men without wigs; muscular development depends upon the length of one's hair; dead people come to life simply to get a joke on their enemies and heirs; witches and wizards converse freely with the souls of the departed; and God himself becomes a stonemason and engraver, after having been a tailor and dressmaker.

The veil between heaven and earth was always rent or lifted. The shadows of this world, the radiance of heaven, and the glare of hell mixed and mingled until man became uncertain as to which country he really inhabited. Man dwelt in an unreal world. He mistook his ideas, his dreams, for real things. His fears became terrible and malicious monsters. He lived in the midst of fairies and furies, nymphs and maids, goblins and ghosts, witches and wizards, sprites and spooks, deities and devils. The obscure and gloomy depths were filled with claw and wing—with beak and hoof—with leering looks and sneering mouths—with the malice of deformity—with the cunning of hatred, and with all the slimy forms that fear can draw and paint upon the shadowy canvases of the dark.

It is enough to make one almost insane with pity to think what man in the long night has suffered; of the tortures he has endured, surrounded, as he supposed, by malignant powers and clutched by the fierce phantoms of the air. No wonder that he fell upon his trembling knees—that he built altars and reddened them even with his own blood. No wonder that he implored ignorant priests and impudent magicians for aid. No wonder that he crawled grovelling in the dust to the temple's door, and there, in the insanity of despair, besought the deaf gods to hear his bitter cry of agony and fear.

The savage, as he emerges from a state of barbarism, gradually loses faith in his idols of wood and stone, and in their place puts a multitude of spirits. As he advances in knowledge, he generally discards the petty spirits, and in their stead believes in one, whom he supposes to be infinite and supreme. Supposing this great spirit to be superior to nature, he offers worship or flattery in exchange for assistance. At last, finding that he obtains no aid from this supposed deity—finding that all search after the absolute must of necessity end in failure—finding that man cannot by any possibility conceive of the conditionless—he begins to investigate the facts by which he is surrounded, and to depend upon himself.

The people are beginning to think, to reason and to investigate.

Slowly, painfully, but surely, the gods are being driven from the earth. Only upon rare occasions are they, even by the most religious, supposed to interfere in the affairs of men. In most matters we are at last supposed to be free. Since the invention of steamships and railways, so that the products of all countries can be easily interchanged, the gods have quit the business of producing famine. Now and then they kill a child because it is idolized by its parents. As a rule, they have given up causing accidents on railroads, exploding boilers, and bursting kerosene lamps. Cholera, yellow fever, and smallpox are still considered to be heavenly weapons; but measles, itch, and ague are now attributed to natural causes. As a general thing, the gods have stopped drowning children, except as a punishment for violating the Sabbath. They still pay some attention to the affairs of kings, men of genius, and persons of great wealth; but ordinary people are left to shift for themselves as best they may. In wars between great nations, the gods still interfere; but in prize fights, the best man, with an honest referee, is almost sure to win.

*(To be continued.)*



## THE GODS HAVE FLED.

BY J. C. HUTTON, TORONTO.

In that vast cemetery called the Past  
Lie the dead gods that men aside have cast;  
And there lie most of man's religions too:  
Old creeds that died, supplanted by the new.

In ruins India's sacred temples lie;  
Cornice and column, gilded dome and wall,  
By trailing vines veiled from the curious eye:  
Old temples that old gods to mind recall.  
Siva—red with the blood he used to shed;  
Vishnu—the sombre three-eyed god of awe;  
Four-headed Brahma; Kali, goddess dread;  
Dranpadi, Chrishna—Hindoo gods of yore;  
Cast down by man from their exalted state,  
Leaving the thrones of heaven desolate.

No longer Isis, by the sacred Nile,  
Wandering, weeping, on dead Osiris calls;  
The shadow of dread Typhon's scowl the while  
No more upon that holy river falls.

The sun still rises as of yore ; its rays  
 Still smite the lips of Memnon, but he stands  
 As voiceless as the Sphinx. Gone are the days  
 Of sacred fanes. Amid the desert sands  
 The dusty mummies still are waiting for  
 The resurrection by their priests foretold.  
 The childish faiths now sleep to wake no more,  
 Wrapped in their mystic shrouds of symbols old.

Odin, author of life and of the soul ;  
 Vili, and Ve, and Yamir, gods of the North,  
 O'er Norsemen's minds have lost their old control,  
 And from their icy halls have wandered forth.  
 The God of Thunder, Scandinavian Thor,  
 Dashes the mountains to the earth no more.  
 The cromlechs of the ancient Druids fall,  
 Their circles now are broken ; over all  
 Their sacred cairns the moss of centuries grows.  
 The fire divine of Persia dimmer glows  
 And dies, for none are left to feed its flames.  
 The harp of Orpheus is still ; the glass  
 Of Bacchus thrown aside, his orgies, games,  
 And feasts are o'er : have passed, as all things pass.

Venus is dead, and her white bosom heaves  
 No more with love. The sunlit rivers glance,  
 But Naiads bathe not. Trees still wave their leaves,  
 But in the forest aisles no Dryads dance.  
 From high Olympus all the gods have flown,  
 Nor can e'en lovely woman lure them down,  
 And man is left to rule the earth alone !

Hushed is the thunder voice of Sinai ;  
 Hushed are the prophets' warnings ; and the lands  
 That erstwhile flowed with milk and honey, lie  
 A waste wherein no tabernacle stands.  
 One by one the myths and fables fade ;  
 One by one the phantoms disappear ;  
 One by one the creeds aside are laid.  
 The Gods have fled, but *Man remaineth here !*



## ANIMISM.

BY PROF. TYLOR, AUTHOR OF "PRIMITIVE CULTURE."

## III.

WHETHER the Buddhists receive the full Hindu doctrine of the migration of the individual soul from birth to birth, or whether they refine away into metaphysical subtleties the notion of continued personality, they do consistently and systematically hold that a man's life in former existences is the cause of his now being what he is, while at this moment he is accumulating merit or demerit whose result will determine his fate in future lives. Memory, it is true, fails generally to recall these past births, but memory, as we know, stops short of the beginning even of this present life. When King Bimsara's feet were burned and rubbed with salt by command of his cruel son that he might not walk, why was this torture inflicted on a man so holy? Because in a previous birth he had walked near a pagoda with his slippers on, and had trodden on a priest's carpet without washing his feet. A man may be prosperous for a time on account of the merit he has received in former births, but if he does not continue to keep the precepts, his next birth will be in one of the hells, he will then be born in this world as a beast, afterwards as a preta or sprite; a proud man may be born again ugly with large lips, or as a demon or a worm. The Buddhist theory of "karma" or "action," which controls the destiny of all sentient beings, not by judicial reward and punishment, but by the inflexible result of cause into effect, wherein the present is ever determined by the past in an unbroken line of causation, is indeed one of the world's most remarkable developments of ethical speculation.

Within the classic world, the ancient Egyptians are described as maintaining a doctrine of migration, whether by successive embodiments in a "cycle of necessity," through creatures of earth, sea, and air, and back again to man, or by the simpler judicial penalty which sent back the wicked dead to earth as unclean beasts. The pictures and hieroglyphic sentences of the Book of the Dead are still preserved, and though the ambiguity of its formulas and the difficulty of distinguishing material from mystical meaning in its doctrine make it of little use as a check upon the classic accounts, yet it shows at least that notions of metamorphosis of the soul did hold a large place in the Egyptian religion. In Greek philosophy, great teachers stood forth to proclaim it. Plato had mythic knowledge to convey of souls entering such new incarnations as their glimpse of real existence had made them fit for, from the body of a philosopher or a lover down to the body of a tyrant and usurper; of souls transmigrating into beasts and rising again to man according to the lives they led; of birds, that were high-minded souls; of oysters suffering in banishment the penalty of utter ignorance. Pythagoras is



made to illustrate in his own person his doctrine of metempsychosis, by recognizing where it hung in Hero's temple the shield he had carried in a former birth, when he was that Euphorbos whom Menelaus slew at the siege of Troy. Afterwards he was Heronimos, the Klazomenian prophet whose funeral rites were so prematurely celebrated while his soul was in a pig, and after that, as Lucian tells the story, his prophetic soul passed into the body of a cock. Mikyllos asks this cock to tell him about Troy—were things there really as Homer said? But the cock replies, "How should Homer have known, O Mikyllos? When the Trojan war was going on he was a camel in Baktria!"

In the later Jewish philosophy, the Kabbalists took up the doctrine of migration, the *gilgul* or "rolling on" of souls, and maintained it by that characteristic method of Biblical interpretation which it is good to hold up from time to time for a warning to the mystical interpreters of our own day. The soul of Adam passed into David, and shall pass into the Messiah, for are not these initials in the very name of Ad(a)m, and does not Ezekiel say that "my servant David shall be their prince for ever?" Cain's soul passed into Jethro, and Abel's into Moses, and therefore it was that Jethro gave Moses his daughter to wife. Souls migrate into beasts and birds and vermin, for is not Jehovah "the lord of the spirits of all flesh"? and he who has done one sin beyond his good works shall pass into a brute. He who gives a Jew unclean meat to eat, his soul shall enter into a leaf, blown to and fro by the wind; "for ye shall be as an oak whose leaf fadeth;" and he who speaks ill words, his soul shall pass into a dumb stone, as did Nabal's, "and he became a stone." Within the range of Christian influence, the Manichæans appear as the most remarkable exponents of the metempsychosis. We hear of their ideas of sinners' souls transmigrating into beasts, the viler according to their crimes; that he who kills a fowl or rat will become a fowl or rat himself; that souls can pass into plants rooted in the ground, which thus have not only life but sense; that the souls of reapers pass into beans and barley, to be cut down in their turn, and thus the elect were careful to explain to the bread when they ate it, that it was not they who reaped the corn it was made of; for that the souls of the auditors, that is, the spiritually low commonalty who lived a married life, would pass into melons and cucumbers, to finish their purification by being eaten by the elect. But these details come to us from the accounts of bitter theological adversaries, and the question is, how much of them did the Manichæans really and soberly believe? Allowing for exaggeration and constructive imputation, there is reason to consider the account at least founded on fact. It seems clear that the Manichæan sect, when they fused together Zarathustrism, Buddhism, and Christianity into a transcendental ascetic faith, adopted the Hindu theory of penance and purification of souls by migration into animals and plants, probably elaborating it meanwhile into fresh and fanciful details. In later times, the doctrine of metempsychosis has been again and again noticed in a

district of South-western Asia. William of Ruysbrook speaks of the notion of souls passing from body to body as general among the mediæval Nestorians, even a somewhat intelligent priest consulting him as to the souls of brutes, whether they could find refuge elsewhere so as not to be compelled to labor after death. Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela records in the 12th century of the Druses of Mount Hermon: "They say that the soul of a virtuous man is transferred to the body of a new-born child, whereas that of the vicious transmigrates into a dog, or some other animal." Such ideas, indeed, seem not yet extinct in the modern Druse nation. Among the Nassairi, also, transmigration is believed in as a penance and purification; we hear of migration of unbelievers into camels, asses, dogs, or sheep, of disobedient Nassairi into Jews, Sunnis, or Christians, of the faithful into new bodies of their own people, a few such changes of "shirt" (i.e. body) bringing them to enter paradise or become stars. An instance of the belief within the limits of modern Christian Europe may be found among the Bulgarians, whose superstition is that Turks who have never eaten pork in life will become wild boars after death. A party assembled to feast on a boar has been known to throw it all away, for the meat jumped off the spit into the fire, and a piece of cotton was found in the ears, which the wise man decided to be a piece of the *ci-devant* Turk's turban. Such cases, however, are exceptional. Metempsychosis never became one of the great doctrines of Christendom, though not unknown in mediæval scholasticism, and though maintained by an eccentric theologian here and there into our own times. It would be strange were it not so. It is in the very nature of the development of religion that speculations of the earlier culture should dwindle to survivals, yet be again and again revived. Doctrines transmigrate, if souls do not; and metempsychosis, wandering along the course of ages, came at last to animate the souls of Fourier and Soame Jenyns.

Thus we have traced the ancient theory of metempsychosis in stage after stage of the world's civilization, scattered among the native races of America and Africa, established in old Egypt, elaborated by the Hindu mind into its great system of ethical philosophy, reviving and failing through classic and mediæval Europe, and lingering at last in the modern world as an intellectual crotchet, of little account but to the ethnographer, who notes it down as an item of evidence for his continuity of culture. What, we may well ask, was the original cause and motive of the doctrine of transmigration? Something may be said in answer, though not at all enough for full explanation.

#### IV.

THE theory that ancestral souls return, thus imparting their own likeness of mind and body to their descendants and kindred, has already been mentioned and commended as in itself a very reasonable and philosophical hypothesis, accounting for the phenomenon of family like-

ness going  
been imag  
birds?  
sider the l  
mind mak  
at least se  
view I hav  
tion of sou  
conception  
afterwards  
it may see  
forward an  
bodies, wh  
generation  
re-birth in  
ideas whic  
features an  
dering sym  
incarnation  
fox, owl, p  
condense i  
Consiste  
migration  
of the hun  
philosophic  
ation of th  
into view  
of transmi  
priateness  
critics as i  
graphic re  
of metemp  
the writin  
the extrem  
world, say  
selves for  
becoming  
shape of su  
most notal  
upon a tho  
developme  
from the v  
the higher  
not here re  
by the the  
vegetable

ness going on from generation to generation. But why should it have been imagined that men's souls could inhabit the bodies of beasts and birds? As has been already pointed out, savages not unreasonably consider the lower animals to have souls like their own, and this state of mind makes the idea of a man's soul transmigrating into a beast's body at least seem possible. But it does not actually suggest the idea. The view I have in another place put forward as to the origin of the conception of soul in general may help us here. As it seems that the first conception of souls may have been that of the souls of men, this being afterwards extended by analogy to the souls of animals, plants, etc., so it may seem that the original idea of transmigration was the straightforward and reasonable one of human souls being re-born in new human bodies, where they are recognized by family likenesses in successive generations. This notion may have been afterwards extended to take in re-birth in bodies of animals, etc. There are some well-marked savage ideas which will fit with such a course of thought. The half-human features and actions and characters of animals are watched with wondering sympathy by the savage, as by the child. The beast is the very incarnation of familiar qualities of man; and such names as lion, bear, fox, owl, parrot, viper, worm, when we apply them as epithets to men, condense into a word some leading feature of a human life.

Consistently with this, we see in looking over details of savage transmigration that the creatures often have an evident fitness to the character of the human beings whose souls are to pass into them, so that the savage philosopher's fancy of transferred souls offered something like an explanation of the likeness between beast and man. This comes more clearly into view among the more civilized races who have worked out the idea of transmigration into ethical schemes of retribution, where the appropriateness of the creatures chosen is almost as manifest to the modern critics as it could have been to the ancient believer. Perhaps the graphic restoration of the state of mind in which the theological doctrine of metempsychosis was worked out in long-past ages, may be found in the writings of a modern theologian whose spiritualism often follows to the extreme the intellectual tracks of the lower races. In the spiritual world, says Emanuel Swedenborg, such persons as have opened themselves for the admission of the devil and acquired the nature of beasts, becoming foxes in cunning, etc., appear also at a distance in the proper shape of such beasts as they represent in disposition. Lastly, one of the most notable points about the theory of transmigration is its close bearing upon a thought which lies very deep in the history of philosophy, the development-theory of organic life in successive stages. An elevation from the vegetable to the lower animal life, and thence onward through the higher animals to man, to say nothing of superhuman beings, does not here require even a succession of distinct individuals, but is brought by the theory of metempsychosis within the compass of the successive vegetable and animal lives of a single being.

Here a few words may be said on a subject which cannot be left out of sight, connecting as it does the two great branches of the doctrine of future existence, but which it is difficult to handle in definite terms, and much more to trace historically by comparing the views of lower and higher races. This is the doctrine of a bodily renewal or resurrection. To the philosophy of the lower races it is by no means necessary that the surviving soul should be provided with a new body, for it seems itself to be of a filmy or vaporous corporeal nature, capable of carrying on an independent existence like other corporeal creatures. Savage descriptions of the next world are often such absolute copies of this, that it is scarcely possible to say whether the dead are or are not thought of as having bodies like the living; and a few pieces of evidence of this class are hardly enough to prove the lower races to hold original and distinct doctrines of corporeal resurrection. Again, attention must be given to the practice, so common among low and high races, of preserving relics of the dead, from mere morsels of bone up to whole mummified bodies. It is well known that the departed soul is often thought apt to revisit the remains of the body. But how far the preservation of these remains may be connected with an idea of bodily resurrection, whether among the native races of America, or in ancient Egypt, or elsewhere, is a problem for which also the evidence available does not seem sufficient. In discussing the closely-allied doctrine of metempsychosis, I have described the theory of the soul's transmigration into a new human body as asserting in fact an earthly resurrection. From the same point of view, a bodily resurrection in heaven or hades is technically a transmigration of the soul. This is plain among the higher races, in whose religion these doctrines take at once clearer definition and more practical import. There are some cases distinctly mentioned in the Rig Veda; the dead is spoken of as glorified, putting on his body (tauu); and it is even promised that the pious man shall be born in the next world with his entire body (sarvatanu). In Brahminism and Buddhism, the re-births of souls in bodies to inhabit heavens and hells are simply included as particular cases of transmigration. The question of an old Persian doctrine of resurrection, thought by some to be related to the late Jewish doctrine, is obscure. In early Christianity, the conception of bodily resurrection is developed with especial strength and fulness in the Pauline doctrine. For an explicit interpretation of this doctrine, such as commended itself to the minds of later theologians, it is instructive to cite the remarkable passage of Origen, where he speaks of "corporeal matter, of which matter, in whatever quality placed, the soul always has use, now indeed carnal, but afterwards indeed subtler and purer, which is called spiritual."

Passing from these metaphysical doctrines of civilized theology, we now take up a series of beliefs higher in practical moment, and more clearly conceived in savage thought. There may well have been, and there may still be, low races destitute of any belief in a Future State.

Neverthe  
for this r  
may mer  
asked wh  
reply tha  
"their gl  
taken do  
Old-Old-  
that he a  
as we no  
in the un  
proper se  
might ha  
This obje  
future lif  
the Dink

"On th

And t

And t

And t

And t

It is to  
the Bari,  
question  
doctrine  
missiona  
tality of  
over; Br  
in anothe  
the existe  
same kin

Lookin  
not be ill  
the doctr  
to limit,  
to miscor  
"immort  
ful how f  
of immor  
savage m  
and year  
the survi  
pears wit

Nevertheless, prudent ethnographers must often doubt accounts of such, for this reason, that the savage who declares that the dead live no more, may merely mean to say that they are dead. When the East African is asked what becomes of his buried ancestors, the "old people," he can reply that "they are ended," yet at the same time he fully admits that "their ghosts survive." In an account of the religious ideas of the Zulus, taken down from a native, it is explicitly stated that Unkulunkulu, the Old-Old-One, said that people "were to die and never rise again," and that he allowed them "to die and rise no more." Knowing so thoroughly as we now do the theology of the Zulus, whose ghosts not only survive in the under-world, but are the very deities of the living, we can put the proper sense to these expressions. But without such information, we might have mistaken them for denials of the soul's existence after death. This objection may even apply to one of the most formal denials of a future life ever placed on record among an uncultured race, a poem of the Dinka tribe of the White Nile, concerning Dendid the Creator:

"On the day when Dendid made all things,

He made the sun;

And the sun comes forth, goes down, and comes again:

He made the moon;

And the moon comes forth, goes down, and comes again:

He made the stars;

And the stars come forth, go down, and come again:

He made man;

And the man comes forth, goes down into the ground, and comes no more."

It is to be remarked, however, that the close neighbors of these Dinka, the Bari, believe that the dead do return to live again on earth, and the question arises whether it is the doctrine of bodily resurrection, or the doctrine of the surviving ghost-soul, that the Dinka poem denies. The missionary, Kaufmann, says that the Dinka do not believe the immortality of the soul, that they think it but a breath, and with death all is over; Brun-Rollet's contrary authority goes to prove that they do believe in another life; both leave it an open question whether they recognize the existence of surviving ghosts. The case is, like various others of the same kind, incomplete.

Looking at the religion of the lower races as a whole, we shall at least not be ill-advised in taking as one of its general and principal elements the doctrine of the soul's future life. But here it is needful to explain, to limit, and to reserve, lest modern theological ideas should lead us to misconstrue more primitive beliefs. In such enquiries the phrase "immortality of the soul" is to be avoided as misleading. It is doubtful how far the lower psychology entertains at all an absolute conception of immortality, for past and future fade soon into utter vagueness as the savage mind quits the present to explore them, the measure of months and years breaks down even within the narrow span of human life, and the survivor's thought of the soul of the departed dwindles and disappears with the personal memory that kept it alive.

(To be continued.)

## THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.

## XIII.

THE morning after the fiercely-contested skirmish, Colonel Grant and his horsemen went out to reconnoitre. The scene of the conflict was strewn with the carcasses of men and horses, and there was one gun which the colonel appropriated. Of the enemy there was no sign. But the strategists made another attempt. The Jellalabad gunners were famed for their accurate firing; and this time the strategists ordered the Jellalabad battery to the front. The gunners fired well, but they were deficient in backbone. Brigadier Wilson headed a charge; the mutineers made a hasty retreat, but they saved their guns. The men of Delhi abandoned strategy.

On June 17th, Capt. McAndrew, in charge of the Bhagput bridge, which spans the Jumna), alarmed by a rumor, retreated within the camp. Of course he was severely reprimanded; but had the rumor turned out to be a reality, and McAndrews' force been cut to pieces, and had he escaped, who would have said a word in his favor? Temerity, if successful, is praised; witness Nelson before Copenhagen. Prudence, when the threatened danger passes harmlessly by, is censured; witness M'Andrew before the bridge at Bhagput. Hodson speedily rectified the mistake.

Reinforcements poured into Delhi. The Jullundhur brigade, which mutinied on June 7th, and the 3rd B.N.I., marched into the city on June 21st. There was no longer room within the walls for the crowd; these new comers had to camp outside, the city guns protecting them. A timely reinforcement reached the British camp two days later; 850 men came in on June 23rd, the hundredth anniversary of the battle of Plassey.

Now was the great day come\*: the British rule in India was to be annihilated on this hundredth anniversary. Full of hope and fanaticism, the Delhi Sepoys came forth to do battle. Two little suburbs of Delhi, the Subzee Mundi and the Kishengunge, lie on the west. On June 17 (it may be remembered) the Sepoys had started to build a battery on a little hillock. On this height was a walled enclosure. The battery and the doors of the enclosure were destroyed by the British on the 19th. This place was near by the Subzee Mundi, and it was here the Sepoys again established a battery on the great anniversary. With

\* The prophecy here alluded to did come to pass. Indian commentators (like some nearer home) twisted the prognostication into meaning the foretelling of an event which did happen. One hundred years after Plassey the Company Bahadour expired.

the guns  
the fire.  
The adv  
with cons  
(22 miles  
to the res  
The Sub  
blood of  
hadly bea  
strengthe  
Sepoys th  
Alread  
time to re  
Canning  
pooh-poo  
General a  
what wou  
graphed t  
now on it  
required  
opinion o  
the 10th  
Elphinsto  
He begge  
war was c  
clearly en  
mission.  
own discr  
on board  
Bombay,  
lost no tin  
existence;  
June 17th  
May w  
soon as th  
and Mad  
Neill, arri  
started fo  
what kind  
detachme  
having be

the guns of this battery they raked the British right flank, and destructive was the fire. Brigadier Showers counselled Sir Henry Barnard to attack the battery. The advice was followed; an assault was made, but the British were repulsed with considerable loss. The reinforcements that had marched in that morning (12 miles had they covered)—the 4th Sikhs and part of the 2nd Fusiliers—came to the rescue; they charged the Sepoys with a fury that carried all before it. The Subzee Mundi "Sammy House" (Hindoo temple) was deluged with the blood of Sepoys who had taken refuge therein. The Delhi attacking party was badly beaten, and the Subzee Mundi hill (thus captured) was fortified, and vastly strengthened the British position. The great anniversary did not bring for the Sepoys the expected deliverance.

Already has it been said that Governors-General arriving in India have for a time to rely on the information supplied them by the local civil servants. Lord Canning was no exception. Entirely misled by high officials in Calcutta, who pooh-poohed the idea of any danger arising from the native army, the Governor-General acted injudiciously, to say the least. Sir John Lawrence, who foresaw what would result from any supineness on the part of the Government, thus telegraphed to Lord Canning: "Send for troops from Persia; intercept the force now on its way to China; bring it to Calcutta. Every European soldier will be required to save the country if the native troops turn against us. *This is the opinion of the leading minds here*" (the Punjab). This was telegraphed on the 10th of May, before Sir John had heard of the Meerut massacre. Lord Elphinstone, the Governor of Bombay, was as prescient as Sir John Lawrence. He begged Sir James Outram, in command of the Persian forces (the Persian war was over), to hasten to Calcutta. Here came in Red Tapism. Outram saw clearly enough what ought to be done, but he had to obtain Lord Canning's permission. The Governor-General's answer was non-committal. "Act on your own discretion." Sir James followed Elphinstone's advice. Havelock was still on board ship somewhere in the Persian Gulf. On May the 29th he landed in Bombay, the first news he heard being that Delhi was held by rebel Sepoys. He lost no time. Starting by sea (the railway crossing the peninsula was not then in existence) for Calcutta, he was wrecked at Ceylon, but reached his destination on June 17th.

May was well advanced before Lord Canning began to use his own eyes. As soon as those eyes were opened he acted with energy. Ceylon, the Mauritius, and Madras were called upon for troops. The Madras Fusiliers, under Colonel Neill, arrived at Calcutta on May 23rd. Without delay, they and the 84th Foot started for the North-West. A short anecdote connected with the start will prove what kind of man Neill was. Neill was at the station with a few men, but the detachment which was to form the *avant-garde* had not yet marched up, there having been some trouble in crossing the river. The station-master told Neill

that the train could not wait. "Can't wait!" retorted Neill; "we shall see if it can't wait!" The next moment the station-master was seized by the soldiers, detained as a prisoner until the detachment was in the train; and then he was set free and gave the order to the engine-driver to move on. This act on Neill's part was a bold defiance to the civil power, whose officials hardly deigned to mingle with military men even of high rank.

Benares is the sacred city of the Hindoos. In 1857, Benares held within its walls many ex-rajahs and unrecognized heirs to small States. Naturally, these were discontented and prone to scheme against the Government. And those everlasting mischief-makers, the priests, were ready at hand to fan the embers of discontent into the fierce flame of rebellion. Benares, in 1857, had a population of 300,000, the majority of whom were Hindoos. Benares was politically of immense importance to the Government; while Allahabad, near the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna, was, as one writer puts it, *essential* from a military point of view. It was the greatest arsenal in India, containing enormous quantities of guns, ammunition, and other stores. And how were these important places defended? Within 130 miles of Benares, at Dinapore, there were three native regiments and the 10th Foot; at Benares itself were 30 European artillerymen, one Sikh, and two B.N.I. regiments. And so colossal was the foresight of the Calcutta Government that the two great arsenals of Delhi and Allahabad had not one European regiment to protect them!

At Benares, Mr. F. Gubbins, of the Civil Service, acted bravely and energetically. June 3rd, the vanguard of the Madras Fusiliers arrived; and on the next day, Neill came in with the rest. Brigadier Ponsonby was in command at Benares; it was with difficulty that Neill and Gubbins could persuade him to disarm the 37th B.N.I. Those Sepoys would never mutiny; but Neill prevailed. A parade was ordered. The 37th was drawn up between the Sikhs and the Irregular Cavalry on the left and the artillery on the right. The 37th at once began firing on their officers; there was confusion. A fatal blunder followed; the Sikhs fired at their own officers, at the artillery and at Neill's Fusiliers! But Neill's men and the gunners drove the mutineers out of the city. Brigadier Ponsonby died from sunstroke at the commencement of the fray. Not only was Neill helped by the brave Gubbins, but two fine fellows, Venables and Chapman, indigo planters, rendered valuable service. And these men, stern in judgment, decisive in action, not only kept in subjection the enormous, fanatical population of Benares, but made their power respected far around the city walls. But to effect this harsh measures had to be adopted. And very harsh they must seem to many of us now; but let us forget in what peace and security we live, and let us step into the shoes of Neill and his stern band of coadjutors. To save their own lives, to save the lives of many other Europeans, and to help save the British rule in India their action had perforce to be stern. Gallows were erected

in the cit  
irrespective  
among the  
With co  
in awe, wit  
mutiny, it  
rich not on  
Delhi. S  
graphed th  
out these t  
shot most  
buildings t  
men, their  
artilleryme  
some Euro  
naked into  
of what wa  
persuaded  
This done,  
over the sc

Mr. ETHE  
under the  
which have  
The reader  
that he has  
dangerous  
page, where  
saying—or  
that should  
whether the  
pun by ans  
"unities"  
himself to  
sneers of S  
business th

\* "Fire a



in the city; and the policy of *he that is not for us is against us* was followed irrespective of rank and caste. And the bodies of those who were numbered among the *against* adorned the gibbets!

With contagious example all around, with no European regiment to keep them in awe, with \$875,000 in silver in the treasury, and with all the inclination to mutiny, it is inexplicable why the 5th B.N.I. in Allahabad did not revolt. The 5th not only remained apparently faithful, they volunteered to march against Delhi. So ecstatic was the joy of the government at Calcutta that they telegraphed their thanks to these loyal men. Colonel Simpson, commanding, read out these thanks to the regiment on June 5th; and on June 6th these very men shot most of their officers, let loose prisoners, and, setting fire to European buildings that they might have light, passed the night in hacking to pieces white men, their wives and their little ones. On May 23rd sixty invalid European artillerymen had marched into Allahabad; these men held the fort, and here some Europeans found refuge. One officer, swimming across the Jumna, came ashore into the fort on the night of the 6th June. He related the ghastly news of what was occurring outside. Braysher, an officer who had risen from the ranks, persuaded the Sikhs to disarm a company of the 6th B.N.I. inside the fort. This done, the fort was safe. On June 11th Neill arrived, and a change came over the scene.

---

### "FIRE AND FROST."

---

MR. ETHELBERT F. H. CROSS is a most promising young Canadian writer, and under the above title has compiled a collection of stories and essays, some of which have already appeared in various publications during the past few years. The reader of the volume will at once recognize that Mr. Cross is a thinker, and that he handles a strong and versatile pen, in no wise afraid of tackling the most dangerous problems of religion and sociology. This will be seen in the very first page, wherein we are introduced to the Devil and Mammon discussing the soul-saving—or soul-buying—business. The introduction contains some crudities that should not have appeared, as, for instance, the inquiry by Mammon as to whether the inhabitants of the earth were ants, bugs, etc. Satan perpetrates a pun by answering "Hum-bugs," but the pun is hardly worth the violation of the "unities" involved in the question, for Mammon immediately afterwards shows himself to be perfectly acquainted with the whole subject, and in response to the sneers of Satan flies off to the earth to prove that purchasing souls is quicker business than "saving" them. An editor's soul is bought with an "ad." that

\* "Fire and Frost," by Ethelbert F. H. Cross. Toronto: Bryant Press. 1898.

of a woman with the price of a new set of teeth ; and finally Mammon meets a preacher :

"Why, certainly," said the preacher. "Bless us, what do I want with a mind? Thinking is not a part of my business. Everything is down in the book, you know ; and besides, the old-fashioned days when preachers required souls have passed away. When one has a fashionable congregation one doesn't care to offend them by parading one's soul in public. Put a mite into the plate, and you may take the soul if you wish."

Mr. Cross pictures for us the beautiful aspect of a world redeemed by the martyred Dreamer, the only soul Mammon could not buy. Mr. Cross himself is a dreamer, and he dreams some visions that *may* be more than dreams. "The thinker of the future will be a great musician, and correlate the waves of ether with waves of thought, and modify matter by volition. Then will the god awake." We might hope that when he awakes he will destroy the demons that seem so largely to possess this world ; but what, then, would Mr. Cross do for inspiration for those specimens of "Fire and Frost" that make up the bulk of his work and form the warp and woof of human life? Must not there be dreamers, martyrs, and preachers always? Assuredly yes. But not our dreamers, not our martyrs, not our preachers. These must make room for new orders, with broader views, higher ambitions, clearer insight. And the demons may be there too, though possibly they will be etherialized, for would not life cease to be life without the pains and the pleasures they bring? Life all good is but an idiot's dream.

In "Thou Shalt Not Smile," Mr. Cross gives us a satire on the Sabbatarians of Toronto the Good ; and in "A Guest of God" we are presented with a new version of the self-sacrifice for love given us by Dickens in "A Tale of Two Cities." It is the triumph of love over religion ; and in "The Fall of the Curate" we see asceticism again worsted in its encounter with real life. Some may think that in some of his sketches Mr. Cross rather "tears a passion to rags," but who is there to fix limits to the depth and breadth of human emotions?

Besides the sketches to which we have referred, "Fire and Frost" contains several essays which give great promise for the future literary career of its author. "Genius and Patriotism" is a protest against that childish provincialism which in these days of war and rumors of war runs to seed in patriotic doggerel and jingoism. "An Exile from Erin" is a sketch of the career of D'Arcy McGee from the pen of an enthusiastic admirer ; "A Poet-Politician" a similar sketch of Mazzini, the great Italian republican reformer. "A Midnight Minstrel" is an essay on James Thomson's poem, "The City of Dreadful Night ;" all of these essays make us wish the volume had been larger and had contained more of this class of work. We sincerely hope the success of the present volume may be such as to bring forth a second volume, in which we feel sure the author, with a more experienced and riper pen, will prove himself a worthy addition to the ranks of Canada's literary army.

FREETHIN  
 tendencies  
 wears blue  
 indignation  
 Catholic c  
 scream, an  
 and we stat  
 we interfere  
 Rome. N  
 Bibleism.  
 We may ra  
 for Michael  
 new shapes  
 Sir Christo  
 yet another  
 by the com  
 nor do we  
 build fresh  
 For my  
 historic chu  
 Church of  
 with Pagan  
 Hildebrand  
 I perceive t  
 the Church  
 But we w  
 shall neith  
 bishop of C  
 XIII., and  
 letters as th  
 fight agains  
 The Lite  
 He wander  
 of the great  
 falling from  
 aim, in sear

"NO POPERY."

— o —

FREETHINKERS hold aloof from the present agitation against the Romanizing tendencies of the Anglican Church. It is no concern of ours whether the priest wears blue or green. A new species of adoration of the Cross excites in us no indignation. Impassioned declarations of the independence of the English Catholic creed do not stir us to wrathful demonstrations. The Evangelicals scream, and we make no response. Sir William Harcourt cries "No Popery!" and we stand idle. Like Mr. John Morley, we keep our blood cool. Why should we interfere? The enemy of progress is not, in the last resort, the Church of Rome. Neither is it the Church of England. Neither is it the Nonconformist Bibleism. The real enemy is the temper that gives birth to all three phenomena. We may raze St. Peter's to the ground (though we have too great an admiration for Michael Angelo to do so), and yet the Papal spirit would live on to create new shapes of superstition. If we burned St. Paul's Cathedral (but the shade of Sir Christopher Wren need never fear), the sacerdotal soul would clothe itself in yet another Anglicanism. And if we ordered Wesley's Journals to be burned by the common hangman (though, as Rationalists, we neither approve of hanging nor do we spurn the memory of Wesley), the Nonconformist conscience would build fresh dismal Bethels and still chant the Calvinistic psalm.

For my part, if I had to choose, I would sooner cast in my lot with a great historic church like that of Rome than with a gimcrack Dissent or a half-political Church of England. For Rome goes further back than Christianity. Its affinity with Paganism would even attract me. Rome is the Church of Augustine, of Hildebrand, of St. Bernard, of Ignatius Loyola. I strike at their theology; but I perceive the greatness of their characters; and if Church it must be, then let the Church be that which nursed such men as these.

But we want neither Papist nor Protestant. We ask for a humanism which shall neither kneel to God nor read the fate of its soul in the Bible. The Archbishop of Canterbury will give us no more freedom from dogma than will Leo XIII., and the pastors of Baptist Tabernacles are as ready to bind us in spiritual fetters as the Ritualists. We are indifferent to their mutual dissensions. We fight against the theological temper which inspires them all.

*The Literary Guide.*

F. J. GOULD.

THE LIGHT WITHOUT.

— o —

He wandered along the gloomy streets of the city,—the dark and lonely streets of the great city,—and with a mind as dark as the darkness which seemed to be falling from the trees upon the footpath, he moved uneasily, and with uncertain aim, in search of a light—a beautiful light which should dispel the darkness and

the shadows and the clouds which robed his soul in gloom. The pedestrian passed him softly, and written in their faces he saw stories of strange sympathy and a hungering after happiness, and in their eyes he read the language of yearning—a longing, unsatisfied yearning for the light he vainly sought.

"Light, did you say?" answered a pedestrian in response to his strange inquiry. "You do seem a trifle light; try the asylum—the lunatic asylum," and he hurried away to join the companion from whom he had been parted for a moment.

The explorer for light continued his journey, and paused before a building from whose doors there floated nervously along the quivering rays of softened light the sweet echoes of airs of music which trembled and fell upon his ear.

"Perhaps there is light within," he murmured as he saw tired faces going by him and disappearing within the doors,—“light, and peace, and rest.” So he ascended the steps and opened the door, and threw himself in a seat apart from the others. And the musician at the organ continued playing, and soft steps hurried down the dimly-lighted aisles and disappeared in the distance, and the candles burned faintly before him, and flung a quivering and uncertain light upon a few of the white waiting faces; and then the music trembled,—trembled and echoed and ceased, and all was quiet, and the shadows stole over the soul of the seeker after light, for he was in church.

\* \* \* \*

"Is it over?"

He heaved a sigh of relief—a sigh of sweet relief—as he rose with the others after the long, long sermon; the sermon and the sighing, the sorrow and the sobbing were done. And all was dark and gloomy, and no ray of light was left. The dark and cruel shadows stole down on the waves of air as they beat from the organ, and floated along the aisles, and hovered and fell around the pillars and arches, and windows and doors; they swept and rolled down the storm of words which echoed from the lips of the speaker, and they clustered in clouds of darkest gloom round the voices and songs of the singers away in the choir above. It was gloom, gloom, gloom, and darkness; and he felt a secret yearning for light, light, light.

The evening was falling on the city when he had entered the sacred walls, and now the night was far advanced. So he followed the others down the aisle clouded with mist and with memories, and passed through the open door.

And standing there on the threshold of the sanctuary, light dawned on his brow and filled the heart of the searcher, for a thousand electric lights burst into brilliance, and shed over the city and over the soul of the searcher a luminous refulgence—a rare and brilliant light, and filled his soul with peace and his heart with joy. And the door closed behind him, and deep darkness dwelt within the sacred sanctuary.

ENDYMION.