

The Dominion Review.

VOL. III.

NOVEMBER, 1898.

NO II.

WILL THE COMING MAN WORSHIP GOD?

BY B. F. UNDERWOOD, CHICAGO, ILL.

THAT religions, considered as systems of doctrine, have been developed from simple conditions, many theologians are willing to concede; but they all continue to maintain that religion, considered as an element of the human mind or as a predisposition to worship, is a primordial part of man's nature, with which he must have been endowed when he came from the hand of his maker. And as certainly as thirst implies water and hunger food, as certainly as fear implies something to dread, and affection beings to love, the religious element of man's nature, it is affirmed, presupposes a personal, intelligent being whom it is our duty to reverence and adore.

But if the theory of evolution be true, religion, regarded as an element of human nature, so far as it is such, as well as a body of doctrine, has come into existence naturally with the development of the race. If man has a relationship with the animals below him, and has risen from the condition of creatures destitute of religious ideas and devoid of a religious nature, then his tendency to worship, not less than his belief in regard to the power that he worships, must have been *acquired*; in which case it presupposes those causes only which have combined to produce this tendency.

The evidence seems to be abundant that there are tribes on the earth to-day entirely destitute of religion; or, if they have it at all, it is in such a rudimentary condition that travelers are unable to observe any indications of it. Of a tribe of Bechuanas, Moffat, who was among them many years, says: "The people have many ceremonies and superstitions, believe in the influence of witchcraft and charms; but no one of them has the remotest reference to religion. They have no knowledge whatever of idols or anything intended to represent an invisible power, and consequently have nothing of a religious character" (Enc. Brit., art. Bechuanas).

"There is," says Darwin, "ample evidence, derived, not from hasty travellers, but from men who have long resided with savages, that numerous races have existed, and still exist, who have no idea of one or more gods, and who have no words in their language to express such an idea" (Dest. of Man, vol. I., p. 63).

Lubbock, in his "Origin of Civilization" and "Prehistoric Times," quotes the testimonies of many travelers and explorers to show that there are numerous tribes without religion, and remarks himself that "sailors, traders, and philosophers, Roman Catholic priests, and Protestant missionaries, in ancient and in modern times, in every part of the globe, have concurred in stating that there are races of men altogether devoid of religion. . . . The question as to the general existence of religion among men is indeed to a great extent a matter of definition. If the mere sensation of fear and the recognition that there are probably other beings more powerful than man are sufficient alone to constitute a religion, then we must, I think, admit that religion is general to the human race. But when a child dreads the darkness and shrinks from a lightless room, we never regard that as evidence of religion. Moreover, if these definitions be adopted, we cannot longer regard religion as peculiar to man. We must admit that the feeling of a dog or a horse towards its master, is of the same character, and the baying of a dog to the moon is as much an act of worship as some ceremonies which have been so described by travelers" (Origin of Civilization, p. 121).

The statement of Lubbock, that there are tribes devoid of religion unless indeed we no longer regard religion as peculiar to man," is significant. It indicates that there is no sharp dividing line between religious and unreligious creatures, and of itself is sufficient to suggest that as the higher religions have been evolved from the lower ones, so the lowest religions have grown out of conditions with which we are accustomed to associate nothing of a religious character. Certain it is, there are tribes in which the intellectual faculties are so feeble that the phenomena of nature have as yet scarcely become an object of thought. According to the theory of evolution, all the higher races of men have come up through stages in which the lowest on earth yet remain. Who can doubt that the men who lived in the earlier ages of human existence were as destitute of religion as are the Bechuanas or Arafuras of to-day? Of the intellectual condition of man in a very remote past, we know something from the rough implements of stone which have outlasted the bones of the rude men who made them.

"Religiously," says Winchell, "there is little to be affirmed or inferred of the paleolithic tribes. Some curiously wrought flints may have served as religious emblems, and the discovery of deposits of food near the body of the dead may very naturally be regarded as evidence of a belief in future life" (Adamites and Preadamites, p. 36).

But there was a yet more remote and a more rude stone age. And there must have been yet earlier ages in which man lived, and was able to leave no memorial of his existence, and during which, in a religious point of view, he was still more like the brute mentally than at the time he is first brought to our notice by prehistoric archæology. Occupied for ages in contests with wild beasts and obtaining food, his life was of a kind not adapted to favor the contemplation of natural phenomena, and when, after ages of mental development under exceptionally favorable circumstances, he began to form ideas and to frame hypotheses, they must have been very simple, crude, and indistinct.

How natural that he should invest inanimate objects with his own thoughts and feelings! Here is indicated an intellectual condition hardly above that of the brutes. "My dog," says Darwin, "a full-grown and very sensible animal, was lying on the lawn during a hot and still day; but at a little distance a slight breeze occasionally moved an open parasol, which would have been wholly disregarded by the dog had any one stood near it. As it was, every time that the parasol slightly moved, the dog growled fiercely and barked. He must, I think, have reasoned to himself, in a rapid and unconscious manner, that movement without any apparent cause indicated the presence of some strange living agent, and no stranger had a right to be on his territory" (Dest. of Man, i. 65.)

"An authentic case is on record of a Skye-terrier," says Fiske, "which, accustomed to obtain favors from his master by sitting on his haunches, will also sit before his pet India-rubber ball placed on the chimney-piece, evidently beseeching it to jump down and play with him. Such a fact as this is quite in harmony with Auguste Comte's suggestion that such intelligent animals as dogs, apes, and elephants may be capable of forming a few fetichistic notions. The behavior of the terrier here rests upon the assumption that the ball is open to the same sort of entreaty which prevails with the master; which implies, not that the wistful brute accredits the ball with a soul, but that in his mind the distinction between life and inanimate existence has never been thoroughly established. Just this confusion between things living and things not living is present throughout the whole philosophy of fetichism, and the con-

fusion between things seen and things dreamed, which suggests the notion of another self, belongs to this same twilight stage of intelligence, in which primeval man has not yet clearly demonstrated his immeasurable superiority to the brutes" (Myth and Myth-Makers, pp. 221-2).

With these facts in mind, it is evident, as McLennan remarks, that "the simplest hypothesis, and the first to occur to men, seems to have been that natural phenomena are ascribable to the presence in animals, plants, and things, and in the forces of nature, of such spirits prompting to action as men are conscious they themselves possess" (Fortnightly Review, 1869, p. 422).

"Man," says Goethe, "is a true Narcissus; he delights to see his own image everywhere; and he spreads himself underneath the universe like the amalgam behind the glass." Thus man, projecting his own nature unconsciously out upon the field of natural phenomena, investing the objects around him with his own thoughts and feelings, commences worship by contemplating himself. To early man pieces of wood and stone were intelligent objects, and he sought to win their favor and secure their aid. Later he invested with his own nature the mountains, rivers, and clouds, the sun, moon and stars; and when the power of abstraction increased with the development of reason and imagination, he formed conceptions of beings more or less like himself, but invisible to the eye and incognizable to all the senses.

"We still say," says Mill, "the sun rises and sets and comes to the meridian, the sea ebbs and flows. Languages were formed by men who believed these objects to have life and active power in themselves" (Logic, vol. i., p. 364).

"Man paints himself in his gods," says Schiller; and the character of his gods is determined by his own, for the reason that he worships, unconsciously to himself, his own qualities abstracted from himself and viewed objectively, whether in the piece of wood, the passing cloud, the flowing stream, the quiet stars, the changing moon, or the glorious sun; whether in a personal being sitting on a throne with a crown on his head and a sceptre in his hand, or in a power that

"Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glowes in the stars, and blossoms in the trees."

With malice and revenge in his own heart, he cannot help believing he is surrounded by beings who delight in making him suffer and to whom he therefore prays in fear and trembling. Nature, in her pleasant moods, excites opposite feelings. The genial sunshine, abundant game,

health, success in combat, whatever gratifies him, he ascribes to beings who possess the good qualities of which he is conscious in himself; and to them he prays in reverent recognition of their superior power, in grateful acknowledgement of his own dependence, and with an eager desire to secure a continuance of these blessings. Religion, then, considered as a belief or hypothesis and as a practice of devotional rites and ceremonies, is seen to have a natural basis and to be due to natural causes. It depends upon two factors: qualities of the human mind—fear, selfishness, gratitude, wonder, admiration, etc.—and the external world whose phenomena are ever present to the mind of man.

But here it will be asked, How came man to have a religious nature, a tendency to worship which in the individual is antecedent to experience, which now depends not upon any observation of nature, which depends not upon experiences such as those through which our savage ancestors passed? The answer, in the light of modern psychology, is not difficult to give, at least in a general way. In the course of ages, states of mind produced by the outward world have become organized in the race in the form of tendencies. A father who has acquired the habit of drunkenness may transmit to his offspring the result of his experience in the form of an appetite for stimulants. There are islands having species of animals and birds possessing an instinctive fear of man, but which exhibited no fear of him when man first visited those islands. Man by his destructive agency has produced in these animals sensations which by repetition, and by the transmission of the results on the brain and nervous system through successive generations, have become condensed and fixed in the species as an instinct which, whenever man—who first produced the impression—appears, manifests itself in a very positive manner. So the shepherd dog and sporting dogs have characteristics which, although originally acquired, are now innate or instinctive. Thus that which is learned, whether from a personal teacher or by contact with nature, and is repeated through centuries, may produce states of mind which by heredity appear in the descendants in the form of aptitudes or predispositions.

"Instinct is inherited habit," or, more properly, instincts are states of mind produced by habits, and by repetition and transmission organized in the race. Although innate in the individual, they are due to ancestral experiences. We are full of these tendencies, some good, others bad. We have to some extent aptitudes for music, mechanics, poetry, oratory, philosophy, language. We have tendencies to temper-

ance or intemperance, to chastity or licentiousness, to truthfulness or falsehood, to courage or cowardice.

These tendencies of mind, as well as bodily characteristics, come to us as a legacy from former generations, and, although independent of our individual experience, have been acquired by our ancestors. We are not born with innate ideas, but it is unquestionable that we come into the world with organisms whose actions and reactions are largely determined by the form and quality of structure, and they include all those results of generations which appear in us as aptitudes and intuitions.

I believe, then, that our religious nature, as far as we possess such a nature, is due ultimately to the experiences of our ancestors. The contemplation of nature, and the disposition to worship induced by ages of experience, during which fear, admiration, wonder, gratitude, and reverence have been constantly excited, have resulted in a predisposition to worship, which, although due to experience in the race, is now *a priori* in the individual wherever it is found. Thus much as to the natural genesis of religion considered as a part of man's nature.

Outside of the human mind it presupposes, not a personal being who implanted it in man, and the worship of whom is man's highest and noblest duty, but that world of phenomena, with all its wealth and variety, with all its beauty and deformity, which confronted our earliest ancestors as it confronts us to-day. The instinctive fear of man exhibited by wild animals implies the existence of man and those destructive acts which excited their dread and terror. And if the religious tendencies of man have been acquired in the manner indicated, they presuppose, in addition to the susceptible mind, not a supernatural being who endowed man with a religious nature when he appeared on the earth, but the material world that impressed him and produced those mental states which have been repeated and the results transmitted in the form of a predisposition to worship. There is nothing in the religious instinct that determines the particular form or character of the object of worship. That depends upon the intellectual and moral condition of the worshiper, due chiefly to the instruction he has personally received from parents and teachers.

But in every stage of religious thought, as we have seen, from the lowest fetichism to the loftiest monotheism, the real object of man's fear, reverence or devotion is a conception of the qualities of the human mind with which he invests the external world. Man cannot rise above or get beyond his own nature. Of beings having characteristics essentially

diff
on s
exter
to th
of al
thou
by o
selve
the s
Ke
enabl
ascrib
it is a
much
own r
moral
In
ing ag
object
god co
the m
taken
same i
the m
childh
there i
separa
there v
The
betwe
billey o
of God
mits th
tian an
Testam
for thei
self to
to comp
themsel

different from his own, he cannot possibly conceive. He may imagine, on some distant star, beings higher than himself or different in their external appearance, yet the positive and final predicates which he gives to these beings are necessarily drawn from his own nature. An analysis of all such conceptions will show that, although we can extend our thoughts quantitatively, yet the quality of our thoughts is determined by our nature and surroundings. We can have ideals superior to ourselves as individuals, but no ideals the elements of which do not exist in the species to which we belong.

Keeping in view this obvious principle, a rigid analysis of religion will enable us to see that, as a system of thought in which phenomena are ascribed to a being or to beings believed to be proper objects of worship, it is an indirect form of self-knowledge. As Feuerbach has shown with much fulness and variety of illustration, man unconsciously studies his own nature in the contemplation of gods long before his intellectual and moral nature becomes a direct object of study.

In every age man discovers and recognizes that what was in a preceding age regarded as the true god was the subjective nature of man viewed objectively. When a nation or a race has outgrown a religion, the old god comes to be regarded as only a conceptual being corresponding with the mental condition of the times in which it prevailed. The portrait taken in childhood cannot be looked upon as a correct likeness of the same individual grown to manhood. No more can man be pleased with the mental image of himself that was formed during his intellectual childhood. As between the likeness of the youth and that of the man there is more or less resemblance, so between the gods of two periods, separated by ages and widely different in their intellectual conditions, there will be much in common.

The profoundly religious man of to-day never recognizes the identity between himself and the object of his worship; but he sees the applicability of this principle in times and among peoples having conceptions of God that are gross and low. The enlightened Christian readily admits this to be true of the ignorant savage. The well-informed Christian and the enlightened Hebrew of to-day admit that many of the Old Testament representations of deity are very imperfect, and they apologize for their grossness by saying that God in those days accommodated himself to the rude, ignorant condition of the people, since they were unable to comprehend any conceptions of God unless they were of a being like themselves. But it is just as certain that the conception of God by the

theologian of to-day is purely a conception of the nature of man; and whenever the Theist has recourse to volition to supply the nexus between cause and effect, he unconsciously invests nature with his own human personality.

Since worship had its origin in man's contemplation of his own nature, in observing himself reflected from the mirror of his own thoughts, in fearing and reverencing his own qualities seen illasively in the objective world, the conclusion seems unavoidable that the continuance of worship must depend upon the continued recognition of a personality like himself behind or immanent in the world of phenomena. To say that God exists, that it is our duty to worship him, that worship consists in contemplating his majesty, his goodness, his love, in adoring and praising him for what he is as well as for what he does, and then to say that all our conceptions of him are but illusions, that all our thoughts of him, on which our admiration and love are founded, are no representation of him at all, that he is an unknown and unknowable something entirely beyond our comprehension—these two statements taken together are, it seems to me, quite inconsistent and absurd. On hearing them for the first time, a mind unperverted by theological teachings would, I think, wonder whether God, if anything, were not really a demon amusing himself by making man a victim of illusion, deception, and fraud.

A god has no significance or value for an ardent worshiper unless he can contemplate him as a being like himself, who approves and disapproves human actions, who sees man's movements, who hears his words, who sympathizes with him in misfortune and distress, to whom he can appeal when in need of aid, and from whom blessings come in response to prayer. What cares the devotee for the "absolute," the "unconditioned," the "unknowable"—a god without any of those human qualities with the contemplation of which, in fear, in reverence, in love, worship commenced and has been sustained through all the ages of man's existence as a religious being?

Just in proportion as men cease to regard God as a being possessing qualities like themselves, will they cease to worship and to find that consolation in communion with God which is the joy and the boast of the devotee. How can he find satisfaction in communing with something of which he can have no conception, and between which and himself there may be nothing in common?

"I am," says Henry James, "constrained by every inspiration of true manhood to demand for my worship a perfectly human deity, who is so

intent upon rescuing every creature he has made from the everlasting death and damnation he bears about in himself, as finitely constituted, as not to shrink, if need be, from humbling himself to every patient form of ignominy, and feeding contentedly year in and year out, century after century, and millennium after millennium, upon the literal breath of man " (Substance and Shadow, p. 495).

That is the kind of god that the worshiper demands, and which alone can satisfy the strong religious nature. But that is the kind of god of which there is no proof, of which there is proof to the contrary, and belief in which is fast fading out of intellectual minds. And the man who has outgrown belief in a personal, intelligent, anthropomorphic being—a being possessing a nature like his own—has outgrown the desire and need of worship, except so far as the lingering tendencies produced by ages of religious devotion in his ancestors assert themselves when the beliefs that caused them have been laid aside.

Since worship began with the conception of personality and intelligence outside of man that could be placated and pleased, when the belief in such personality and intelligence disappears, worship must also cease. No doubt, as Mr. John Fiske maintains, the purification and refinement of Theism consists in a continuous process of "deanthropomorphization," discarding the human qualities with which man has invested deity. But as Theism commenced by ascribing natural phenomena to personality and intelligence, and has always recognized them as the essential attributes of deity, when they are discarded, when it is affirmed that we cannot philosophically believe in a personal intelligent being as the cause of phenomena, the essential element of Theism is abandoned, and worship is no longer possible. When Mr. Fiske purifies and refines Theism by the total abolition of every anthropomorphic element, he simply deprives "god" of every quality that has had or can have any interest for the worshiper. In affirming the existence of absolute reality, self-existent and eternal, and "of which all phenomena, as presented in consciousness, are manifestations," the "Cosmic Theist," as Mr. Fiske calls himself, postulates that only which is common to Theism and Atheism, and which is more appropriately represented by the algebraic x than by the word "god."

Since the "god" of the worshiper must have physical qualities and psychical qualities such as man is conscious of possessing, Mr. Fiske's Cosmic Theism can afford no consolation to the religious worshiper.

Imagine the devotee attempting to reconcile the duty and the delight of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving with sentences like these :

"For to represent the deity as a person who thinks, contrives, and legislates, is simply to represent him as a product of Evolution. The definition of intelligence being 'the continuous adjustment of specialized inner relations to specialized outer relations,' it follows that to represent the deity as intelligent is to surround deity with an environment, and thus to destroy its infinity and its self-existence" (Cosmic Phil., ii. 394).

"In ascribing intelligence to unembodied spirit we are either using meaningless jargon or we are implicitly surrounding unembodied spirit with an environment of some kind, and are thus declaring it to be both limited and dependent" (Ibid, p. 396).

"It is not that the environment has been adapted to the organism by an exercise of creative intelligence and beneficence, but it is that the organism is necessarily fitted to the environment because the fittest survive" (p. 398).

"It is not the intelligence which has made the environment, but it is the environment which has molded the intelligence" (p. 402).

"If there exist a personal creator of the universe who is infinitely intelligent and powerful, he cannot be infinitely good ; and if, on the other hand, he be infinite in goodness, then he must be lamentably finite in power or in intelligence" (p. 405).

"With Mr. Mill, therefore, 'I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures.' And, going a step further, I will add that it is impossible to call that being good who, existing prior to the phenomenal universe, and creating it out of the plenitude of infinite power and foreknowledge, endowed it with such properties that its material and moral development must inevitably be attended by the misery of untold millions of sentient creatures for whose existence their creator is ultimately responsible. In short, there can be no hypothesis of a moral government of the world which does not implicitly assert an immoral government. As soon as we seek to go beyond the process of Evolution disclosed by science, and posit an external agency which is in the slightest degree anthropomorphic, we are obliged either to supplement and limit this agency by a second one that is diabolic, or else to include elements of diabolism in the character of the first agency itself" (p. 408).

"*Personality* and *Infinity* are terms expressive of ideas which are mutually incompatible. The pseud-idea 'Infinite-Person' is neither

more
Spi
deny
insist
quite
Deity
Ho
tures
sonal
religi
that
cold
fore
with
ate, v
warm
trine
extre
pract
In
early
"as v
and
altoge
est se
which
analy
(p. 46
Th
religi
the es
is the
platio
but th
does n
of its
based
mere
will e

more nor less unthinkable than the pseud-idea 'circular-triangle.' As Spinoza somewhere says, '*Determinatio negatio est*'—to define God is to deny him; and such being the case, what can be more irrational than to insist upon thought and volition, phenomena only known to exist within quite narrow limitations, as the very nature and essence of the Infinite Deity" (p. 408-9).

How evident that Mr. Fiske's "Divine Power," as he occasionally ventures to characterize the "unknowable," without goodness, without personality, without intelligence, can never be an object of interest to the religious worshiper! Anticipating the obvious criticisms, Mr. Fiske says that "it will doubtless be urged that such religion is too abstract, too coldly scientific, to have any general influence upon action, and can therefore be of no practical value. . . . And it will, moreover, be asserted, with vehemence, that in place of a father whom men can love and venerate, we are giving them a mere philosophical formula, calling for no warmer feeling than calm, intellectual assent. Granting that our doctrine is philosophically the reverse of Atheism, it will be urged that here extremes meet, and that an infinite and therefore unknowable God is practically equivalent to no God at all" (p. 468-9).

In reply to this criticism, Mr. Fiske reminds his readers that "the early Christians were called Atheists by their pagan adversaries;" that "as we proceed to take away, one by one, the attributes which limit deity and enable it to be classified, we seem, no doubt, to be destroying it altogether;" yet "the symbolization of deity indicated by the profoundest scientific analysis of to-day is as practically real as the symbolization which has resulted from the attempts of antiquity to perform such an analysis, and is in every way more satisfactory alike to head and heart" (p. 469).

This reply cannot be satisfactory to either the careful thinker or the religious devotee. There was no logical or verbal propriety in calling the early Christians Atheists, because they recognized in God that which is the very essence of Theism, *personality and intelligence*, and the contemplation of which as the cause of phenomena was the beginning of Theism; but the terminal phase of stripping deity of anthropomorphic qualities does not simply purify and refine the conception of deity, but divests it of its essential nature, that with which it originated, upon which it is based, and without which prayer, praise, and adoration to God were a mere farce. And it may be added that no amount of scientific culture will ever prepare the people for, or induce them to accept, the "unknow-

able" or the "unconditioned" as an object of reverence and worship in the place of a personal intelligent deity. When a mind becomes sufficiently emancipated from theology, and sufficiently advanced to appreciate and accept the philosophy which Mr. Fiske has so admirably expounded, it will lose all disposition to worship an unseen being, unless, indeed, it be with him as Strauss says of Schleiermacher, with whom "prayer was the expression of a conscious illusion, partly the result of early habit, partly in view of the congregation which surrounded him; and he intentionally avoided lifting himself above it by his critical consciousness" (Old Faith and New, p. 129).

"But," says Mr. Fiske, "what men have worshiped from the earliest times has been, not the known, but the unknown. Even the primeval savage, who worshiped plants and animals, worshiped them only so far as their modes of action were mysterious to him, only in so far as they constituted a part of the weird, uninterpreted world by which he was surrounded. As soon as he had generalized the dynamic phenomena presented by the plant or the animal—that is, as soon as it became an object of knowledge—it ceased to be an object of worship. . . . Though theology has all along wrestled with the insoluble problems presented by this supreme mystery, and, by insisting on divers tangible propositions concerning it, has implicitly asserted that it can be at least partially known, the fact remains that only by being unknown has it continued to be the object of the religious sentiment" (Cosmic Phil., ii. 421).

But this paragraph fails to state the whole truth, or the most important one, in connection with the subject treated.

That which is an object of worship is that which the worshiper believes he understands, so far as it has interest for him. He worships a personal intelligence, the operations of which he firmly believes he observes, and which he constantly compares with the processes of which he is himself conscious. It is his own qualities, and not the "unknowable," that become the object of his devotion. Just so far as he ascribes his own good qualities to his god he loves him, and so far as his god is regarded as bad he fears him. It is true there is a mystery, but the devotee believes that his religion solves it. As Herbert Spencer says: "For, though every religion, setting out as it does with the tacit assertion of a mystery, forthwith proceeds to give some solution of this mystery, and so asserts that it is not a mystery passing human comprehension" (First Principles, p. 45).

That which is mysterious to the philosopher or the man of science

seems perfectly clear to the devotee. He is confident he understands, where the thinker is in doubt. If he worship a fetich, he does so confident that he knows its disposition. His gods are real, conceivable beings, more or less like himself ; and, although with the growth of intelligence mysteries arise in connection with the deities, they are the result of speculation, and are an unessential accompaniment, not the objective basis, of religion. It is as a philosopher, and not as a religious devotee, that man dwells upon and gives prominence to the mysteries of the universe.

When man comes to see that the ultimate source of phenomena is unknowable, that it is useless to attempt to form any conception of it, that he cannot properly predicate of it even goodness or intelligence, it must cease to be an object of religious sentiment.

As soon as an object became known to the worshiper, "it ceased to be an object of worship," for the very obvious reason that it ceased to be what it had appeared to be—what it was believed to be when it was worshiped. When it was worshiped, it was not the mysteriousness of its nature but the qualities with which it was invested, and its supposed power to benefit or injure man, that constituted the object of religious interest. Now, when it is seen that the qualities with which the unknowable has been invested cannot be properly ascribed to it, and that nothing is or can be known in regard to it, it must certainly cease to be an object of religious sentiment. True, when it reaches the ultimate mystery, "science must ever reverently pause, acknowledging the presence of the mystery of mysteries ;" but when science pauses and philosophy acknowledges the inability of the mind to penetrate further, the Cosmic Theist claims that the unknown and unknowable will be the object of his religion! But such a religion can have adherents only among those who have reasoned themselves out of the belief in an anthropomorphic deity, but in whose minds there yet linger religious influences which have been inherited and strengthened by education and surroundings. With the surrender of anthropomorphism, the disappearance of the religion of Cosmic Theism is only a matter of time. It will never touch the practical life of man, nor produce a ripple on the current of religious thought. Mr. Fiske I recognize as one of the most profound and clear-headed thinkers this country has produced, and his exposition of the philosophy of Herbert Spencer shows ability of a high order ; but by his own religious feelings, or from some other cause, he has been betrayed into inconsistencies on the subject, to which I have referred, that appear

in strange contrast to his generally lucid and logical treatment of philosophical questions.

Undoubtedly the sentiment of devotion which has been attached to the conception of a personal, intelligent deity will be greatly modified, as we know it is in individual instances, with a decline of belief in such a being; but its object must be in the future what it has been in the past—man—with this difference, that whereas in the past man has worshiped, unawares, his own nature in an imagined objective being, in proportion as this illusion is discovered he will make his intellectual and moral nature the direct object of his love and devotion, and the improvement of his race, not the glory of God, the object of his efforts. Theology will give way to anthropology, the worship of God to the contemplation of humanity and to the realization of noble ideals, by the recognition and cultivation in man of all that is lofty and grand in the theological conceptions of God.

"It may not be consonant to usage," says John Stuart Mill, "to call this religion; but the term, so applied, has a meaning, and one which is not adequately expressed by any other word. Candid persons of all creeds may be willing to admit that if a person has an ideal object, his attachment and sense of duty toward which are able to control and discipline all his other sentiments and propensities, and prescribe to him a rule of life, that person has a religion. . . Many, indeed, may be unable to believe that this object is capable of gathering around it feelings sufficiently strong; but this is exactly the point on which a doubt can hardly remain in an intelligent reader of Comte; and we join him in contemning, as equally irrational and mean, the conception of human nature as incapable of giving its love and devoting its existence to any object which cannot afford in exchange an eternity of personal enjoyment" (Auguste Comte and Positivism, p. 122).

"With the general tenor of this passage," says Fiske, after quoting the above passage from Mill, "I heartily agree. I have no sympathy with those critics who maintain that the idea of humanity is an unworthy idea, incapable of calling forth to a high degree our sentiments of devotion and reverence. . . . We may still further admit that all morality may be summed up in the disinterested service of the race, such being, as already shown. . . the fundamental principle of the ethical philosophy which is based on the doctrine of Evolution. And it is, moreover, easy to sympathize with the feelings which led Comte formally to consecrate the memories of the illustrious dead, whose labors have made us what

we a
nob
into
their
This
siasm
consi
is on
religi
Philo
It
maki
of re
retain
religi
elem
being
accor
opme
Un
of ma
"ent
ments
slow
and s
stitut
so abl
I co
time,
lavish
prover

THE fo
terror
lapp h
markat

we are—that 'communion of saints, unseen yet not unreal,' as Carlyle nobly expresses it, 'whose heroic sufferings rise up melodiously together into heaven, out of all times and out of all lands, as a sacred *miserere*; their heroic actions, also, as a boundless, everlasting psalm of triumph.' This intense feeling of the community of the human race, this 'enthusiasm of humanity,' as the author of 'Eece Homo' calls it, forms a very considerable part of Christianity when stripped of its mythology, and is one of the characteristics which chiefly serve to difference the world-religion of Jesus and Paul from the ethnic religions of antiquity" (Cosmic Philosophy, pp. 418, 419).

It is not necessary that we accept all the views of Comte in regard to making "the human race, conceived as a continuous whole," the object of religious devotion, such as he insists on, or approve his scheme of retaining the forms and symbols of exploded or decaying systems of religion; but the essential idea of his system—that in the future the elements of excellence in man will take the place of an anthropomorphic being as the highest object of man's reverence and love—is in perfect accord with our views as to the tendency and ultimate end of the development and modification of the religious sentiment.

Unreasoning worship of an invisible Being will give way to a recognition of man's powers and possibilities, intellectual and moral, and to an "enthusiasm of humanity" which will inspire him with noble sentiments and give a grandeur to human life. But such a change must be slow and gradual. It can take place no faster than philosophic criticism and scientific culture undermine faith in anthropomorphism, and substitute in its place those broader views of nature which Mr. Fiske has so ably set forth.

I conclude that the coming man will not worship God, but that the time, money, devotion, and enthusiasm which in the past have been lavished on an imaginary being will in the future be given to the improvement and elevation of the human race.

CHEMICAL PROOF OF "GOD."

THE formation of organic bodies has scared those obsessed by the gratuitous terror of a breach in the wall between living and non-living matter, and Professor Japp has come to their aid. The new prophet, however, has nothing more remarkable in his doctrine than its proclamation with the pomp and dignity lent

by a seat in the chair on the section devoted to chemistry. Long ago Pasteur, who was the founder of that branch of modern chemistry with which Prof. Japp dealt, made his remarkable discovery of the relation between the optical activity of certain chemical bodies and the existence of a peculiar asymmetry in their structure. This asymmetry has been compared with the relation between a right hand and a left hand, but a more ingenious and intelligible comparison is that with a semi-detached villa. The whole edifice is a symmetrical body; the right-hand house and the left-hand house are each lop-sided, and their want of symmetry is complementary, so that the reflection in a mirror of, say, the left-hand villa would seem, not another left-hand villa, but the twin right-hand portion of the building. When light passes through solutions of bodies the molecules of which correspond to the twin pairs, it is unaffected; when it passes through solutions containing an excess of right-hand or left-hand structures, it is twisted to the right or to the left. When organisms act upon a neutral solution, they gradually transform it into an active solution by selective absorption of one set of the component parts.

Pasteur proclaimed what has since been shown to be probably universal truth, that organisms alone produce isolated bodies of right or of left-hand symmetry. Moreover, it appears to be the case that, when organic bodies are formed artificially, either the twin halves are present in a conjoined state or in such equal proportions that they neutralize one another, with the result that the artifacts are neutral to light, while the natural products twist it.

It is upon the reiteration of such facts, stated certainly with a distinguished luminosity, that Prof. Japp finds his claim to the grave attention of biologists and the profound gratitude of philosophers. He drives it home by two extraordinary statements. It happens to be the case that chemists, by picking out crystals under the microscope, are able to separate in artificially prepared solutions the two kinds of symmetrical bodies, and so to prepare optically active bodies like those actually formed in organisms. To this Prof. Japp, borrowing, as he tells us, from Owen Brown, retorts that here, after all, there is the operation of living organisms acting through the microscope! Precisely so; unless man, an organism, existed, there would be no possibility of the human production of organic bodies. The second remarkable statement is remarkable only as coming from a scientific man, who, presumably, has a training in the logical pursuit of an argument. It is the statement that it is inconceivable that at the first beginning of life these optically active bodies could have come into existence without the direct intervention of some selective agency, comparable with the action of a chemist selecting and rejecting with the aid of a microscope. For this statement is precisely the thesis which Prof. Japp professes to be proving.—*London Saturday Review.*

HOW THEY MADE A GOD IN JAPAN.

A DELIGHTFUL volume by Mr. Lafcadio Hearn, "Gleanings in Buddha Fields," gives us not only some of the metaphysical suggestions of which the esoteric world of Buddhistic thought is so full, but many quaint and beautiful pictures of Japanese life, with its mixture of perennial youth and hoary antiquity, its exuberant joyousness and subtle pathos, its robust vitality and delicate sense of beauty. One of the most charming tales is that of Hamaguchi, a true "living god," with its weird description of one of those tremendous volcanic waves which now and again, as in June, 1896, carry destruction for scores and hundreds of miles along the coast of Japan. The story runs thus.

THE STORY OF HAMAGUCHI.

BY LAFCADIO HEARN.

One autumn evening, more than a hundred years ago, Hamaguchi, who was the head man of his district, was watching from the balcony of his house the preparations for a merry-making in the village below, in which he was, alas! too old and infirm to join. An earthquake came—not strong enough to frighten anybody in that land of earthquakes, but with "a long, slow, spongy motion. . . . and Hamaguchi became aware of something unusual in the offing. He rose to his feet and looked at the sea. It had darkened quite suddenly, and it was acting strangely. It seemed to be moving against the wind. The sea was running away from the land." And below the people guessed not what that monstrous bob signified, but were running to the beach, and even beyond the beach, to watch it. But Hamaguchi knew its meaning. He calls to his grandson for a torch, and, hurrying into the field where his summer crop lies piled up in rice-stacks ready for the market, he kindles the sun-dried stalks till his whole harvest is ablaze, and the big bell is set booming in the neighbouring temple, and the people hasten back in response to this double appeal. They think he is mad.

"Kita!" shouted the old man at the top of his voice, pointing to the open. "Say now if I be mad!"

Through the twilight eastward all looked, and saw at the edge of the dusky horizon a long, lean, dim line like the shadowing of a coast where no coast ever was,—a line that thickened as they gazed, that broadened as a coast-line broadens to the eyes of one approaching it, yet incom-

parably more quickly. For that long darkness was the returning sea, towering like a cliff, and coursing more swiftly than the kite flies.

"Tsunami!" shrieked the people; and then all shrieks and all sounds and all power to hear sounds were annihilated by a nameless shock heavier than any thunder, as the colossal swell smote the shore with a weight that sent a shudder through the hills, and with a foam-burst like a blaze of sheet-lightning. Then for an instant nothing was visible but a storm of spray rushing up the slope like a cloud, and the people scattered back from the mere menace of it. When they looked again they saw a white horror of sea raving over the place of their homes. It drew back, roaring and tearing out the bowels of the land as it went. Twice, thrice, five times the sea struck and ebbcd, but each time with lesser surges; then it returned to its ancient bed and stayed, still raging, as after a typhoon.

On the plateau for a time not a word was spoken. All stared speechlessly at the desolation beneath,—the ghastliness of hurled rock and raked riven cliff, the bewilderment of scooped-up deep-sea wrack and shingle shot over the empty site of dwelling and temple. The village was not; most of the fields were not; even the terraces had ceased to exist; and of all the homes that had been about the bay there remained nothing recognizable except two straw roofs tossing madly in the offing. The after-terror of the death escaped and the stupefaction of the general loss kept all lips dumb, until the voice of Hamaguchi was heard again, observing gently: "*That was why I set fire to the rice!*"

He, their Choja, now stood among them almost as poor as the poorest. His wealth was gone—but he had saved four hundred lives by his sacrifice.

The period of distress was long, because in those days there were no means of quick communication between district and district, and the help needed had to be sent from far away. But when better times came the people did not forget their debt to Hamaguchi Gohei. They could not make him rich; nor would he have suffered them to do so, even had it been possible. Moreover, gifts could never have sufficed as an expression of their reverential feeling towards him; for they believed that the ghost within him was divine. So they declared him to be a god, and thereafter called him "Hamaguchi Daimyoin," thinking they could give him no greater honor; and truly no greater honor in any country could be given to mortal man. And when they rebuilt the village, they built a temple to the spirit of him, and fixed above the front of it a tablet bearing his name in Chinese text of gold, and they worshiped him there with prayer

and with offerings. How he felt about it I cannot say; I know only that he continued to live in his old thatched home upon the hill, with his children and his children's children, just as humanly and simply as before, while his soul was being worshiped in the shrine below. A hundred years and more he has been dead; but his temple, they tell me, still stands, and the people still pray to the ghost of the good old farmer to help them in time of fear or trouble.

THE HEAVEN IDEA.

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

THE heaven idea is the logical outcome of the speculative doctrine that men, if not all animals, have immortal souls—an idea now commonly believed to be born of dreams; the untutored savage observing that when his body lay dead, as it were, in sleep, his spirit, ego, mind, or intelligence was active, and often wandered amid strange scenes and places. Given, then, "souls" good and bad, these must have habitats, and naturally the latter went down into darkness, to "Hades," the grave, pit, or Sheol, and the former passed upwards to dwell for ever with the Devas, or "Spirits of Life," in a *Swarga*, or heaven—speculations which ignore the hard facts of a rapidly-revolving and advancing little globe.

Heaven is a comparatively modern term and idea in the long-past life of man, and of very varied and weakly growth. Ancient peoples hardly recognized it, and in the Hebrew Scriptures no after-life is formulated or apparently longed for. The Jewish deity dwelt amidst and over the waters, upheld by "a leaky firmament," into which Hebrews thought Babylonians could erect a great tower. Out of the windows of this firmament came rain and great floods, and through these windows God talked with the patriarchs, prophets, and even early Christians, who occasionally saw through the firmament, as when Stephen noticed "Jesus standing at God's right hand."

As a natural corollary to the fanciful souls and ghosts of dreamland, came the idea of an immortal life therein, for who could extinguish a soul invisible and independent of matter? As it must have been created, a creator was also pre-supposed—a Lord of all souls or spirits, who must necessarily keep in hand an innumerable supply to meet the constant

demands of the procreative energies of the whole world. He was called the "Lord of Heaven" or of "the good Spirit Land," and the enemy of "the Prince of the Power of the Air," who ruled similarly over hosts of spirits in Hades or Sheol—another logical but fanciful creation. And so this idealic ball grew as it rolled through the ages, despite the cautions of many wise thinkers, who called upon the ignorant, their leaders and dupes, to remember that their great superstructures were based on dreams and insufficient reasonings. So seems to have thought our immortal bard when he wrote: "We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep."

Nevertheless, these ideas and doctrines of Heavens and Hells assumed a stable and grossly materialistic aspect, and were more or less accepted by Egyptians some 5,500 years ago; by Babylonians over 4,000; by Zoroastrians and Vedists, 3,000; and by Greeks and most of Western Asia as early as the time of Pythagoras, Sophocles, and their schools, and Hebrew Psalmists (see the writer's chronological summary of religious ideas in the last chapter of "Short Studies"). Vainly have Spiritualists, Mazdean, Hindu, or Christian, condemned Materialism; man can grasp no phenomenon, whether of God or ghost, heaven or hell, save through material conceptions born of consciousness or knowledge, which he can only obtain through his five senses. The more devout the priest or pietist, the more materialistic do we find all his ideas.

Etymologists have not yet settled the derivation of "heaven," but it is evidently based on the Anglo-Saxon *hebben* or *hevan*, "that which is heaved, lifted, or heaped up," for many rude races believed the sky was forced up from the earth, when only darkness ceased, and the Devas or "Light Gods" arose to rule over a *Nabpas* or *Scarga*. "To heave or lift up" is in Danish *hæve*; Dutch, *heffen*; German, *heben*; hence, *hear-er*, "heave-offering and heavy;" cf. Ger., *Himmel*; Goth., *himins*; Livon., *debbes*; Bangal and Hindu dialects, *dibi*; Rus., *Nebo*; Pol., *Niebo*; Boh., *Nebe*.

The Asiatic transmigration and expiatory ideas of an after-life were not recognized by Egyptians, Hebrews, and most early peoples. In the Hebrew *Sheol* there dwelt, according to Jewish ideas of 700-400 B.C., a medley of holy and unholy ones—those who "walked with God," yea, the Elohim himself—as Adam, Seth, Shem, Elias, Samuel, etc.; see the *seance* with the Witch of Endor, and note how freely Satan and others walked and talked with God in heaven, or *Shamim*.

We see the early belief of Christians in a heaven and hell in the writ-

ings attributed to Peter and Nikodemus, the latter devoting ten chapters to Christ's visit to hell—a sort of Egyptian Amenti. Peter calls it "a Prison," where "Christ visited the Spirits." The Churches claim to have obtained details as to abodes of the dead from those who arose from their graves at the crucifixion; Nikodemus saying that two of the dead, Cherenus and Lentheus, were induced to write down all they had seen. Alas that this was lost! but would we have believed it?

The Egyptian heaven was a pleasant, glorified earthly existence, where the righteous were served by gods or angels. There they ate the choicest viands at the tables of Osiris and great deities. The climate and surroundings were more exquisite than the eye and heart of man could conceive, and there was "only such amount of healthy labor as was necessary to sweeten ease and soft repose." Men ploughed, sowed, and reaped in the fields of Aaru and Hotep, which yielded such crops as have never been seen on earth.

A characteristic indefiniteness pertains to the Apostolic heaven. We are only assured that it is too exquisitely beautiful and delightful to describe or imagine. It is such that neither the eye nor ear, heart nor mind of man can conceive (1 Cor. 2:9), though many are said to have seen it. Satan used to walk in it, and others saw it openly (Luke 3:21; Mark 1:10), with angels and other spirits ascending to and descending from it, though this little globe was swiftly revolving, making such words utterly erroneous and destructive of all inspiration ideas. Hebrew seers saw Jehovah in heaven sitting on a throne and the hosts of heaven standing by him, and Jesus said that the angels or spirits of little ones do always behold the face of God (1 Kings 22:19; 2 Chron. 18:13; Matt. 18:10). In Stephen's "straight" view into heaven, he "saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing by his right hand" (Acts 7:55).

Nevertheless, Hebrews seem to have believed, like Jesus, that "no man has ascended up into heaven," not even the pious King David (Jo. 3:13; Acts 2:34), a confusing statement in the face of the ascent of Elijah, Enoch, and the Abrahamic and Lazarus episodes. Some texts point to the heavens and throne of god as "enduring for ever;" but Job said man cannot rise again till the heavens be no more (14:12), and Peter (2:3) asserts that the earth and heavens are to pass away and be dissolved with fire, and all things that are therein, which necessarily includes the bodies of Job, his friends, and all past and present saints and sinners.

The authors of Revelation, Ezekiel, and some few other visionaries do not lack indefiniteness; their idea is that of an ordinary Imperial Eastern

Court, for ever sitting in Durbar or full-dress Assembly, or of a gorgeous cathedral in full worship; and there are in this heaven temples or chapels, tabernacles and fire-rites (Rev. 11:9; 14:19; 15:5; 16:17; 20:9). Ezekiel says there is a great central throne of sapphire surrounded by an emerald rainbow, and on it "one like a jasper and sardine stone," and "in its midst and round about four beasts full of eyes, who rest not day nor night crying, Holy," etc.—a very noisy worship, increased "by thunderings, lightnings, and voices which proceed out of the throne."

In front of the throne are a sea of glass and seven lighted lamps, and round about twenty-four seats for twenty-four elders clothed in white, holding harps and golden vials and wearing crowns. As the ritual proceeds, they cast their crowns before the throne and fall down in worship, calling him who sitteth upon the throne by an ancient solar epithet, which, with other details, and the numbers 7, 4, 24, etc., mark the whole as of Mithraic origin, such as is portrayed in the prologue to our chapter on "Sun-Worship" ("Rivers of Life," i.).....

This, the highest conception of a heaven in the seventh century B.C., continued down to Christ's time, when it expanded into the visionary shade of the "bosom of Abraham"—a subject on which Rabbim have written much. Later, it became a cloudland, which priests and poets like Dante, Milton, and others, have described as a sweet, do-nothing, dreamy abode of hymning and chanting, where no increased powers, knowledge, or virtues can be of any further use. Hell, also, which had become very dreadful, and, like heaven, an eternal dwelling, was renovated. Its strictly Biblical character was ignored or set aside, and in these days it is called by many—even Churchmen—"unreasonable, detestable, and degrading" to their modernized ideas of a Father God, good, just, and merciful. They refuse to believe the scriptural picture of happy souls in heaven, rejoicing over the "torments of the lost," though founded on the supposed words of Christ. Heaven they also sublimate into a fanciful "temper," a "principle," or "mental phase," and we thus lose the beautiful "jewelled city," with its liturgical rites, chantings, praises, and symphonies.....

The heaven-lore of Greeks was mostly borrowed from Western Asia. It was believed that Achilles, Herakles, and other heroes descended to hades "to visit the mighty dead," their idea of "saints;" but it was confessedly better to be a hireling or doorkeeper on earth than a prince in Hades. Yet Adam seems to have there fared well: though in company with Satan and Belzabub, he had also Samuel and prophets, all appar-

rently in an unchanged earthly form—and Christians did not at first break with these ideas and legends. Only Christ, his apostles, and a very few, "the salt of the earth," were to go to heaven. Some earthly ones were to dwell in "a heavenly Jerusalem a city let down from heaven," where their Lord was to reign for ever—or a thousand years. A fine poetic inaccuracy pervades these matters, and wisely did the early churches not insist on the now current doctrines of a future and immortal life. The learned theologian, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, thought this was only certain in the case of a good believer in Christ.

Many centuries B.C. the pious and shrewd metaphysicians of the East had well thought out and mostly rejected the legendary joys and surroundings of all popular heavens. Their arguments and comments on an eternal rest after the toils of earth, followed by sundry transmigrations or other states of existence necessary towards attaining purity, are fairly summed up in the story of the good and pious sage Mudgala of the Mahabharata. Owing to his holy life, wise words, and good works, and after the severest trials of temper and patient endurance, which the gods decreed to test his faith in goodness, the Darvasas declared that he must ascend bodily to heaven in their celestial car; but Mudgala hesitated. He required first that the "holy ones" should make clear to him the advantages of a heaven over an earth where he was so busy in many good and useful works. A long debate ensued, well summed up in Muir's "Orig. Skt. Texts," v., 342-6. Heaven was described as the blest abode where there is no hunger, thirst, weariness, neither cold nor heat, desire nor labor, suffering, happiness, nor pleasure. . . . all is perfection. To this the sage gravely replied: "Then I desire no such heaven. It cuts off from their very root the highest and holiest springs of true happiness, the blessedness of working and doing good, and all those high gratifications of the heart and intellect which in a thousand ways arise therefrom. Go, blessed ones, and leave me in the daily practice of virtue. I desire to remain as much as possible indifferent to praise and blame till my nirvana, or that time when I shall be absorbed into the essence of Brahm," or perfected nature.

The epic writer follows up in the same trenchant manner his criticisms on all popular ideas of heaven; as in the arrival of Yudhisthira at the celestial gates, when his faithful friends and his dog are forbidden to approach, and are thus consigned to hell. One by one his wife and brothers had sunk down in their weary mundane pilgrimage, and now they found heaven indifferent to their cries and labor. "The Eternal

One," standing unmoved at the gate, only said to the sad survivor: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into eternal and perfect rest and bliss." But the good and true man, looking back upon his fallen friends, exclaimed in anguish: "Nay, not so, thou thousand-eyed one, God of Gods! Let my brothers come with me here; without them I seek not e'en to enter heaven." After much insistance and some very equivocal arguments on the part of the gods, Yudhishthira was assured that they were already in heaven; when, gazing on his faithful dog, he urged that this dumb companion of all his joys and weary wanderings must also accompany him whithersoever he went. Then the stern reply was: "Not so; this is no place for dogs"—when the good sage (more merciful than the gods) turned aside, calmly murmuring that duty compelled him not to forsake even a dumb friend.

The reproof pricked Heaven's conscience, and "the great Indra" appeared, and urged that, as he had left his brethren by the way, so he may well consent to leave his dog at the gates of heaven. To this Yudhishthira haughtily replied: "I had no power to bring them back to life; how can there be abandonment of those who no longer live?"

Finally, the capricious deity and the just man are reconciled by the former showing that the dog was really a saint in disguise, and the actual father of the righteous prince—an apparent celestial equivocation necessary to reconcile justice with mercy. Another difficulty, however, arose on the man and his dog entering heaven. No brothers were to be found! and Yudhishthira, resting as it were on Abraham's bosom, saw with horror his brothers far away down enduring the torments of hell! Starting up, incensed at the heavenly deception, he demanded the cause, and insisted that he be at once permitted to go to his brothers and share their miseries. This was too much for the gods; so the heavenly principles were changed to accord with the eternal ones of justice, truth, and loving-kindness. And so, perhaps, will a new heaven again evolve with our culture, full of art, science, music, and song—better, perhaps, but as fanciful; while Hades will merge into a sublimated purgatory.—*Condensed from Agnostic Annual.*



HOW AND WHEN DID OUR AIR GET ITS OXYGEN?

— o —

This interesting question is treated in two notes addressed recently to the French Academy of Sciences by T. L. Phipson. We quote portions of a translation made for *The Journal of the Franklin Institute* by Chief-Engineer Isherwood, United States Navy. Says Mr. Phipson:

"That the primitive atmosphere did not contain free oxygen may be accepted as certain, since sulphur and graphite—combustible substances—are found in the primitive rocks. Dr. Koene, who was for many years professor of chemistry in the University of Brussels, says that after the period of intense heat had passed, the atmosphere contained only nitrogen and carbonic acid, the proportions of which gradually diminished as the proportion of oxygen gradually increased."

Where did this free oxygen come from? According to Mr. Phipson it was freed from its partner, carbon, in the carbonic acid gas by the agency of vegetation. His experiments, reported in *The Chemical News*, during the last few years show that microscopic plants of primitive type can grow in carbonic acid, in hydrogen, and in nitrogen, and in all cases where the plant could get hold of carbonic acid it freed the oxygen and gave it out into the atmosphere. This, in Mr. Phipson's view, is what went on in the early ages of the earth. He says:

"If the primitive ages of the globe be considered, there must be conceded (and many scientists do so concede) that the high temperature then existing would have prevented the formation of any chemical compound whatever, the matter of the globe being at that time in the state of free atoms; but in measure, as the earth cooled the elements combined according to the laws of chemical affinity, until finally the surface of the earth remained covered by a surface of nitrogen gas only, a substance having no tendency to combine directly with other substances. Now, into this primitive atmosphere of nitrogen gas vegetables have discharged oxygen gas during an incalculable period of time, until the air has attained its present composition. The oxygen of our air is thus a result of vegetable life (which latter had necessarily to precede animal life). The carbonic-acid gas appropriated by the vegetable must be regarded as a volcanic production...."

"The first plants which appeared upon the land and in the waters of the earth were the inferior ones. Now, my experiments show that these inferior plants, these *Protococcus*, *Conferva*, *Ulva*, etc., discharge, weight for weight, much more oxygen in a given time than the superior ones. For example, I found that in one experiment the unicellular *Algæ* gave at least five times more oxygen than the avicular *Polygonum*.

"It may easily be conceived that in measure as the anaerobic [non-air-living] cellule of the primitive plants was immersed in an atmosphere continually becoming richer in oxygen, this cellule underwent continuous modification until at the end of cycles the aerobic [air-living] cellule

was finally produced, a cellule which discharges carbonic-acid instead of oxygen into the atmosphere. In this manner I explain the slow and gradual production of animal life."

Mr. Phipson sums up his conclusions in the following statements :

"(1) That in the remotest geological periods nitrogen formed, as it forms to-day, the principal part of the earth's atmosphere.

"(2) That the presence of free oxygen in this atmosphere is wholly due to vegetation : and that the primitive plants were the means employed by nature to supply the air with gas.

"(3) That the plants of the present day, like those of the oldest geological evolutions, are essentially anaerobic.

"(4) That in measure as the proportion of free oxygen in the atmosphere continuously increased during the course of cycles, the anaerobic cellule became less and less anaerobic (mushrooms, ferments, bacteria), and finally completely aerobic (animal life).

"(5) That even at the present time the most inferior unicellular Algae give, weight for weight, much more oxygen to the atmosphere than the superior plants.

"(6) That in measure as the proportion of free oxygen in the atmosphere has continuously increased during the past long geological ages, the nervous cerebrospinal system, the highest characteristic of animality, has continuously developed, as paleontological investigations show."—*Literary Digest*.



THE VOICE OF PROGRESS.

—:0:—

ABOVE the chaos of impending ills,
Through all the clamor of insistent strife,
Now, while the noise of warring nations fills
Each throbbing hour with menaces to life,
I hear the voice of Progress !

Strange indeed
The shadowed pathways that lead up to light.
But, as a runner sometimes will recede
That he may so accumulate his might,
Then with a will that needs must be obeyed
Rushes, resistless, to his goal with ease ;
So the new world seems now to retrograde—
Slips back to war, that it may speed to peace.
And in that backward step it gathers force
For the triumphant finish of its course.

—*Cosmopolitan*.

ELLA WHEELER WILCOX.

IN SEARCH OF A RELIGION, AND WHAT I
FOUND ON THE WAY.

BY CHARLES C. CATTELL.

It is many years since I started in search of a true religion, and, although unprofitable as regards the main object, what I met with on the way may be at least entertaining. I consulted those who had studied the origin of the *word* religion, and found reliable evidence of its Roman indication of a system of practical duties, instead of its modern denotation of a system of speculative views. The objection raised to such an interpretation and signification, was that it implied only morality, as contained in the ordinary duties of citizenship. It expressed an obligation due to the State, the protector of life and property of those who lived in it and participated in such benefits as it rendered. Objectors said, "Call that a Religion! Why, it at most only relates to society, to the events of time, only to the present life in this sublunary sphere of existence. It does not relate to the unknown, into which the thoughts of men will wander." It thus became necessary to call the conclusions the religion of this life—what is known to contribute to the welfare of men in their relation to one another—conclusions based upon the observation of nature and the development of the possible achievements of human nature. While this is all plain and comprehensible by every average member of society, it is not generally accepted, and no one has offered to build a church to proclaim it. It appears open to a fatal objection, as the popular religion of which everybody is thinking and talking begins with the assertion of mystery, and then proceeds with an explanation. At the time I am referring to there was a rumor afloat that all the religions of the world were founded in error, and some held that they were all impostures. Christians did not hesitate to call all religions except their own impostures. There was no scruple about taking part in debate—"Was Mahomet an Impostor?" and the conclusion was assured before the discussion commenced. Since that time, the English people have been made more or less familiar with all the various religions of the world, and no doubt many have been astounded at the observation of their great family likeness.

There are now more religions known than at any previous time in our history, and more millions of people who profess no religion at all. Mr. Punch once described an institution open to the general public and added, "N.B.—All religions taken in!" The Christian religion has been like hares and pheasants in England, carefully protected by legal enactments; yet it is confessed from the pulpit that nine-tenths of the people never grace the interior of the house of God. When they do recognise it, it is purely formal, as at baptisms, weddings, and funerals. In our

grandfathers' time those who refused to profess Christianity were excluded from all public offices, and many suffered for their nonconformity in mind, body and estate. A member in the House of Commons once said they intended that "those who did not obey the church should not have any ease."

But all that has broken down—the number of sects has so increased that it is difficult to count and describe them, in spite of all the efforts to maintain one only true religion. The multitudinous views of religion in England to-day must furnish materials for curious reflections among surrounding nations. Perhaps the multiplicity of religious sects tends to prevent any particular one doing uncontrolled mischief to the commonwealth. The people now appeal to the secular power to keep order among religions, and to maintain the right of free discussion. There are two difficulties in maintaining only one true religion—the old law, compelling church attendance, has become obsolete, and the churches are too few to hold the people, if it was still in force and practicable. Those who do attend are so overcome with the vain repetition that they forget one week what they heard the week before, and many have the habit of letting what goes in at one ear go out at the other. If it was otherwise the whole proceedings would become an intolerable nuisance.

At a time of life when I could endure all things I had 12 years' experience of church going. In recent times, I have frequently observed the egress from the parish church, noting a great number of women, many children, and a few old men—to which must be added, sweethearts and their necessary accompaniments. Hence it is obviously a social institution, a meeting place, a fashionable resort for the interchange of views as to the best form of human adornment, of seeing and being seen at the best advantage.

Whosoever attempts to upset this must first supersede it. The Nonconformists begin to see this, as disestablishment has not been effected after seventy years of agitation. They already call their meeting-houses churches, and decorations succeed whitewashed walls, and at one end they have erected towers or spires of a moderate dissenting height. The Roman Catholics seem to be aiming at getting in front of both church and dissent, as regards interior and exterior attractions even in villages. The Salvation Army makes most noise, and in dress presents a hybrid species—a cross between an old Quaker and members of a blue coat school. Church rectors not only give choral services, assisted by eminent soloists, but also provide accommodation for cyclists at the back. Notices are posted informing wheelmen that they can slide gently in with cycling costumes after service has commenced, and need not remain for the sermon, but gently slide out when they have had enough. In one large city the rector has erected a pulpit outside in the churchyard, as an attraction, the service lasting only a few minutes. Fifty years ago it was deemed low and vulgar to be seen anywhere except inside a church on Sundays. But in July, 1898, an enterprising newspaper had the

people under observation, and thus describes what was seen in that particular Sabbath in the city of Birmingham alone. On trams and busses, wearing top hats, frock coats, and the latest styles of feminine adornments—109,237 people. The morning trains to favorite fishing grounds were crowded. Going out of the city, one road was occupied by 240 cyclists. Outside an inn further on, 703 machines were being given a rest. Ten miles out, at different villages, were counted 2,000 people who had arrived by coaches, brakes, and other vehicles. The number on foot seeking "books in brooks, tongues in trees, and sermons in stones," defied computation. Over a thousand of the quieter sort were seen in the Art Gallery and the Free Library, and another two thousand patronized the public baths. Nearly another thousand were occupied as policemen, pressmen, and in connection with the various requirements of the post office. These many thousands were outside the 223 churches and chapels wherein was being taught the only true religion, although few of them would be found to exactly agree as to what that was. Those who have devoted much time to establish a free Sunday during the past forty years, may be pardoned for believing that a certain amount of success has attended their efforts. Sabbath-breaking, as parsons call it, bids fair to become as common as Sabbath-keeping was two generations ago.

During my time the popular view of the Bible has been considerably modified among the thoughtful few, by "Essays and Reviews," Bishop Colenso, and the Higher Criticism. It has been made clear by the law courts that even the clergy may now criticise their chief authority on religion. The gravest objection I have seen to this kind of criticism was that it was criticising the Holy Ghost, who or which was the accepted author of the Bible. Another grave objection was that "Our Lord" quoted from authors of the Old Testament, whose authorship is now disputed, and thus implying that "Our Lord" knew no better. One reply in defence was very smart—we were nowhere told that our Lord's opinion on the authorship of the Word of God was ever expressed or solicited—he was never consulted about the Higher Criticism. But he clearly endorsed the Old Testament. The fact remains that Jesus spoke of Moses and the prophets, and of certain allusions to himself, while we are unable to find any reliable reference to him at all in the Old Testament. Neither is it possible to connect him with the New Testament, either as author or as directly advising its publication or revising its contents. Besides, the whole scheme of the Christian religion is founded on events recorded in the Bible, whether they happened or not. Take away all the old stories and the new story is devoid of sense or meaning. The illustration of the death and resurrection was taken by Jesus from the tale about Jonah and the whale with a belly, and Noah's Flood, wherever it was taken from, was another example of his of history repeating itself. Perhaps my most surprising discovery of all was that no historian of the time referred to the life, birth, death or teachings of Jesus, the person mentioned in the New Testament. Thus historically

we know nothing of the true religion of Jesus, or that there ever was a founder living of that name. This is very remarkable for two reasons,—first, the historians mention every trivial occurrence during Pilate's time, and omit the death and resurrection of Jesus, to say nothing of his extraordinary birth and his claim to represent the God of the Jews in person in the streets of Jerusalem. The silence of history thus becomes the strongest link in the chain of evidence of the only true religion, for no chain is stronger than its weakest link.

The theory and practice of Christianity are both open to doubt, and the discussion of them leads to endless divisions, as ever will be the case, owing to the main point being beyond human comprehension. The only hope of unity is in the study of the laws of nature, the discoveries of science, and the deductions of reason. The guide to life, which can be understood by all, must be based on these purely human considerations; and, after all, what is more important than the conduct of daily life by which all are benefitted or injured, according as its results affect the good or ill of all of us? Perhaps any system, based on considerations arising out of the wants of civilized life, and adapted to meet them—would be best named Philosophy.

Mr. G. J. Holyoake nearly fifty years ago, in his first exposition of Secularism, called it "The Practical Philosophy of the People," and I do not know that he has ever had occasion to alter the descriptive title.

CHANGES IN RELIGION DURING QUEEN VICTORIA'S REIGN.

BY W. T. STEAD, EDITOR OF "REVIEW OF REVIEWS."

ONE of the most conspicuous features of the legislation of the Victorian era has been the gradual but steady removal of religious disabilities. Tests were abolished in the universities. Nonconformists were permitted to use the national burial-grounds, Jews were admitted to the House of Commons, church rates were abolished, and the Anglican Church in Ireland was disestablished and disendowed. Every one of these measures was successfully resisted for years by the Tories, backed by the majority of the clergy, on the ground that they would fatally impair the Established Church. As long as these reforms were not carried, the Liberation Society grew and prospered, and began to indulge in hopes of its complete success. But no sooner did these bills become Acts of Parliament than it was discovered that their immediate effect was enormously to strengthen the church and to destroy the very foundation of Liberationist

influence. There is no opponent of the State Church to-day who will not admit that the Establishment is stronger than it was fifty years ago, and that its increased security is chiefly due to the success of its assailants, who demolished the irritating and indefensible outworks by which its position was sought to be defended.

This brings us by a natural transition to consider the change that has come over religion in the reign of the Queen. When she ascended the throne the state of the Established Church was in many districts a scandal and a disgrace. One of my earliest memories is that of hearing a discussion as to whether a neighboring rector, familiarly known as "Drunken Jack ——," was or was not too tipsy properly to perform the burial service. In many dioceses the Anglican Church was as the valley of dry bones in the prophet's vision. But in the early years of the reign there came a wind from Oxford, and it breathed upon the dry bones, and so they came together and stood up an exceeding great multitude. The Catholic revival that is associated with the name of Newman did at least this for England. It made Anglicans believe in the church as something other than an ecclesiastical branch of the civil service. Cardinal Manning used to declare to the day of his death that it is absolutely impossible to get the spiritual idea of the church of God into the head of an English churchman, so hopelessly erastianized is the Anglican mind. If he felt that in 1890, it is easy to imagine how much more bitterly the conviction must have been borne in upon the earnest disciples of the Catholic revival. A genuine spirit of religious enthusiasm lit anew the flame of piety in many a parish, and the good works that followed were too excellent to lose their savor because the good vicar held fantastical notions about apostolical succession and believed wondrous things as to the spiritual significance of the bibs and tuckers and other small-clothes of the English incumbent.

In Scotland the same spirit of revived faith in the spirituality of the church and her divine mission led to the great secession which founded the Free Kirk of Scotland. Nothing converts men like sacrifice, and the spectacle of Chalmers in the North and Newman in the South shaking off the dust of their feet against what they considered a heretical or faithless church, produced a deeper effect upon the minds of men than all their preachings.

The Free Churches of England and Wales passed through similar experiences. They were provoked to a spirit of pious emulation by the new spirit born of the Catholic revival; and, as competition is the soul

of business, in things religious as well as in things secular, the somewhat leathery conscience of John Bull was assailed from opposite quarters with appeals the like of which he had not listened to since the early days of the great Methodist revival.

The conflicting enthusiasm of Tractarians and Evangelicals, of Old Kirk and Free Kirk, of Anglicans and Dissenters, operated, as might have been expected, on the practical nation to which they were addressed. Despairing of ascertaining which of the excited disputants was right in his view of the sacred mysteries, the Man in the Street decided that the safest thing for him to do was to try to carry out in some practical fashion the teachings which were common to all the jarring creeds. This tendency was powerfully reinforced by the growth in Oxford itself, partly as a reaction against the sacerdotal pretensions of the Tractarians, of a Broad-Church party which had Jowett as its hierophant and Stanley as its apostle. Agnosticism also asserted itself, and Secularism, and it was with genuine relief that men and women betook themselves to the helpful works of charity and mercy as a way of escape from the battle of the chasubles and the arithmetic of Bishop Colenso. Hence, indirectly arose the great philanthropic altruistic movement which is one of the glories of the reign. It was a spirit of practical Christianity often unconscious of its origin which inspired most of the humanitarian legislation of the latter years of the reign.

Tractarianism ran to seed in Ritualism. Dean Stanley died and left no successor. But our English soil, ever fertile in new growths of religious enthusiasm, threw up two new organizations, which, although widely differing in object and method, nevertheless both agreed in two points. Both demanded something more real in the sense of the actual supernatural element in the affairs of men, and both owed their success at the outset largely to women. Mrs. Booth, with her husband's assistance, founded the Salvation Army; while Mme. Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott established the Theosophical Society. Both organizations offend the deepest prejudices of the conventional, both aim at world-wide dominion, and both claim to have communion with the invisible world, to work miracles, and to be commissioned from on high to found a brotherhood to inculcate the true faith. Mrs. Booth and Mme. Blavatsky have both passed away, but the mantle of "H. P. B." has fallen upon Mrs. Besant; while Mrs. Booth's work is carried on by the children whom she brought forth, dedicated from the womb to the service of the Salvation Army.

CHARACTERISTICS AND TOLERATION OF MR. GLADSTONE.

BY GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE.

MR. GLADSTONE resembled in many respects Voltaire, who was the most conspicuous man in Europe in the eighteenth century, as Mr. Gladstone was in the nineteenth. Both were men of universal knowledge beyond all their contemporaries. A map of railways shows that they go everywhere. Mr. Gladstone's mind was like that. Most men go to one place, or several; Mr. Gladstone went to them all. Both Voltaire and Gladstone wrote more letters than any other men were ever known to write. Every Court in Europe was concerned about the movements of each in their day; both were deliverers of the oppressed, when no one else moved on their behalf; both attained great age, and were ceaselessly active to the last. In other respects Voltaire and Gladstone had points of resemblance, as any will find who read Mr. John Morley's noble "Life of Voltaire," which has suggested these comparisons. But both men were utterly different in religious sentiment. Gladstone had spiritual devotion and emotion; Voltaire had neither, though he was as strongly Theistic as Mr. Gladstone was Christian. Yet Voltaire was like Mr. Gladstone in the risks he undertook in defence of the right. As Mr. Sexton lately said: "Mr. Gladstone feared nothing and dared everything in defence of what his conscience led him to champion." Mr. Gladstone ought to have an everlasting name in Ireland. He was the first English Premier who sacrificed himself for Irish equality. His services ought to obliterate the memory of the Old Testament cruelties of Cromwell. We in England knew Mr. Gladstone as the illustrious statesman who, in the great days of his power, gave, beyond any predecessor, conscience the first place in public affairs. He was the friend of freedom in every land and of industrial equity at home, and was the friend of every form of progress that could prove its reasonableness to him.

True, Mr. Gladstone held views I did not share; but his sincerity was so clear that it commanded respect. As I am for the right of free thought, I regard all manifestations of it with interest, whether coinciding with or opposing views I hold. Shortly before his death I wrote to him, when Miss Helen Gladstone sent me word, saying: "To-day I read to my father your letter, by which he was much touched and pleased; and he desired me to send his best thanks." I shall always be proud to

think that any words of mine gave even momentary pleasure to one who has given delight to millions, and will be an inspiration to millions more.

In the next century it will be said : " There were giants in those days." There have been three who stood up above all others for the people—Cobden, Bright, and Gladstone ; and the greatest of these has been Gladstone. In the splendid winter of his days there was no ice in his heart. Like the light that ever glowed in the temple of Montezuma, the generous fire of Gladstone's enthusiasm never went out. People struggling for self-government in every land have heard with sadness the cry, " Gladstone is dead." Not alone because he believed in the ascendancy of the co-operative principle, but because he infused conscience into international affairs—because he had that noble tolerance only possible to men of larger knowledge—I have affection for his memory. He had that invincible courtesy in debate which alone maintains the dignity of Parliament, and converts, in controversy, the rivalry for victory into a search for truth. He was always and everywhere for justice, and was fearless and tireless in defence of it. Because of these things the nation mourned his loss with a pomp of sorrow more deep and universal than ever exalted the memory of a king.

In former times, when an eminent woman contributed to the distinction of her consort, he alone received the applause. In these more discriminating days, when the noble companionship of a wife has made her husband's eminence possible, honor is due to her also.

I have many religious friends, and, when I find works in their way of thinking which may be unknown to them, I sometimes send them to them. When I last saw Mr. Gladstone we spoke of the " Secret Songs" of the late Professor Francis William Newman, a copy of which I had given to him, and which he had read with great pleasure, because of the devoutness they breathed, which he had not expected from one who had shown such decision in admitting and delineating the errors of Jesus.

It came into my mind that my expressions of sympathy and respect for persons whose Christian belief arose from honest conviction, and was associated with efforts for the improvement of the material condition of the people, might lead him to suppose that I myself inclined to belief in Christian tenets of faith. I therefore sent him my new book on " The Origin and Nature of Secularism : Showing that where Freethought commonly ends Secularism begins "—saying that, as I had the honor of his acquaintance, I ought not to leave him unaware of the nature of my

own opinions. He answered that he thought my motive a right one in sending my book to him, and that he read a considerable part with general concurrence, though, in the main, the views expressed were painful to him. But this made no difference in his friendship to me, which continued to the end of his days, showing how strong were his religious convictions, and how nobly tolerant he was to those unable to share them. I often thought Mr. Gladstone had the fine spirit of the Abbe Lamennais, who, writing of a book of mark depicting the "passive" Christian, said: "The active Christian, who is ceaselessly fighting the enemies of humanity, without omitting to *pardon and love them*—of this type of Christian I find no trace whatever." Mr. Gladstone was of that type. It was his distinction that he applied this affectionate tolerance, not only to the "enemies of humanity," but to the dissentients from the faith which he loved so well.

I can well understand Lord Randolph Churchill's testimony of astonishment at Mr. Gladstone's personal superiority. "Personality" it is now called—a word too much and too indifferently used in relation to men of ordinary individuality, that it becomes mean when applied to Mr. Gladstone. Lord Randolph had been familiar with him in Parliament for many years, and knew his greatness in speech and debate, but never became so entirely conscious of his ascendancy as he did in a personal interview with him. This was my experience. One time, when conversing with Mr. Gladstone, many topics and incidents arose of later and earlier years. Oxford in the days of the two Newmans was one subject. I was amazed at the spontaneity of his mind and the resources of his memory. Opinions and facts were expressed with easy luminousness. The color in his language, his effortless eloquence of phrase and tone, gave me a deeper conviction than I ever had before how much he was an orator by nature. How wide and wonderful was the knowledge buried with him, so far as we know, in his Abbey grave! If men do not live hereafter—from the human point of view—they ought. Those waiting on the "silent shore" (if any are waiting there) would rejoice at the arrival of Mr. Gladstone, who would enchant them and add to their information beyond that of any other visitant who has left this land since the philosopher of Ferney disembarked there. The "silent shore" would cease to be silent, and inquiries would arise in the air like prayers.

So far as my recollection went of earlier events occurring within my experience, Mr. Gladstone's memory was marvellous in its detail as well as in historic facts. The two Newmans, Francis and John, he knew, but

he had never heard of there being a third brother, Charles, and was much interested in what I was able to tell him of that singular thinker. Mr. Gladstone said he would ask Lord Acton to call upon me, thinking his conversation and wide knowledge would interest me; and, when Lord Acton was prevented by official duties from doing so, Mr. Gladstone, with that omnipresent courtesy, as one may call it, for which he was distinguished, wrote to me the reasons which prevented the visit.

Mr. Bertram Dobell lately published extracts from a volume by an unknown author that came under his notice. The book was written in the middle of the last century, and was published by Tonsons, of London, in 1756. This author seems an English Montaigne—at least, he resembles him by unexpected aptitude of thought. One instance is this: "Freethinker! What a term of honor; or, if you will, dishonor; but where is he who can claim it?" Mr. Gladstone might claim it beyond any other eminent Christian I have known. It was he who, at the opening of the Liverpool College some years ago, warned the clergy that "they could no longer defend their tenets by railing or reticence"—a shaft that went through the soul of their policy of silence and defamation pursued for half a century.

It is Diderot who relates that one who was searching for a path through a dark forest by the light of a taper met a man who said to him: "Friend, if thou wouldst find thy way here, blow out your light." The taper was Reason, and the man who said Blow it out was a priest. Mr. Gladstone would have said: "Take care of that taper, friend; and if you can convert it into a torch do so, for you will need it to see your way through the darkness of human life."

The unknown aphorist whom I have quoted has this observing remark: "The same quality may be delightful in one man and disgusting in another. One man may have a light that wants a shade; another a shade that wants a light." Mr. Gladstone had both light and shade, which renders him so delightful and imperishable a remembrance.—*Agnostic Annual*.



THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.

XVII.

LIGHTLY and brightly rose the British warriors after their brief slumbers, in joyful anticipation of the welcome they would soon receive from the imprisoned women and children of their race. It was early morn, July 17th, 1857. Two miles off was Cawnpore; but, ere the march was begun, Havelock's spies brought in terrible news. *Nana Sahib had massacred his prisoners!* An advance guard was sent on to ascertain if this could really be true. Well might brave men doubt in such a case. A horrible explosion greeted the guard; the magazine had exploded, fired by the last of the retreating enemy. The rest of the British force came up, and once more the Union Jack floated proudly over Cawnpore. But no joyous shouts greeted the old flag as it was unfurled to the breeze; no huzzinga of those who conquer was heard. No funeral could have made the men's faces sadder. In a house near by lay the bodies of 207 British women and children, cut and hacked beyond recognition. The walls of the different rooms were bespattered with blood and brains, and scratched and indented by strokes of the merciless sword. Little caps half full of hair, pieces of skull, brains and coagulated blood; bits of women's apparel crimson with gore; long tresses stuck to the wall with portions of the brain they once shaded; arms, legs, trunks of nude bodies lying about in all directions,—these were some of the terrible sights to be seen in those chambers of horrors. No wonder the conquerors were sad; no wonder that strong men wept!

But from the lips of those weeping men came forth vows of vengeance. Every one of them secured a relic, the sight of which should steel his heart if ever the voice of Mercy was heard pleading for the life of a Sepoy. Every man felt like a Fitzjames from whom a betrayed and murdered Blanche, with her last breath, had exacted a vow of vengeance,—a vow to which each had set his seal by dipping a braid of her hair in the blood that had flowed in her veins.

A Bible was found in which Miss Blair, its late owner, had written: "June 27th, went to the boats; June 29th, taken out of the boats; June 30th, taken to Sevadah Kothi—fatal day."

And now the victor of so many fights, the hero who had seen death in so many forms and had endeared himself to his soldiers,—even his stout heart quailed, and his dauntless spirit for a season bowed before the calamities which faced him. After such a long and weary march, after so many battles won and so much hardship endured, they for whom he and his men had toiled and fought were lying dead and mutilated before him. And from without other sad tidings came: Sir

Henry Lawrence, of Lucknow, dead ; General Barnard, before Delhi, dead ; a repulse of British troops at Agra ; Nana Sahib at Bithoor with 5,000 men. And that night of July 17th Havelock's sleep was disquieted by spectres which all brought him the same message—" Despair and die ! "

But Havelock was himself again in the morning. He posted his troops west of Cawnpore ; and it was now that he purchased all the intoxicating liquor in the place to protect his men from drunkenness and cholera. Neill was marching to Cawnpore with a small reinforcement. Havelock made his plans. Choosing a strong position on the Ganges, thousands of coolies were hired to build a fort. Suitable men were selected from the infantry, mounted and drilled, and formed a corps of forty-one horse. Hearing that the Nana had evacuated Bithoor and had started for Oude, Major Stephenson was despatched to Bithoor to verify the news. Stephenson found it correct. He blew up the Bithoor fort, burned the Nana's palace, and returned with 20 guns. On July 20th, Neill and his 227 men arrived. The nearly-finished fort was handed over to Neill, and with 300 men he was left to guard it and the sick and wounded.

That same evening Havelock despatched the first detachment of the force with which he intended to invade Oude. Rain was falling in torrents. Havelock saw the detachment over the river and returned drenched. On July 29th the force was before Onao, a small town. The mutineers had carefully chosen their ground : Onao to their left, a village in front, swamps on their right. The attack was made in front. The Fusiliers and Highlanders drove the Sepoys from a strong position in a walled garden, and they fell back to the village. The 64th Foot was called up, and the three regiments charged and captured the village and the guns there. Havelock placed his men on firm ground, with swamps around except in one direction, and between Onao and the Sepoys. The latter, crowding on the narrow road in front, attacked the British force, but were exposed to a heavy fire and cut to pieces. The Oude gunners (Sepoys) fought desperately, many being sabred beside their guns. Onao and 15 guns rewarded the victors.

The British troops needed rest and food, and a short halt was ordered. The pursuit was then continued. The British force came upon the enemy at Busserutgunge, a walled town on the road to Lucknow. The gate through which the British would have to pass was intrenched and protected by four guns, and was flanked by four towers. The British artillery fired upon this gate ; the Fusiliers and the Highlanders lying down ready at hand to storm it when the order was given. The 64th Foot was sent to the left of the town, to turn that flank and cut off the retreat of the enemy. The charge was made, the town was won, and four guns were captured. Behind the town the road (to Lucknow) passed across a *jheel* (an artificial lake or tank). Over this the mutineers hurried, and the 64th arrived too late to cut off their retreat.

While the troops rested, Havelock rode forward to reconnoitre. As he returned

some men shouted, "Clear the way for the General!" With a smile softening his stern face, Havelock replied: "Right well have you done that already, my men!" A compliment so neatly expressed and so unexpected went straight to the hearts of the soldiers, and the cry was raised, "God bless the General!"

Havelock had been promised reinforcements—the 5th and 90th Foot. He needed more men, for his late losses had been heavy; moreover, cholera was claiming its victims daily. Grievously disappointed by not receiving the aid he expected, he retreated to Mungulwar. A Sepoy rising in Dinapore had deflected the services of the 5th and the 90th Foot into other channels. At Mungulwar 257 men and five guns were added to his force and, per contra, some Lascars in the artillery had to be disarmed and dismissed. News from Neill now reached Havelock: the mutineers were gathering in force at Bithoor, meditating an attack on Cawnpore. Telling Neill to keep open his communications, Havelock for the second time marched on to Busserutgunge, reaching it August 5th. This time he knew the ground well. Ordering a detachment to the left flank of the enemy, he suddenly opened a heavy cannonade on the front of the village. Surprised and bewildered, the enemy fled. But British guns, ready this time, poured in a deadly fire as the Sepoys hurried along the causeway crossing the *jheel*. Pluckily the mutineers rallied on the other side, but were soon driven off; having no cavalry, however, Havelock could not take full advantage of his victory.

But in spite of these victories, the victor was conquered; the march to Lucknow had to be abandoned for a time. Havelock's force was too weak to confront the hosts of mutineers in Oude. The famous Gwalior Contingent (mutineers) and the Nana were in that province. Havelock again retreated to Mungulwar. The troops murmured; thought scorn for a while of the brave man who dared to retreat. Yet what could Havelock do? Had he arrived at Lucknow without the loss of a single man, his force would have been too small to protect a number of women and children and escort them safely through thousands of well-armed foes to a place of refuge. His army could not have remained at Lucknow; a famine would have been the result. The men were unreasonable, but they were eager to avenge the slaughter of the Cawnpore women and children.

The men wanted a fight; a fight was ready for them. Neill required help to drive the mutineers from Bithoor. Havelock had already begun his march on Cawnpore when spies brought in the news that a large body of mutineers was at Busserutgunge. To retreat now seemed somewhat like cowardice, but the lion was roused, and to the joy of the men a move was made in the opposite direction. For the third time Havelock appeared before Busserutgunge, and for the third time the mutineers suffered a heavy defeat there. The Sepoys had had enough of Busserutgunge by this time.

Back again went Havelock, and recrossed the Ganges on August 13th. Three days later he was before Bithoor. A large force of Sepoys confronted him, in

a position partially sheltered by sugar-canes and strengthened by villages. The Sepoys fought well, actually crossing bayonets with the Madras Fusiliers. Driven from the sugar-canes, the Sepoys formed again behind a breastwork built in rear of their first position. Here the fight was fiercer, the mutineers holding their own gallantly. Their guns were much heavier than those of the British. Seeing that his artillery was not able to cope with that of the enemy, Havelock ordered a charge. Cheerily the men responded to the call. The breastwork, obstinately defended, was gallantly carried, and the flying Sepoys were chased across a stream in their rear. All their guns were captured. As Havelock rode past the regiments, the soldiers cheered. "Don't cheer me, my men; you did it all yourselves!" That was Havelock's answer to the cheering. The cheering was redoubled. Halting that night at Bithoor, in the morning Havelock ordered whatever remained of the Nana's buildings to be blown up. Then, fearing the mutineers might sack Cawnpore, he hastened thither with his army.

This was Havelock's ninth victory in India, and with it he ended his first campaign. And what was his reward? At Cawnpore he heard that Sir James Outram was to command the Lucknow Relieving Force, and not Havelock! Keen was his disappointment.

THE ATONEMENT.

ON the sharp-splintered shore the sea would make atonement,
 and then find peace;
 But no concession is offered or found.
 Daily I hear the wild pulsations of pain,
 And the night is vexed by the hoarse monologue.
 In my life, from Calvary's brow no calmness descends.
 The old-time agony, the importunate pain, are daily repeated;
 I feel the sharp nails in my hands and feet; on my brow,
 The crown of thorns is daily renewed.

Ray's Crossing, Indiana.

ALONZO L. RICE.

WHEN SMILES ARE GONE.

SHALL joy from me have vanished,
 And sorrow take its place,
 Because your smiles are banishee,
 When we meet face to face?
 Ah, no! I'll joy discover,
 And these sweet strains shall swell;
 Oh, love me not, my lover,
 And I shall love thee well.

Toronto.

M. E. L. H. E.