The Dominion Review.

VOL. II. | MAY, 1897. | NO. 5.

THE MIRACULOUS ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

III. (*Conclusion*).

THE martyrdoms of the apostles, it has been said, are testimony of the miracles, since without the assurance of the miracles the pains of martyrdom would not have been faced. This history contradicts. To say nothing of the persecutions endured under Nero and Diocletian, when belief in miracles still lived, we have instances in abundance at the time of the Reformation of martyrdom undergone for the doctrine of the reformers, though no miracles were even alleged to have taken place. Nor are such cases confined to the Christian pale. The sect of the Babis in Persia has in recent times undergone the most cruel persecution, not only without the support of miracles but for a faith which Christians pronounce false. Servetus died for Socinianism, and Giordano Bruno for scepticism. St. Paul endured a life of martyrdom, but evidently it was for love of Christ and for the faith. That Christ had risen was an essential part of his faith, and it is in this aspect, rather than as a confirmatory miracle, that it presents itself to the mind of Paul.

No man of comprehensive mind, unless it be Renan in his dealing with the raising of Lazarus, has taken the miracles for creations of fraud. They are the offspring of a childlike fancy in a totally uncritical age. They are a halo which naturally grew round the head of the adored Teacher and Founder, as it grew round the head of every mediæval saint. That world teemed with miracle, both divine and diabolical. Jesus himself is represented as recognizing miracles of both kinds. He challenges his opponents to say, if he by Beelzebub casts out devils, by whom do their sons cast them out. Instead of a disposition to criticise, there was a dominant predisposition to accept. If in the country of Descartes highly educated men could believe in the miracles wrought at the tomb of the saintly Deacon Paris, how much more easily could Galilean peasants, or simple-minded disciples of whatever race, believe in the miracles ascribed, perhaps long after his death, to Jesus? Dr. Arnold asked whether it was possible that there should be myths in the age of Tacitus. The age of Tacitus was, but not the country; though even in the country of Tacitus miraculous signs attended the births or deaths of Cæsars, and Tacitus himself records miracles reported to have been performed by Vespasian in which, however, nobody believes. The Jews

were further prepared for the acceptance of fresh miracles by their traditional acceptance of those of the Old Testament. So devoid were they of any conception of natural law, or of anything except a direct action of Deity, that with them a miracle would hardly be miraculous.

If we must resign the miracles, the Messianic prophecies with their supposed fulfillment in Christ, and the Trinitarian creed, what remains to us of the Gospel? There remains to us the Character, the sayings, and the parables, which made and have sustained moral, though not ritualistic, dogmatic, or persecuting, Christendom. There remain the supremacy of conscience over law and the recognition of motive as that which determines the quality of action. The character is only impaired as the model and guiding star of humanity by supposing that it was preterhuman. We cannot even conceive the union of two natures, divine and human, though we may mechanically repeat the form of words. The sayings of Christ would be not less true or applicable if they had been cast ashore by the tide of time without anything to designate their source. The parable of the prodigal son, that of the laborers in the vineyard, or that of the Good Samaritan, would touch our hearts whoever might be deemed their author. There remains, moreover, the ethical beauty of the Gospels themselves, unapproachable after its kind. Their miracles are miracles of mercy, not of destruction, like many of the miracles of the Old Testament. When James and John propose to perform an Old Testament miracle by commanding fire to come down from heaven and destroy an inhospitable village, they are rebuked and told they know not of what manner of spirit they are. In this sense it may be said that the miracles confirm the Gospel and the Gospel confirms the miracles. The Inquisition, to justify its existence, could find among Christ's words none more apposite than "Compel them to come in," said by the giver of the feast in the parable. The halo of miracle is worthy of the figure. If there is a Supreme Being, and if he is anywhere manifest in human history, it is here.

A biography of Christ there cannot be. There are no genuine materials for it, as Strauss truly says. Four compilations of legend cannot be pieced together so as to make the history of a life. No ingenuity can produce a chronological sequence of scene such as a biographer requires. The "Lives," so called, are merely the four Gospels cut into shreds, which are forced into some sort of order, while, to impart to the narrative an air of reality, it is profusely decked out with references to local scenery, allusions to national customs, and Hebrew names. Each biographer gives us a Christ according to his own prepossessions; Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, or Rationalist. The Roman Catholic priest presents him as a living crucifix; the New York minister as a divine preacher. Renan's "Life of Jesus," though it is exquisite as a work of literary art, as a biography is worth no more than the rest. It has no critical basis, and the facts are arbitrarily selected and arranged in virtue of a learned insight which Renan supposes himself to possess.

Nothing is more arbitrary than the selection of the raising of Lazarus as an example of pious fraud. Nor does Renan's work escape the idiosyncrasy of the writer. We find in it a touch of sentimentality, or even of something verging on the sensuous, which bespeaks a Parisian hand.

Did Jesus give himself out or allow his disciples to designate him as the Messiah? It is impossible to tell. All that we can say is, that his disciples, and not only those whose traditions are embodied in the first Gospel, desired to identify him with the hope of Israel, and applied or wrested passages of the Old Testament to that intent. With that object evidently were produced, by two different hands, the two genealogies, which hopelessly diverge from each other, while one of them, by arbitrary erasion, forces the pedigree into three mystic sections of fourteen each: a clear proof that it was not taken from any public record, even if we could suppose it possible that, amid all the convulsions of Judea, the record of a peasant's pedigree had been preserved. One of the genealogies, moreover, includes the mythical line of patriarchs between Adam and Abraham. The Messiahship of Jesus is a question with which we need practically concern ourselves no more. The Messiah was a dream of the tribal pride of the Jew, to which, as to other creations of tribal or national pride or fancy, we may bid a long farewell. That it should be necessary for the redeemer of the Jewish race to trace his pedigree to a hero so dear to the national heart, though morally so questionable, as David, was natural enough; but who can believe that this was necessary for the Redeemer of Mankind? It is rather lamentable to think how much study and thought have been wasted in the attempt to establish the fulfilment of a Hebrew vision, devoid of importance or interest for the rest of the human race.

What was the relation of Christ to Judaism? His culture manifestly was Jewish; he accepted the sacred books of the nation, treating the book of Daniel as authentic and the story of Jonah as history; he taught in the synagogues; he fulfilled all righteousness by his observance of the ceremonial law. He was a reformer and a regenerator, not a revolutionist. It can hardly be doubted that he was of pure Jewish race, though the population of Galilee was very mixed, and was, on that account, despised by the blue blood of Jerusalem, while the fabrication of genealogies seems rather to indicate some misgivings on this point. Here, again, we are perplexed by the discrepancies among the authorities, if they can be called authorities. In some places, Christ is made to represent himself as being sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; as coming not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it, and to establish every jot and tittle of it for ever; as regarding all outside the pale of Judaism in the light of dogs, worthy only to eat of the crumbs under the Judaic table; as forbidding his apostles to enter any city of the Gentiles or Samaritans. Elsewhere he selects a Samaritan in contrast to the self-righteous Jew as a type of charity, praises the faith of a heathen soldier as greater than any found in Israel, and chooses the Samaritan woman as the reci-

pient of his highest and most memorable utterance concerning the nature of religion: while the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Laborers in the Vineyard seem also symbolically to suggest the conversion and admission of the Gentiles. The writer of the first Gospel evidently draws one way; the writer of the fourth, who betrays a positive antipathy to the Jews, the other. What is certain is, that practically Jesus put conscience above the law, even above the law of the Decalogue; and in place of the tribal and half-local religion of the Jew, introduced the religion of humanity. For this, Judaism rejected him, crucified him, and itself, sinking deeper than ever into tribalism and legalism, remained the enemy of his religion and of his brotherhood of man. In the Pauline Epistles we see Christianity detaching itself by a painful effort from Judaism; and we willingly believe that Paul is right in holding that the genuine tradition of Jesus is on the side of emancipation.

Did Jesus regard himself or allow himself to be regarded as God? Unitarians quote strong texts to the contrary. The Trinitarians get their texts chiefly from the fourth Gospel, which is manifestly imbued with the peculiar views of the writer and his circle. In fact, it may be said to be one note of the comparatively late composition of that Gospel, that time must have elapsed sufficient for the teacher of Galilee to become, first divine, and then the Second Person of the Trinity and the Alexandrian Logos. It seems unlikely that, even in those days of theosophic reverie, the author of the Sayings and the Parables should ever have been led by spiritual exaltation or by the adoring love of his disciples to form and promulgate such a conception of himself. At any rate, we have done with the Alexandrian Logos, as well as with the paradoxes of the Athanasian Creed.

We have done, too, for ever with the mixture of Rabbinical and Alexandrian Theosophy, with which St. Paul has been accused of overlaying the Christian faith. We may bid farewell to his doctrine of the Atonement. That belief is bound up with the belief in the Fall of Adam, and the Fall of Adam is now abandoned as a fact even by orthodox theologians, though they would fain substitute for it some lapse of the human race from a more perfect state, without any proof either of the more perfect state or of the lapse. As was said before, if there was no Fall, there was no need of an Atonement; if no need of an Atonement, there was no need of an Incarnation; and that whole cycle of dogma apparently falls to the ground.

In calling himself the Son of Man Jesus might seem to identify himself with a mystic figure in Daniel; but the Son of Man is not the Son of God, nor is it the Son of a Jew; it is a title of humanity.

From such ethical limitations and peculiarities as cling to the characters and teachings of philosophers of Athens and Roman Stoics, the character and teaching of Jesus are essentially free. There is no brand of nationality or race to interfere with our acceptance of him as pattern and model of humanity. His limitations are those of a peasant of Galilee

seeing nothing of modern and complex civilization. For Jesus, politics had no existence; at least, the only political relation known to him was that of provincial subjection to the military empire of Rome, so that all political questions were perfectly solved for him when he had said, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." He saw little of commerce; if he ever looked on Tyre and Sidon it was from afar; trade, as it showed itself in the money-changers and salesmen of the temple, was revolting to him; from the magnificent buildings of the capital his simplicity seems to have recoiled. Art Judea had not, but to art he would probably have been indifferent. To his eye the lily of the field was more beautiful than Solomon in all his glory, and would have been more beautiful than the work of Phidias. Wealth appeared to him only in the guise of Dives with Lazarus lying at his gate, not in its more beneficent form; and therefore to him wealth seemed in itself unblest and poverty in itself blest. His benign influence has been mainly over the individual heart and in the simple relations of life. Over politics, commerce, the great world, and civilization generally his influence, notwithstanding national professions and state churches, has been far less.

The pursuit of wealth has been eager among the professed disciples of him who preached the Sermon on the Mount, and in the temples of the Prince of Peace have been hung up the trophies of war. The morality of civil, commercial, and social life has, perhaps, rather suffered by the formal profession of an unattainable standard, and the world has been more evil than it might have been if the ideal of good men had not been withdrawal from an evil world. Among the teachings of Jesus recorded in the Gospels, learning, literature, and science have no place. To the mind of Jesus, had they presented themselves, they would probably have seemed entirely alien. The simplicity of the child and the spiritual insight of poverty were in his eyes superior to the wisdom of the wise. In this respect, his thorough-going disciples have generally reflected the image of their Master. What would St. Francis of Assisi have made of European civilization? Other limitations of Jesus were his estrangements from domestic life with its relations, and the curtailment of his experience by an early death.

To one of low estate in a province oppressed by foreign rule, full of misery and leprosy, it might well seem that this world was evil, and the only chance of happiness for man was by escaping from it to a better. There can be no doubt that the pessimist has a right to say that the Gospel is with him so far as the present world is concerned.

Allowance must also be made for Oriental hyperbole. Over-carefulness poisons life; but if we literally cared not for the things of to-morrow, we and our families should starve. The sparrows do not look to Providence to feed them; they search for food the livelong day themselves. Forgiveness is the general principle which even self-interest prescribes; but if we were to offer the other cheek to the smiter, the other cheek

would too often be smitten; and if we were to forgive all wrong-doers until seventy times seven, wrong would fill the world. To the brotherhood of men there is a rational limit. In our relations to each other, if there is something that is fraternal, there is something that is not. Competition and antagonism are normal facts. The practical truth lies somewhere between the view of Hobbes and that of the Gospel, though with a recognition of the Gospel view as the ideal. Justice, with her scales and her sword, will keep her place as well as love or the enthusiasm of humanity. If the aggressor tries to take away your coat, you will have, instead of giving him your cloak also, to withstand his aggression in the court of law or by force. It would be bad for him as well as for you if you did not.

Of the intolerance, persecutions, and religious wars which have resulted from dogmatism, on the other hand, the true Jesus is blameless. If anything like narrowness or intolerance is thrust upon him by a dogmatic narrator, his own character and the general scope of his teaching repel it. His genuine teaching clearly was ethical and spiritual, not dogmatic. Nor to him can be fairly ascribed asceticism, eremitism, the false idea of saintship as seclusion and self-torture, or the hideous array of hospital pathos embodying that idea which fills the galleries of mediæval art. His ministry commences at a marriage feast and his enemies reproach him with not being ascetic. In his character and history there is no doubt a large element of sorrow, without which he would not have touched humanity. Yet we think too much of Jerusalem and of the closing scene with its agonies, its horrors, and the circle of dark, even of dreadful, dogma which has been formed around it. We think too little of the preaching of the Word of life, and of the land in which the Word of life was preached. Let us sometimes draw a veil over the Cross, banish from our imaginations Jerusalem and its temple reeking with bloody sacrifice, its fanatical Judaism, its hypocritical Pharisaism, its throng of bigots yelling for a judicial murder. Let us learn to see the great Teacher of humanity in the happy days of his mission, while he gathers round him the circle of loving disciples and of simple hearts thirsting for the waters of life, in the village synagogue, on the summer hillside or lakeshore, amidst the vines and oleanders and lilies of Galilee.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

BY RABBI B. A. ELZAS.

"SCIENCE and religion." When these words are uttered in connection with each other, the first thought that suggests itself to us naturally, is the fact of the enmity that exists between them. Every-one, now-a-days, is acquainted with the way in which religious people generally look upon scientific investigation. It is, namely, with a feeling of suspicion, and that because of the supposition that Religion can never be advantaged by Science, but on the contrary may be seriously crippled by it. Scientists, on the other hand, have reciprocated the sentiments of religionists. They have regarded religious forms with conscious dread and disfavor. They have had very little patience with the different creeds, and while the religionists were widening the gulf between themselves and the scientists, the latter have been helping them along in their work.

Now, what are the causes of this mutual suspicion and dislike? Are these causes reasonable?

In the first place, the churches have blocked the way of scientific advance, and this fact scientists are careful not to forget. The establishment of Christianity hindered the development of science for nearly 1,500 years, and this it did in two ways: (1) by the creation of an atmosphere that was unfavorable to the fostering of scientific thought. The end of the world was at hand, and the kingdom of Heaven nigh to be revealed, and hence (2) a standard was erected to which all science which did grow up in this atmosphere was made to conform. That standard was Revelation.

The motto of science was Truth. The ecclesiastics answered, "We have it." And thus did the forces of ecclesiasticism and those of science, set themselves for a deadly encounter. Never was the enginery of persecution brought to bear with direr effect, nor does history furnish a more melancholy picture than is contained in its recital. From Roger Bacon, who five centuries before the inductive theory was enunciated, practised it in the secluded cloister of an English monastery, and for explaining the phenomenon of the rainbow contrary to Genesis and experimenting with the laws of combustion, suffered years of imprisonment—down to the time of Charles Darwin, history has the same story to relate.

This persecution, however, came not from Religion but from Ecclesiasticism. Draper has written a work on "The Conflict between Science and Religion," but his book discloses no such conflict. It merely describes the conflict between Science and the Roman Catholic theologians—which is a very different matter. *Religion and Science have never been in conflict.*

On the other hand, the grounds on which religionists base their hostility

towards Science, are furnished by the fact that Science has pronounced itself against many, and seems to have destroyed not a few of their cherished beliefs. Our earth was formerly believed to be the centre of the universe, and the sun, moon, and stars created for the special benefit of man. Then came Copernicus, and demonstrated that our world is one of the smallest planets of a system revolving round the sun, and the theologians lifted their hands in horror. Then, in addition, there has come into general favor among thinkers, the theory that the universe of worlds has been in a process of making throughout the ages. The theory of special creation was thus shaken.

Genesis and geology were next claimed to be at variance, and geology seems to have triumphed. The teaching of evolution has overturned the old idea that man was created perfect in the image of God, and has proven that he has been on the upward step since time began. And so, too, the old theory of salvation has been exploded. The investigations of science have shown a human element in the Bible, and have brought to light many of the facts of the origin of religion. Such things have filled, and still do fill, certain minds with dread.

And yet Science has not touched Religion, nor has Religion opposed Science. For what is Science? It is nothing more and nothing less than the systematic registration of knowledge. No matter of what the knowledge is. And what is Religion? It is by no means identical with creed, system, or cult. It is simply the awakening of the spiritual nature of man to the existence of spiritual things. As the spiritual nature manifests itself through the various channels of the human organism, its expression takes on various forms. Manifested through the intellect, it gives us religious knowledge or belief; manifested through the heart, it gives us sentiments and attractions, and lastly—manifested through the executive organs, it gives us worship and action. This expression varies also, in strength, clearness and elevation. In savage races, it is gross and feeble; in others it is intense, pure and lofty. Primitively, it very likely gave only a sense of the occult, intelligent energies animating the man, the cloud, the wind, the sky, which were looked upon with fear, and to be placated, shunned and defied. Ultimately it rises to the recognition of a moral and spiritual being in man capable of an eternal existence, and attains also a sense of an infinite and creative Spirit on whom man is dependent, and to whom he owes gratitude, obedience and reverence. Religion, then, begins as a sentiment, and culminates in convictions that move and mould the life. These convictions, briefly expressed, are (1) a soul within man, (2) an environing soul without, and (3) harmony between them.

Now, what has Science to say against these things? Nothing. For until it has sounded the uttermost abysses of infidelity, and fathomed the depth of all mysteries, it cannot say that there is no God, and no soul, and until this is done, Religion, pure and simple, is not at variance with Science, and when Science attempts any such assertion, it has gone beyond its limits. Nor, similarly, can Religion have any quarrel with the increase of knowledge.

Like the two armies who engaged in battle in the dark, and who, when the light dawned, discovered that they had been fighting their friends, so has been the supposed conflict between Science and Religion. But hand in hand they must now go, to the task of uplifting and exalting humanity.

UTILITARIAN ETHICS.

(A Paper read before the Cambridge (Mass.) Conferences, April 12, 1897.)

I.

In the introduction to his "Outlines of the History of Ethics," Prof. Henry Sidgwick points out that the system of morals formulated by Hobbes, which forms the starting point for the development that the science of ethics underwent in England for a century and a half, was founded by antithesis from the view of Natural Law "which had been taken as the basis of International Law in the epoch-making work of Grotius some fifteen years before Hobbes' view took written shape."

Sidgwick divides the development of English ethics into two periods, during the first of which the dependence of social morality on the establishment of political order is the aspect of Hobbism combatted by its opponents. The broad lines of opposition may be distinguished: "(1) That of the Cambridge moralists and Clarke, which laid stress on the self-evidence of moral principles viewed abstractly, and their intrinsic cogency for rational wills as such, apart from any consideration of them as laws laid down for man by an omnipotent ruler. (2) That of Cumberland and Locke, which treats morality as a code of Divine Legislation, to be ascertained by considering the relations of human beings as designed and created by God."

The former line is that of the *earlier* Rational Intuitionists—the latter being the school of Price and Reid—"while the jural moralists, Cumberland and Locke, are perhaps most instructively viewed as precursors of the later utilitarianism of Paley," although the two lines of thought are not definitely opposed to each other. In the second period of English ethics, the reply to Hobbism "penetrates to its basis of Psychological Egoism. This line of thought is initiated by Shaftesbury and developed in different ways by Butler and Hutcheson, all three agreeing in maintaining against Hobbes (a) that disinterested Benevolence and the Moral Sense or Conscience are natural springs of action distinct from Self-Love; and (b) that they prompt, always or for the most part, to the conduct that enlightened self-interest would dictate, and are therefore *harmonious* with, though distinct from, Self-Love. In the view of Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, the Moral Sense, Comprehensive Benevolence, and Enlightened Self-Interest combine in a triple band to draw us, if we only see empirical facts as they are, to good conduct; in Butler's view it is needful (1) to face the possibility of apparent conflict between Conscience and Self-love, and therefore to lay stress on the authority of the former; and (2) to note that the dictates of conscience diverge importantly from the directions which a mere regard for general happiness would give. The first of these points is emphasized in the preface to his sermons (1726); the second only became perfectly clear

to him later and appears in the Analogy (1736); this latter date accordingly may be taken as the starting point of the controversy between Intuitional and Utilitarian Ethics."

"The next division of the subject is characterized," says Sidgwick, "by the preponderance of Psychology over Ethics; the question that is both most originally and effectually treated is not, How right conduct is to be determined, but, How moral sentiments are to be scientifically explained. Three lines of explanation, all of which supply elements to the later Associationism of James and John Mill and others, are developed by Hume, Hartley and Adam Smith respectively. Of these, Hume's, which resolves moral sentiments into sympathy with the pleasurable and painful effects of action, leads naturally to a Utilitarian solution of the strictly ethical question; but Hume's concern is primarily with psychological explanation. . . . . Finally, when the main interest turns again to the systematic determination of right conduct, we find the opposition between the plain man's Conscience and Comprehensive Benevolence, which Butler noted in 1736, developed into the antithesis between Intuitional and Utilitarian Morality, which has lasted into our own time."

The moral system of Hobbes is the root from which has developed the Utilitarianism of English Ethics, and a history of Utilitarian theories must necessarily begin with an account of Hobbes' ethical thought. This is based on the idea that man's appetites or desires have for their aim the preservation of life, or the heightening of its pleasures, and hence what appear to be entirely unselfish emotions are really forms of self-regard. Thus the grief for the calamity of others termed pity, arises from our imagining a similar calamity to befall ourselves. As desires are directed toward pleasure, aversions are directed away from pain. The social inclinations, similarly, have self for their aim; "all society is either for gain or glory." Mutual fear is the source of the political unions into which men enter, with their restrictions and positive obligations. Man is naturally unsociable, and shows his opinion of his fellows by his actions. "When taking a journey he arms himself; when going to sleep he locks the doors; when even in his house he locks his chests; and this when he knows there be laws and public officers armed to revenge all injuries that shall be done him." As nature fixes the end of human action, it is reasonable for a man to seek his own preservation or pleasures, and hence, if it is reasonable for him to observe the rules of social behavior commonly called moral, it is so only as a means to his preservation or pleasure; and then merely if they are generally observed. Such observance can be secured only by the intervention of government. The first and fundamental law of nature that affects man's relations to his fellows is to "seek peace and follow it;" but, if peace cannot be obtained, he may reasonably "seek and use all helps and advantages of war." The State of Nature is one free from all the moral restraints, a state in which "right and wrong, justice and injustice have no place."

Every man has a right to everything, even another's body, as it may be valuable for his preservation; and thus it is a state of war and wretchedness, from which rational self-love leads men to emerge into the peace of an ordained commonwealth. The sovereign authority, be it vested in an individual or an assembly acting as one, must be unlimited, though subject to the laws of nature; and its commands are the final measure of right and wrong for the conduct of individuals, who must give them absolute obedience, so long as it affords protection and does not threaten them personally with grievous harm.

Cumberland (1632-1718) the first of the jural moralists so-called, who treat morality as a code of divine law, ascertainable by a consideration of the ordained relations between man and his fellows, lays down as the supreme law of nature, which includes all other laws, that the "greatest possible benevolence of every rational agent towards all the rest constitutes the happiest state of each and all, so far as depends on their own power, and is necessarily required for their happiness; accordingly, the Common Good will be the supreme law." The Divine Lawgiver provides a sanction in the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice, moral obligation depending primarily on the influence exercised over the will by these inducements to obedience. But rational beings rise from this earliest stage to that where obedience is governed by love to God, regard for his honor, and disinterested affection for the common good.

Locke (1633-1704) follows Hobbes in explaining good and evil as "nothing but pleasure and pain, or that which occasions or procures pleasure or pain." Moral good and evil he defines as "only the uniformity or disagreement of our voluntary actions to some law, whereby good and evil is drawn on us from the will and power of the law-giver." Though Locke does not suppose the rules of moral conduct to be intuitive, yet they can be formulated on principles intuitively known, and they are obligatory independently of political authority, as constituting the law of God, and are sanctioned by adequate rewards and punishments. The utility of the moral rules is a secondary consideration with Locke, but he shows that they have a tendency to promote the general happiness. This view is not fundamental to his theory, however, and hence, says Sidgwick, if it "be called utilitarian in respect of its method of determining right action, and not merely in respect of the motive it accepts as normal, it ought to be admitted that the utilitarianism is for the most part latent and unconscious."

The earliest writer of the second period of English ethics, who criticized Hobbes' theory, was Shaftesbury (1671-1713), the chief aim of whose reasoning is to show that the private and social affections which tend naturally to public good, are conducive also to the happiness of the individual exhibiting them. He divides impulses into "natural affections," "self-affections," and "unnatural affections." The first of these he defines as "such as are founded on love, complacency, good-will, and sympathy with the kind." The class of self-affections comprises love of

life, resentment of injury, bodily appetite, desire for the conveniences of life, emulation, or love of praise, indolence, or love of ease and rest. Unnatural affections include all malevolent impulses except resentment, with all impulses arising from depraved appetite, barbarous custom and superstition, and also certain self-affections when exorbitantly or monstrously developed. Self-affections constitute what is called self-love, and they promote the individual good only if kept within strict limits. When they begin to be mischievous to society, they are mischievous to the individual, but up to this point they are beneficial to both. The natural affections are the most conducive to the happiness of the person experiencing them, pleasures of body being inferior to those of mind, and benevolent affections giving the highest mental satisfaction. This is compounded of the pleasure arising from the benevolent emotion itself, the sympathetic enjoyment of the happiness of others, and the consciousness of their love and esteem.

Shaftesbury insists on the importance of the social affections in human life, saying that "to have these natural and good affections in full strength is to have the chief means and power of self-enjoyment; to want them is certain misery." A moral sense is not essential to his system, as he affirms that an individual without a moral sense would always find it to his interest "to maintain in himself precisely that balance of social and self-regarding affections that is most conducive to the good of the human species."

Sidgwick remarks: "Shaftesbury is the first moralist who distinctly takes psychological experience as the basis of ethics. His suggestions are developed by Hutcheson into one of the most elaborate systems of moral philosophy which we possess; and through Hutcheson, if not directly, they influenced Hume's speculations, and are thus connected with later Utilitarianism. Moreover, the substance of Shaftesbury's main argument was adopted by Butler."

With Butler's distinction between Self-love and Conscience began the controversy which led to the development of what is known as the Utilitarian system of morals. Self-love leads man "to attain the greatest happiness he can for himself in the present world." Coincident with self-love is benevolence, which, guided by reason, includes all virtues, and therefore a "disposition and endeavor to do good to all with whom we have to do, in the degree and manner which the different relations which we stand in to them require, is a discharge of all the obligations we are under to them." In accordance with this view, Butler maintains that the pleasures of love and sympathy are as much elements in the happiness aimed at by self-love as the pleasures of sense. Pleasure is not the primary aim even of the impulses of "self-affection," as required by Shaftesbury's theory, but rather that which attends the attainment of their natural ends. Thus Butler's argument requires the social affections to be as natural as the appetites and desires which constitute self-affection. Both alike tend to promote public and private good. While

one set of appetites tend primarily, when exercised within due limits, to the individual good, another set, such as desire of esteem, love of society, as distinct from affection to the good of it, indignation against successful vice, tend primarily to the public good. In addition to the natural passions and affections and the principles of Self-love and Benevolence, man possesses a conscience or principle of reflection "by which he approves or disapproves his heart, temper, and actions." Butler concludes that "reasonable self-love and conscience are the chief or superior principles in the nature of man; because an action may be suitable to this nature, though all other principles be violated, but becomes unsuitable if either of those are."

Hutcheson (1694-1747) agrees with Butler in regarding universal benevolence as the object of moral approbation, and in treating disinterested affections as essential parts of human nature. These principles do not conflict with calm self-love, the actions flowing from which have no hurtful effect upon others, as such actions are perfectly indifferent in a moral sense. The disposition which deserves the highest approbation is either the "calm, stable, universal good-will to all," which leads an individual to "desire the highest happiness of the greatest possible system of sensible beings," or the desire and love of moral excellence that always attends universal good-will. These principles cannot conflict, and they are supported by conscience, which is regarded by Hutcheson as an independent faculty, which he terms (after Shaftesbury) the Moral Sense. This is a natural sense of immediate excellence in certain affections and actions consequent thereupon. Hutcheson distinguishes between actions "materially" good and those "formally" good, and affirms that "that action is best which procures the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers, and the worst that which in a like manner occasions misery." He then lays down the principle which became the basis of Bentham's Utilitarianism.

Hume (1711-1776) regards moral approbation as derived from "humanity and benevolence," and as based on the sympathetic pleasure attendant on the recognition of the fact that virtue conduces to the interests of other human beings. But he insists that there is no obligation to virtue "except that of the agent's interest or happiness," reason being no motive to action, although it "directs the impulse received from appetite or inclination."

Adam Smith (1723-1790) differs from earlier moralists in deriving benevolence from sympathy, instead of the reverse. According to his theory, which is an application of the principle that each man finds pleasure "in the accord of his feelings with another's," the man of the most perfect virtue "is he who joins to the most perfect command of his own original and selfish feelings the most exquisite sensibility to the original and sympathetic feelings of others." Pleasure and pain are the chief objects of man's desire and aversion, and they are distinguished by immediate sense of feeling. If, therefore, virtue "be desirable for its

own sake, and if vice be in the same manner the object of aversion, it cannot be reason which originally distinguishes those different qualities, but immediate sense and feeling." Conscience itself is based in sympathy, and Sidgwick remarks that both Hume and Smith are allied to the modern school of utilitarians, "so far as they lay stress on the general relation of the moral sense to sympathy."

Hartley (1705-57) bases his moral system, which is strictly psychological, on the idea of association, which operates on mental phenomena in a manner analogous to chemical combination. He divides pleasures and pains into six classes, corporeal pleasures being the lowest, and forming the foundation of the rest, each of which is more complex than the class immediately beneath it. The pleasures of the moral sense are the most complex, as coming last and being due to the blending of the preceding classes. Pains undergo a similar blending, which "causes the sense of guilt and anxiety that arises when we reflect on our own vices." The proper function in human development of rational self-interest is the "begetting in ourselves the disposition of benevolence, Pity and the Moral Sense . . . so that reasonable self-love may receive its fullest satisfaction by its own extinction. For the pleasures of sympathy, theopathy and the moral sense, unlike the inferior kinds, may be pursued without danger of excess, and without mutual conflict." Owing to the difficulty of calculating consequences, Hartley thinks the general rule that every action should be directed towards producing the greatest happiness and the least misery to others, must be subordinated to less general rules, "such as (beside obedience to Scripture) regard to our own moral sense and that of others and to our natural motions of good will and compassion," preference for near relations over strangers, and for benevolent and religious persons, regard for veracity and obedience to the civil magistrate."

With Paley (1743-1805) obligation arises from the command of some authority, moral obligation being based on the command of the Divine Being, and sanctioned by future reward and punishment. God wills the happiness of his creatures, as evidenced by the action of nature, and hence the tendency of actions to promote or diminish the general happiness may be used as a criterion of morality, that is, of "coming at the will of God." By reference to this, utility supports the obligation of moral rule. There are, however, actions which are not right, although apparently useful, and the public authority should forbid them. Moral government must proceed by general rules which include the idea of reward and punishment. Paley's system is one of pure expediency. He expressly affirms that "whatever is expedient is right."

The moral system of Bentham (1748-1842) is based on the principle laid down by Hutcheson of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." This he declares to be "a plain but true standard for whatever is right and wrong in the field of morals," although he also affirms that the "constantly proper end of action on the part of every individual

at the moment of action is his real greatest happiness from that moment to the end of his life." To insure that the true consequences—pleasurable or painful—of actions may be known, a systematic registration of their effects should be made. Their general good and bad tendency may be ascertained by reference to their intensity and duration and other characters, but no attention is to be given to mere difference of quality. The sanctions for moral conduct Bentham classifies as "physical," "political" and "moral," those which are provided by the ordinary course of nature, those arising from judicial action, and the action of individuals, "according to each man's spontaneous disposition," to which he adds the religious sanction of pleasure and pain dependent on the action of a divine being.

Sidgwick remarks that one section of Bentham's school "maintained it to be a cardinal doctrine of utilitarianism that a man always gains his own greatest happiness by promoting that of others; another section, represented by John Austin, apparently returned to Paley's position, and treated utilitarian morality as a code of divine legislation; others, with Grote, were content to abate the severity of the claims made by "general happiness" on the individual, and to consider utilitarian duty as practically limited to reciprocity; while on the opposite side the most unqualified subordination of private to general happiness was advocated by J. S. Mill."

Although Mill enforces the utilitarian principle that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness, he does not make happiness the sole or direct end of human action. Virtue may come to be recognized as good in itself without regard to its pleasurable consequences. The moral faculty, Mill supposes to be natural, though not innate, and he asserts that it can be cultivated in almost any direction. It is natural as being founded in the social feelings of man, of which he says: "The deeply rooted conception which every individual even now has of himself, as a social being, tends to make him feel it one of his natural wants that there should be harmony between his feelings and aims and those of his fellow-creatures.......The conviction is the ultimate sanction of the greatest happiness morality." The "feeling of unity with his fellow-creatures, which thus constitutes a powerful motive for right conduct, may be wanting altogether, and is usually much inferior in strength to the selfish feelings, but those who have it feel it to be an attribute which it would not be well to be without." Mill follows Hartley in referring the love of virtue for its own sake to the law of association of feelings and ideas. The moral sentiments arise from "very numerous and complex elements" which are blended in such a manner that they are very unlike the sum of the elements from which they spring, and virtuous conduct may thus become habitual. By the law of association, those feelings and ideas through which whatever is included in the words useful and desirable is obtained, come to give immediate satisfaction and are distinguished

as moral. The means to some further end comes to be regarded as a virtue in itself. By repeated virtuous acts, the tendency to virtuous conduct may be so decided and strong that it will assert itself "even when the reward which the virtuous man receives from the consciousness of well-doing is anything bnt an equivalent for the suffering he undergoes or the wishes he may have to renounce."

Utilitarians thus "not only place virtue at the very head of the things which are good as means to the ultimate end, but they also recognize as a psychological fact the possibility of its being, to the individual, a good in itself, without looking to any end beyond it." That which was at first desired and therefore willed comes to be desired because it is willed. Thus virtuous habits are formed. Persistent virtuous conduct tends to become habitual.

John Stuart Mill says that the feeling which consists in an eternal sanction of duty, whatever the standard of duty may be, "when disinterested and connecting itself with the pure idea of duty and not with some particular form of it, or with any of the merely accessory circumstances, is the essence of conscience."

The binding force of obligation "consists in the existence of a mass of feeling which must be broken through in order to do what violates our standard of right, and which, if we do nevertheless violate that standard, will probably have to be encountered afterwards in the form of remorse."

(To be concluded.)

THE CREED.

WHOEVER was begotten by pure love,
And came desired and welcomed into life,
Is of immaculate conception. He
Whose heart is full of tenderness and truth,
Who loves mankind more than he loves himself,
And cannot in his heart find room for hate,
May be another Christ. We all may be
The Saviors of the world, if we believe
In the Divinity which dwells in us
And worship it, and nail our grosser selves,
Our tempers, greeds, and our unworthy aims,
Upon the cross. Who giveth love to all,
Pays kindness for unkindness, smiles for frowns,
And lends new courage to each fainting heart,
And strengthens hope, and scatters joy abroad,—
He, too, is a Redeemer, Son of God.

—Ella Wheeler Wilcox

AEROLITES AND RELIGION.

(A Paper read before the Royal Society of Canada, May 18, 1895.)

BY ARTHUR HARVEY, TORONTO.

FEW natural phenomena are more terrifying than the fall of an aerolite. A ball of fire, often said to be "as big as the moon," suddenly appears, moving with marvellous swiftness. A noise, as of cannon, followed by the rattle of musketry, stuns the ears. Perhaps a cloud is formed, emitting a shower of stones. Sometimes there is a second loud report, a continuous rumbling that lasts for minutes, a hissing sound, and thousands of missiles bombard an area several miles across. Or there may be a whizz from a body enveloped in smoke, leaving a trail of fire. The fireball may emit jets of flame and disappear with a noise as of distant thunder, or it may actually fall in the sight of the observer. It may rush at the rate of twenty miles a second over a thousand miles of earth and sea, at a height of a hundred miles or so, dropping a fragment here and another there, or it may come vertically down. If it buries itself in the soil, it may penetrate several feet. If it falls in the ocean, it is, of course, for ever lost. But it may strike a rock with but a scanty covering, or ice or snow, or hard-packed sand, or trees and even buildings. Then it is usually found to be hot, and of a shape, color and material utterly unlike the stones of earth.

It would be surprising if in the earlier ages of the world men had not seen in the meteorite, not merely a message from the gods, but a messenger—a very god himself. All natural religion begins with fear, though it may end with love, and in the study of the history of religions it may be that the sun and his powers have received too exclusive attention. Zeus has certainly been ethnically, etymologically, astronomically supreme; yet the thunderstorm, with its attendant terrors, or the rarer but more dreadful meteorite, must have received the earliest notice of primitive man, whether on the prairies of America, the steppes of Russia, the dry littoral of the Mediterranean, or the sandy plains of Arabia. There are, indeed, many traces of a very early and very widely-spread cult of the aerolite, especially among the races of nomadic habits, and to some of these this paper is intended to refer.

In the Greek fable, Chronos used to devour his children (*Tempus edax rerum*), but, one day, they saved Zeus by giving his father a stone to crunch, instead. The stone itself, Pausanias says, was shown at Delphi, near the tomb of Neoptolemos, in the precincts sacred to Apollo. This was probably an aerolite. The image of Diana at Ephesus, referred to by Euripides and in the Acts, is described as a bust, with many breasts, tapering to a pedestal, the whole of black stone. It fell from heaven, and part of it may have been an aerolite, or it may

have been made to replace the old aerolithic deity. The club of Hercules, worshipped in Thrace, was probably a Thor's hammer, the Thracians being of Northern kin, and an aerolite. Like the images or symbols of Apollo, the guardian of the ways, and of the Paphian Venus, it was said to have fallen from above. These uncertain instances are adduced first, because the opportunity is afforded thereby to prove that it is not important as a matter of religion to discriminate between a real and an imaginary aerolite. A gentleman still living in Toronto, having purchased from a farmer near Niagara a nodule containing quartz crystals, read a paper to a learned society, in which he explained its structure as being that of a planetoid, rounded, flattened at the poles, and he argued that the interior of our globe might be crystalline too. There is little doubt that the farmer saw a meteorite fall, and, picking up this geode, believed it to be the aerolite. Again, one of the secretaries of the Astronomical Society of Toronto, whose family thought they saw a meteorite fall into a snow-bank, delved into the drift and brought up a water-worn pebble of gneiss, which a less experienced person might have sworn to be an areolite. So with the objects of the ancients' veneration: it could make little difference whether they were really meteorites or not, provided they were believed to have fallen from the skies.

To ascertain the probable views of the folks of the early ages in Europe, let us now see how the untutored races of the present day regard the aerolite.

Professor Garner, the well-known student of the speech of monkeys, who says the negroes of the Guinea Coast do not believe in a beneficent deity, but rather in a being who does harm, tells the writer that in one African village he found the chief public treasure was two stones, about the size of hens' eggs. The natives said they had been shot out from the sun and had killed this malevolent being, who, however, had revived. They thought the stones had been alive, and because they still made fire when struck together, they thought they were not dead yet, but were in a sort of trance. So they built a house for them, and very carefully guarded them.

The Rev. H. S. Taylor, in the Report of the Government Central Museum of Madras, 1890, gives an instructive account of the fall of a meteor. Two aerolites travelling through space together, or two pieces torn asunder by explosion, had fallen at Parmallee, Madras, India, February 28, 1857, reaching the earth two miles apart. Persons were standing near each place of fall. "Many," says Mr. Taylor, "worshipped them." And again: "Of the excitement among the natives I need not speak....Some of them supposed they were gods that had fallen."

The American Indians have from time immemorial regarded aerolites as sacred objects. Many specimens of meteoric iron have been found near the "altars" in the mounds of Ohio. One is an amulet in the shape of a large ring, and another, figured and described by Mr. G. F. Kunz, in the *American Journal of Science*, has still in it the point of a copper chisel, which broke off as the aborigine

was trying to split the mass. In the Dacotah winter counts (*vide* Report of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, 1882-83) there are symbols of the fall of an aerolite in 1821-22, and the explanation given of the two separate "counts" is "Large ball of fire with hissing noise," and "a large roaring star fell." The meteorite in Victoria College Museum, of which Prof. A. F. Coleman has given an analysis in the Transactions of this society, is alluded to by the Rev. Geo. McLean, now of Port Arthur, in his "Indians in Canada." For long ages, he tells us, the natives say it lay there, and they attributed to it mysterious powers, he thinks on account of its weight (specific gravity 7.784). Though many had tried to lift it, all had failed, and when they heard the white men had taken it away they put their hands to their mouths and said, "The white man is very strong." They much regretted its removal, and their medicine men prophesied that evil would come upon the tribes and the buffalo forsake the country. The Rev. J. Macdougall, of Morleyville, whose father had it removed, tells the writer that the place where it fell was named on its account Pe-wah-bisk Kah-ah-pit or "the iron, where it lay." Though it had been there from time immemorial, the Indians knew it had fallen from heaven. On passing the place, or anywhere near it, they would go to the spot and leave upon it a piece of tobacco, a broken arrow-head, or some such offering, for they wished the spirit which had sent it to protect them, or at least not to interfere with them in their forays. They also thought it had grown, because their forefathers could lift it, while they could not.

There was an aerolite at Witchita, Kansas, which in a similar way the tribes there reverenced. We can after this reflect without surprise on the great aerolite placed on the Aztec pyramid of Cholula or those set on other Mexican teocallis

Mr. Keary, in his "Outlines of Primitive Belief," speaks of the conical shaped stones and the stumps which were conspicuous in the religions of the Syrians and Phœnicians as fetishes, and as perhaps connected with Phallic worship, and thus almost contemptuously dismisses the subject. "Phallic worship" is a good term to conjure by. It serves the mythologist as the glacial theory has served the geologist, to explain everything otherwise inexplicable, or as the term "subjective mind" now serves the psychologist to unravel the knotty questions of mind-reading and second-sight. Surely the above examples of the creeds of various simple peoples are enough to show the real state of the belief of prehistoric men in Europe and Asia, as regards these heaven-sent stones.

We can now proceed to speak of the development of this cult, which has left so many traces on historical pages that it appears to have had a considerable vogue, especially where the Arabian influence prevailed. That intellectual and warlike race had a wide empire in the time of the shepherd kings of Egypt. Under the Tobbaas of the Christian era their sway extended to China, while under the successors of Mohamet they ruled from India to France. They were, from the earliest times, much given to astronomical studies, the appearance of

certain stars being the signal for certain kinds of work. Each tribe had a tutelary star, and the worship of the meteorite appears to have been common among them. There were several temples in Arabia where such sacred stones were reverenced. One, at Petra, was dedicated to a god who had the attributes of Mars, an appropriate dedication, for celestial phenomena have always had much influence on armies. The worship seems, however, to have become in time encrusted with idolatry; images were placed in the temples, and a new litholatry had replaced the old form when Mahomet appeared upon the scene, destroyed the figures and the temples too, excepting one, at Mecca. This is of especial interest here, because the traveller Burton, in his "Mecca and Medina," says that, after an examination of full ten minutes, he is convinced the celebrated black stone there reverenced, and kissed by every pilgrim, is a meteorite.

This shrine was probably the one referred to by Diodorus (200 B. C.) when he says the Bizomenians possess the most sacred fane in all Arabia, and the strength of inherited religious beliefs and customs is nowhere better shown than in its history. It was several times rebuilt, had gates and palisadings given it that were forged from captured weapons, was adorned with images and dowered with gold. It even endured through Mahomet's iconoclastic times. He did, indeed, remove the great idol that stood above the Kaaba, or shrine proper, and the various other images and objects the Arabians had venerated there; but his order that the faithful should turn in prayer towards Jerusalem was so obnoxious that it had to be rescinded, and the black stone became and remains the central point of the Mohammedan world. The Kaaba is said to have been built by Abraham, at the divine command, and to be modelled on the oratory of Adam. Isaac furnished the material, and the black stone served as a scaffold, being miraculously raised or lowered to suit Abraham's convenience in building. This stone is fabled to have been as white as milk, but to have become black with the sins of unbelievers. Burton says it is of a reddish-brown color, with shining points—just what a crypto-siderite after frequent rubbing might well be.

It seems difficult to believe that the kings of the Amorites, upon whom we are told in Joshua, 10 : 11, that "the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died," were not the victims of a shower of aerolites, especially when it is added in Judges 5 : 20, that "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." Prof. McCurdy, of Toronto, is opinion that stones from heaven mean hail, and says the word "hailstones" in the latter part of the verse is simply a plainer term for "stones from heaven," and the ordinary word for hail as well as for stones is employed, viz., "bārād."

The cult of aerolites at Rome was of Eastern origin, and we will accompany two of them on their westward travels to that city.

In the year 204 B.C. aerolites fell oftener than usual. The decemvirs therefore consulted the Sybilline books, and found "that a foreign enemy landed on Italian

soil could be driven off by bringing the Idæan mother from Pessinus to Rome." At this time Hannibal's terrible grip was loosening, and the consuls were preparing to carry the war into Africa. Great events were in the air. The crisis of an intense struggle was reached. The men at the helm of state felt the turning of the tide, but, wishing to leave nothing undone that would command success, desired to fan religious fervor while levies were being raised. Revivalism (*repens religio*) and drill were, as in the time of Cromwell, enjoined. The Senate had recently made good friends of the Oracle of Delphi, and had been assured that a crowning victory was in store for them, so the embassy they sent to Attalus, of Phrygia, their only Asiatic ally, in charge of a squadron of five line-of-battle ships, visited Delphi *en route*. The priests told the ambassadors that Attalus would grant their requests, and that on obtaining the goddess-mother they were to select the best of their citizens to receive her and welcome her to Rome. Attalus accordingly met the envoys with all kindness at Pergamus, his capital, took them to Pessinus, and gave them a sacred stone which the residents said was the mother of the gods. Sending one of their number forward to announce success, they followed at leisure. Meantime, more prodigies at home. Two suns were seen. (Parhelia, so common here, are rare in Italy.) It grew light at night-time. (Query—An aurora?) A bolide like a torch flew from east to west across the sky. Lightning struck several important places; and a great crash, without apparent cause, was heard in one of Juno's temples. When, finally, another shower of stones occurred, they had a day of general supplication and nine days of religious exercises and consultations how to receive the ancestral goddess. She was coming—the vessels were at Terracina—then at Ostia, the mouth of the Tiber. They chose Publius Cornelius Scipio. (Livy will neither tell nor guess at the exact reason why he was thought the worthiest of the Romans.) With him all the matrons of the city streamed out to Ostia. He put out from shore to receive the goddess in the roadstead, and, on returning, he delivered her to the matrons, who received her with enthusiasm, and, passing her along the ladies'-chain from hand to hand, in that strange way they carried her to Rome. There were censers at the gates, from which clouds of the smoke of spices perfumed the air. All the people implored the goddess to enter the city as a friend and to look on the Roman State with a favoring eye. Then they placed the Idæan mother in the Temple of Victory, and enriched her with abundant gifts. We have no data concerning the shape, size, weight, or general appearance of this stone, but we can infer from the above that it was a comparatively small fragment, of perhaps thirty pounds in weight. It is reported, though not by Livy, that an image had been made in a female form and dress, and the stone placed on it for a head or face. This was probably a true aerolite.

There is no room to doubt the meteoric origin of the great black stone of Emesa, Syria, for it is described with scientific precision by Herodian. This was

worshipped with divine honor by the natives of the locality, while neighboring kings and satraps sent annual presents of gold and silver and precious stones to adorn the great temple in which it was housed. At the beginning of the third century A.D., this god-mountain, El Gabal, was being served by a handsome lad of some fourteen summers, with dances and the music of cymbals, flutes and drums, the young priest being arrayed in richly-embroidered garments of cloth of gold, when the Roman legionaries, by intrigues it is not now profitable to recount, were led to proclaim him Imperator. The stone was cone-shaped, probably like an old-fashioned sugar-loaf. It stood on the round end, and tapered to a point. It had upon its surface small bumps (*exochas bracheias*) and indentations (*typous*). Its crust was black (*melaina te he chroia*). There were marks upon it thought to indicate the figure of the god. (Query—Von Widmanstatten lines?) And it was held in reverence because it had fallen from heaven (*diopete te auton einai semnologousin*). As the young enthusiast could not well get to Rome at once, he sent a great painting of the stone and himself in the act of adoration, which was put up by his orders above the statue of Victory in the Senate chamber. The next year he entered Rome, and built a magnificent temple for this strange god, whose image, unlike those of Greek and Roman gods, was not made with hands. He had Syrian maidens dance and musicians circle in procession round it. Hecatombs of victims he sacrificed before it, cattle and sheep. Rivulets of the best and oldest wines mingled with their blood. The chief officers of the army and of the state assisted, in barbaric costume, to elevate above their heads the golden vessels used in the ceremonies, while in a wondering ring stood all that was noblest in the Eternal City. Those who smiled or dared to scoff were mercilessly slain. Every officiating priest of other gods had to preface his litany with the name of Elagabalus. When the stone was brought into the city it was in a chariot adorned profusely with gems and precious metals ; the horses, white, were led—no mortal being allowed to drive—and the emperor himself walked backward in front of the aerolite, as being wishful to gaze uninterruptedly at the divine symbols. In the height of summer, the stone was in like manner carried to a country seat, the roads being strewn with gold-dust on its path. Soon the emperor, who, by the way, married and divorced three wives in as many years, thought the god would be better pleased if he were mated too, so to his fane he brought the Palladium, which had been from the dawn of Roman history concealed from every eye. The fancy did not last long, he thought the Palladium too martial and severe in temper, and he sent to Carthage for the equally prehistoric Ourania (Virgo Cælestis), which Dido set up there when she first measured off its liberties with her famous strips of ox-hide. It is not stated how this escaped when Scipio razed the city, and, perhaps, it was an image, not a stone. With his rouged cheeks and blackened eyes or eye-lashes, with his strange vesture and barbaric orgies, the soldiers soon tired of him, and when the inside

ring had matters well prepared, an end was put to this farce and to the life of the acolyte emperor (the priest, perhaps, of a debased Zoroastrian or Mithraite creed) at or about the time of his eighteenth birthday. Exit from history the stone he worshipped, with its pittings, crust, markings and other unmistakable characteristics of aerolites.

To conclude this paper without some reference to the significance of the noise which accompanies the meteors would be improper. Like thunder, it was the voice of the gods. In the well-known passage in Livy which recounts how stones fell on the Alban mount, in the reign of Tullus Hostilius, in a swirl like a gust of hail (*conglobati*), there is an interpretation of the voices of the explosion—"Neglect not the worship of your local deities." Something should be said, too, of the talismanic properties attributed to weapons made from meteorites, such as the scimitar of Attila, which may have been made from meteoric iron, and the poniard of Jehangir, which certainly was.

The latest notable instance of a connection between aerolites and religion is in 1492, when, at Ensisheim, Maximilian fought a battle after a shower of meteors and won it. The largest of the aerolites was long preserved in the church there, and Maximilian, subsequently negotiating with the Turks, referred to this event as a seal of the divine favor.

EVEN theologians have got so far as to struggle to show that science and revelation can be made to agree. In this, we know they will not succeed; but it is a testimony to the strength and consideration which science has obtained.—*Harriet Martineau.*

THE progress of truth is ever slow, while error moves with rapid pace. The reason is obvious. Error is seized by a class of minds which asks no evidence; while the searchers for truth adopt it only after the most deliberate examination. —*Gen. O. M. Mitchell.*

To read the book on Coral Reefs is, indeed, to take a lesson of the deepest value in applied inductive canons. Every fact is duly marshalled; every conclusion is drawn by the truest and most legitimate process from careful observation or crucial experiment. Bit by bit, Darwin shows most admirably that, through gradual submergence, fringing reefs are developed into barrier reefs, and these again into atolls or lagoon islands; and incidentally he throws a vivid light on the slow secular movements upward or downward for ever taking place in the world's crust. But the value of the work as a geological record, great as it is, is as nothing compared with its value as a training exercise in inductive logic. Darwin was now learning by experience how to use his own immense powers.—*Grant Allen, "Charles Darwin," p.* 68.

FROM LIFE'S PAGES.

BY WALT. A. RATCLIFFE, LISTOWEL, ONT.

WISDOM woos, and they who heed her
Hand in hand do walk with Truth,
Till their hearts, attuned to gladness,
Sing again the songs of youth ;
All along their upward journey
In that fair lamp's steady glow,
Lo ! the book of life is open,
And they read it as they go.

I have learn'd that all of sadness
Is not seen in Sorrow's tears ;
I have learn'd that all the music
Is not made among the spheres ;
All the songs of all the seraphs
Cannot gladden any day,
If our soul of soul is songless
All is discord by the way.

I have read of boastful knowledge
Men have woo'd from musty tomes,
Stately temples they have reared him—
I have seen their gilded domes ;
But I've learned, as I have journeyed,
That I'm nearest all that's good
When my heart can catch the anthem
Of the choir of the wood.

Minster spires skyward pointing
Warn the erring of the rod
That must surely come upon them
From the dwelling-place of God ;
But I know my soul is strongest,
And my ills are surest healed,
When his autograph I'm reading
In the lilies of the field.

COMMERCIAL MORALITY.

BY GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE.

FEW things more valuable or more relevant to the ethical needs of the day have appeared anywhere than the articles in *The Open Court* on the "Doctrines of Buddha." There is newness in the wholesome ethics of *Karma* nobler than the familiar Christian teaching, which seems second-hand, egotistical and stale by the side of it. The late Lord Derby said : "The greatest British interest is peace." Should we not rather say the greatest interest of mankind is morality? and commercial morality constitutes a greater part of the life and glory of a nation.

Some information as to how we in England stand in this respect will be relevant, and possibly interesting.

We have an Ethical Society which gives lectures at Essex Hall, Strand, in the city of London. I lately heard one there, lured by the name of Augustine Birrell, a member of Parliament, who is always original, with flashes of humor and wit, and is wisely entertaining. But I on this occasion found him surprising —in what he did not say. Discussion was permitted, but no information was supplied whether it was expected or merely tolerated ; whether it was regarded as a right or an interruption No information was given to the audience upon the subject, or I should have asked the lecturer for the expression of some additional opinion beyond what he vouchsafed.

The lecturer began by remarks upon the Sermon on the Mount, which he told us contained precepts the common sense of mankind regarded as absurd and impracticable. I should like to have asked whether Mr. Birrell did not think it a great misfortune that one who was regarded as a divine teacher should have brought morality into contempt by putting forth precepts which the world must ignore if society is to exist. Bishop Magee had said this in a famous speech, and subsequently defended his representation. At the conclusion of his lecture Mr. Birrell extolled Christ as the flawless, unsurpassed, transcendant moral teacher of mankind ; but as so many speakers in pulpit and on platform do this, it did not strike me as strange, nor yet did I think it ethical.

My surprise came in later. Mr. Birrell's subject was "City Morality." As I had never heard of it, I was very desirous of learning in what it consisted. He said that the morality of the city accepted the principle that in commerce it is justifiable in the seller to withhold any information which the buyer could find out for himself. How can the ordinary buyer find out whether food, or drugs, or garments are adulterated ; whether there is shoddy in his coat or pasteboard under the soles of his boots, or whether colors will fade, and a thousand things from which nothing but honesty and candor in the seller can save the purchaser? The motto of the city, Mr. Birrell said, was, "Let the buyer beware of

the seller." This seemed to me to be the motto of knaves, and I told the International Congress in Paris the other day that this motto implied that behind every counter there probably stood a knave. The tradesman may be an honest man, and often is, who would not cheat by his speech, but he may by his silence. This is competitive morality. Mr. Birrell did not seem to be aware that there was a large commercial house in the city, a branch of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, whose business transactions amount now to nearly a million a month, whose principle is to make known to the purchaser anything known to the vendor which the purchaser ought to know. This rule is in the laws of all British co-operative stores. Why should the morality of city gentlemen be lower than that of workingmen co operators?

Afterwards I took an opportunity of asking Mr. Birrell whether I rightly understood him as saying "that the morality of the city accepted the principle that in commerce it is justifiable to withhold any information which the customer or buyer could find out for himself." Though Quain professor of law in the London University, with parliamentary and other duties, he courteously made time or found time to tell me that:

"The rule *caveat emptor*, when it is applicable, covers *silence*. A vendor, if he opens his mouth, must not *lie* (as distinguished from mere puffing), but he may hold his peace unless the *defect* is a concealed one. The rule also applies in favor of the buyer. Suppose an estate is put up for sale with a valuable mine underneath it, of the existence of which the purchaser is, and the vendor is not, cognizant; a contract for the sale and purchase of the estate would be binding. Mr. Justice Story states the law thus: 'The general rule, both of law and equity, in respect to concealment, is that mere silence with regard to a material fact which there is not legal obligation to divulge, will not avoid a contract though it operate as an injury to the party from whom it is concealed.'

"In a well known case the late Mr. Justice Blackburn says: 'A mere abstinence from disabuse to the purchaser of an inaccurate impression is not fraud or deceit, for whatever may be the case in a court of morals there is no legal obligation in the vendor to inform the purchaser that he is under a mistake *not induced by the act of the vendor*.'

"In certain cases there is an obligation to disclose: (1) Where a fiduciary relationship exists (*agent* and *principal*, *solicitor* and *client*, *trustee* and *beneficiary*).

"(2) Certain contracts are from their character considered as Marine Insurance Partnerships. In these cases full disclosure must be made of all material facts. In other words, in these cases the law adopts the *moral* view up to the hilt; but in the other cases it takes the view that people must look out for themselves, and that though it is illegal to cheat people, there is no harm in allowing people to cheat themselves."

These were the legal grounds which Mr. Birrell explained to his audience as the law of city morality by which we were all instructed. But my surprise was that he uttered no word against the commercial morality of fraud by silence. Is it not the very business of an ethical lecture, given in the name of an ethical society, to show us not only what *is*, but what *ought* to be? If an ethical lecturer does not do this, who is likely to do it, and to whom are we to look for the lessons which shall impart honesty to commerce and raise it above the level of war or fraud?—*Open Court*.

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS.

BY "RAMLED."

THE Rev. Alex. Hislop, in his "Two Babylons"—a work that was published under the auspices of a Christian Missionary Society, and has passed through seven editions—conclusively proved that Christian Rome got its religion from Babylon. This included dogma, rites, symbolism, ceremonial and festivals. He proved that the trinity, the worship of the mother and son, the incarnation of God, the doctrine of original sin, the immaculate conception, the descent, the ascension, the weeping of Mater Dolorosa; in short, the entire series of myths, doctrines, prophecies, and miracles which constitute the business and properties of the Christian drama, were all drawn from Chaldean sources. At the same time Dr. Hislop held that Protestant Christianity,—"true" Christianity, his Christianity,—was derived from the Word of God, the teachings of Jesus, Son of God, and the Acts of the Apostles. It was these reservations that enabled his book to pass the scrutiny of the religious press, and gain access to a very considerable portion of the religious world.

While the present writer finds it difficult to associate the wide reading, the profound acumen, and the logical ability evinced by Dr. Hislop, with continued belief in the divine authorship of the Bible, or the divine mission of Jesus and his twelve apostles, he has no right to question the doctor's sincerity. But he proposes to go a step farther in the same direction. While he does not yield to Dr. Hislop, or anybody else, in his reverence for those fundamental precepts which have always formed the basis of the moral code in civilised states, such as truth, honesty, justice, philanthropy, love and filial respect, he cannot share his credulity.

The "higher criticism" which has appeared since Dr. Hislop published his remarkable researches, has proved, beyond any doubt, that the so-called Word of God is the compilation of a few clever, but illiterate monks, who were ignorant of languages, history, astronomy, geology, geography, and even astrology, a branch of learning that was peculiarly their own. The archæological discoveries of recent years, especially of the dates on marbles and coins, prove that the entire history of the gentle suffering Jesus is a fiction, a poem, a religious rhapsody, of the sixth or seventh century, and that all the evidences which support an earlier existence of the New Testament are forged or perverted, the common methods of imposture being to alter some existing work, or to attribute it to a well-known writer of a more ancient period, or to epitomise and interpolate the work, and impute it to an imaginary author associated with a long previous era.

Among these impostures of the medieval Roman Church is a list of Christian chief-pontiffs from Peter to Siricius. No such offices, no such officials ever existed. On the contrary, the chief-pontiffs of Rome,

during this period, were the Emperors of Rome, beginning with Augustus, and ending with Theodosius. Their names and offices are proclaimed on their coins, and in their public acts and decrees, and it would have been anathema and death to anyone else within the Roman empire to have claimed the title, or exercised the office of the chief-pontiff. There is not a cavern in the Alps, nor a desert in Africa so secret or remote as to have saved that man from being torn to pieces who would have dared to assume this sacred title, or attempt to exercise the slightest function pertaining to the office. There is no record of such an attempt, except in the forged and perverted histories which the Italian monks have forced down the throats of a credulous world.

A far graver imposture has been the alteration of the calendar. Livy claims that Piso altered the Roman Pagan calendar to the extent of two years by omitting the consulates of A. U. 447-8. Mr. Bryce, in his "Later Roman Empire," shows that Leo III. altered the Roman Christian calendar to the extent of one year. It can be shown that the alterations were far more important than either of these historians suspected, or were willing to admit. It can be shown that Augustus altered the Pagan Roman calendar to the extent of 78 years, and that the Christian popes altered the Christian Roman calendar to the extent of 15 years the other way. These alterations, especially the last one, have so greatly perverted our chronology, that several learned and critical writers, as Father Hardouin in the 17th century and Professor Johnson in the 19th, have supposed that the alterations in the calendar amounted to several centuries of time. The truth of the matter, however, is settled beyond all question by the coins, not the Roman coins alone, but by contemporary issues of the Roman, Moslem, and Oriental mints.

The religion that existed not merely in the city of Rome, but throughout the Roman Empire, from Augustus to Theodosius, was not the worship of Jesus, Son of God and Mary, which worship was totally unknown at that period, but of Augustus, son of Apollo and Maia. It was Augustus who was predicted by the soothsayers, and sung by the poets ; it was Augustus whose divine and miraculous birth was hailed by auspicious omens, and followed by miracles and portents ; it was Augustus who was hailed as the Prince of Peace in the Fourth Eclogue ; it was Augustus who assumed the sacred titles of Jasius and Quirinus, and who thrice closed the brazen gates of his temple in token of the golden age of peace which he had brought to the Roman world ; it was Augustus, the living not the dead Augustus, who was worshipped throughout the empire as God incarnate, to whom an Augustine priesthood chanted litanies, to whom propitiatory offerings and sacrifices were made by more than 100 millions of people, to whom Horace fawned and Ovid prayed on bended knees, and who was recognized not only throughout the empire as the long-predicted Son of God, but identified in India with Salivahana, the Son of God and the Virgin.

When this impious and blasphemous cult fell into a decline, and when

the vices and crimes of successive sovereign-pontiffs of Rome proved only too plainly that they were unworthy of the divine homage which the priesthood inculcated, the laws commanded and the magistrates enforced, the religion of Rome reverted to that Dionysian form which had always remained close to the popular heart, because it aspired to freedom, to escape from tyranny, to a future world of bliss, and to social equality on earth and justice in heaven—or hell.

It is the tombstones and other monuments of this Dionysian period—the first three or four centuries of our era—that have served so well to delude the modern world. When Christianity, which is a development of the Bacchic cult, succeeded its progenitor, it had but few alterations to make in order to fit the old monuments to the new myth. The cross, the svastica, the triune obelisk, the cup, the umbrella, the fishes, the bleeding heart, all these symbols, as Dr. Hislop has abundantly shown, were Bacchic. They were all adopted by the Christians, and then employed to prove the antiquity of their new religion, as they are still employed for the same purpose. Happily, there are other testimonies, not so susceptible of perversion, which establish the truth, and the truth is, that Christianity as an organized religion preaching the divinity or semi-divinity of Jesus Christ, Son of God and Mary, is but little older than Mahometanism. The earliest image of, and unmistakable allusion to Jesus, on any monument known to exist or to have existed, is stamped on a coin of Justinian II. after his restoration A. D. 708.

The Christian religion was not two centuries, perhaps not a century, old at that period. The interval between the decline of the Augustan cult and the establishment of Christianity, must be filled with the Dionysian worship, whose emblems and doctrine appear upon numerous monuments of that period. Among the most interesting of these are the Ogham inscriptions to Liber Pater, found in the British Isles, because they bring the matter within the range of familiar subjects. However, the object of this communication is neither to fill the voids in Dr. Hislop's work, nor to restore the historical palimpsests which Italian forgery has covered with fabulous adventures of manufactured gods and goddesses, but rather to show that doctrinal Christianity is inconsistent with civil liberty, and that such antagonism has already imperilled the victory gained to humanity by the Protestant Reformation and by the revolutions and civil wars which have occurred since that event. So long as Christianity includes the worship of the fabulous personages invented by the Italian priests, so long as it inculcates the anti-Dionysian dogmas (original sin, etc.), which it has borrowed from the Brahminical Church, it will continue to be at war with history and chronology, and drift us helplessly into that arcana of falsehood and perversion whose headquarters are in Rome, and which alone can supply the corresponding portions of a fabulous cosmos. I reserve this phase of the subject for a future article.
—*The Agnostic Journal.*

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO INGERSOLL.

A Plea for Rational Education.

Let us be honest. Let us preserve the veracity of our souls. Let education commence in the cradle—in the lap of the loving mother. This is the first school. The teacher, the mother, should be absolutely honest. The nursery should not be an asylum for lies. Parents should be modest enough to be truthful—honest enough to admit their ignorance.

Nothing should be taught as true that cannot be demonstrated. Every child should be taught to doubt, to inquire, to demand reasons. Every soul should defend itself—should be on its guard against falsehood, deceit, and mistake, and should beware of all kinds of confidence men, including those in the pulpit.

Children should be taught to express their doubts—to demand reasons. The object of education should be to develop the brain—to quicken the senses. Every school should be a mental gymnasium. The child should be equipped for the battle of life. Credulity, implicit obedience, are the virtues of slaves and the enslavers of the free All should be taught that there is nothing too sacred to be investigated, nothing too holy to be understood. Each mind has the right to lift all curtains, to withdraw all veils, to scale all walls, to explore all recesses, all heights, all depths, for itself, in spite of church or creed, of priest or book.

The great volume of Nature should be open to all. None but the intelligent and honest can really read this book. Prejudice clouds and darkens every page Hypocrisy reads and misquotes, and credulity accepts the quotation. Superstition cannot read a line or spell the shortest word. And yet this volume holds all knowledge, all truth, and is the only source of thought! Mental liberty means the right of all to read this book. Here the Pope and the peasant are equal. Each must read for himself, and each ought to honestly and fearlessly give to his fellow men what he learns.

There is no authority in churches or priests, no authority in numbers or majorities. The only authority is Nature, the facts we know. Facts are the masters, the enemies of the ignorant, the servants and friends of the intelligent. Ignorance is the mother of mystery and misery, of superstition and sorrow, of waste and want.

Intelligence is the only light. It enables us to keep the highway, to avoid the obstructions, and to take advantage of the forces of nature. It is the only lever capable of raising mankind. To develop the brain is to civilize the world. Intelligence reaves the heavens of winged and frightful monsters,—drives ghosts and leering fiends from the darkness, and floods with light the dungeons of fear.

All should be taught that there is no evidence of the existence of the super-

natural; that the man who bows before an idol of wood or stone is just as foolish as the one who prays to an imagined God; that all worship has for its foundation the same mistake, the same ignorance, the same fear; that it is just as foolish to believe in a personal god as in a personal devil, just as foolish to believe in great ghosts as little ones.

So all should be taught that the forces, the facts in nature, cannot be controlled or changed by prayer or praise, by supplication, ceremony, or sacrifice; that there is no magic, no miracle; that force can be overcome only by force, and that the whole world is natural. All should be taught that man must protect himself—that there is no power superior to nature that cares for man—that nature has neither pity nor hatred—that her forces act without the slightest regard for man—that she produces without intention and destroys without regret.

The Infallibility of the Bible.

We know that in the first and second chapters of Genesis there are two contradictory accounts of creation. We know that both accounts cannot be true unless they are inspired, and no man can believe them both unless he is inspired. We know that the story of the Flood is not true; we know that the Tower of Babel story is idiotic. If Dr. Hall has paid any attention to recent discoveries and conclusions, he knows that Moses did not write the Pentateuch nor a line of one of the books. He ought to know that the enslavement of the Hebrews by the Egyptians has no foundation in fact. He ought to know that the plagues of Egypt existed only in the imagination of some savage. So, he ought to know that there are two accounts of the Flood. In one account Noah takes into the ark one pair of each species of living things; according to the other account he takes seven pair of the clean and one of the unclean.

It does not seem possible that intelligent men believe all that is recorded in the Old Testament. Does any sane human being believe that Elijah was carried up to heaven in a chariot of fire? Where is heaven? How far or how high did Elijah go? Does any sane man believe that a river was divided because it had been struck with a cloak? Can anything be more childish?

Does Dr. Hall believe that the day was lengthened by stopping the rotary motion of the earth for the purpose of giving Joshua more time to kill his enemies? What a waste of force!

Does he believe the earth was not only stopped, but made to turn the other way, until the shadow went back ten degrees on the dial, to convince a little Jewish king that he would recover from a boil? Can any sensible man believe such a story?

Does any minister believe that David raised five thousand million dollars in gold and silver to build the temple?

Is it necessary to believe such a story to be saved?

Is it necessary to believe the story of Jonah in order that you may become an angel?

Most of the ministers who have been interviewed admit that there are mistakes—at least, in the translation. What are these mistakes? I should say that the unreasonable, the impossible, the absurd, the cruel, and all the miracles should be called mistakes. Throw away your Eden, your dust man, your rib woman, your apple, your talking snakes, your flood, your Babel, your plagues, your quails, manna, and fiery serpents, your horns that level the walls of cities, your witches that raise the dead, your suns that pause, your moons that rest, your bears that destroy children, your prophets that kill innocent men by calling the lightnings from heaven, your soothsayers who interpret dreams, the people who walk in fire without getting warm your wandering jugglers, who raise the dead, and cause pots to exude oil, your ravens that keep hotels and feed prophets, your axes that float in water, your bushes that burn without being consumed, your clothes that refuse to wear out. Throw all these falsehoods away. Throw away the supernatural and cling to common sense.

Throw away the writing on the wall and the lion's den, and all the ravings of the "inspired." Open your eyes, use all your senses, my dear preachers. You cannot afford to believe without evidence. Keep all the sense you have. You cannot afford to throw any away. Read your New Testament and think when you read.

Throw away your belief in a man who was half God. The birth of one babe is just as miraculous as the birth of any other. Use the sense, the intelligence that you have. Do not try to believe that Christ cast devils out of the bodies of men and women. What is a devil? About how large are devils? What shape, what color, and where do you think they live? Throw away all the miracles. Bread and fishes cannot be made of nothing; touching clothes will not cure disease; saliva mixed with dirt cannot give sight to the blind; the dead cannot be raised with words; the handkerchiefs of St. Paul never cured anybody.

The Halls and Buckleys, the Eatons and Abbotts, and all who have been "called" to preach the gospel, should throw all the miracles away. They ought to know that this is a natural world—that the endless chain of cause and effect has never been broken. They ought to know that all the miracles are the children of ignorance, cunning and mendacity. These ministers ought to know that there are many interpolations in the New Testament. When they find a passage inconsistent with the character of Christ they ought to denounce it as a mistake, an interpolation. If Christ said that He came to bring a sword and not peace, He was malicious. If He offered a reward to men who would desert their wives and children, He was infamous. If He pretended to cast out devils, He was an impostor or insane. Throw away these interpolations that stain the character of Christ.

THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.

IV.

THE officers and ladies who had leapt into the deep ditch between the wall and the glacis of Delhi, made their way, as best they could, to the Flagstaff Tower. It will be remembered that the Europeans were ordered to rendezvous there.

In Delhi, at that time, there were two powder magazines. One, two miles outside the city walls, contained upwards of one thousand barrels of powder; the smaller one was stored with fifty barrels and was near the palace. It was this that Lieutenant Willoughby received instructions to look after. Willoughby had under him Lieutenants Forrest and Raynor, Conductors Buckley, Shaw and Sculley; Sub-conductor Crow and Sergeants Edwards and Scott. For five long, weary hours these nine gallant men defended the place against a raging, savage mob of Sepoys. Placing a few cannon, loaded with grape, at the most commanding points they could, they quietly awaited the attacks. Fully realizing that eventually they would be overpowered by numbers, Willoughby ordered a train of powder to be laid to the magazine. Sculley and Stewart were to fire the train on the signal being given by Buckley. That signal was to be the raising of Buckley's hat, Buckley acting upon orders from Willoughby.

The King of Delhi was a cowardly intriguer. The past had taught him that the British power was not to be despised. He fully expected to see the European troops at Meerut march into Delhi; so the crafty king hesitated before he openly joined the mutineers. Spy after spy, however, came in and reported that there were no signs of British troops marching towards the royal city. Reassured by the news, and attributing the inaction of Hewitt to cowardice, the scheming monarch openly espoused the cause of the Sepoys. The King's troops dashed with a savage yell to swell the ranks of the mutineers. In the defence of the little magazine, Edwards and Crow had been killed; Forrest and Buckley wounded. On the other side, reinforcements had poured in, and the attacks grew fiercer. All hope had abandoned the brave defenders; Willoughby gave the order for firing the train: Buckley raised his hat, and Scully, coolly as if lighting a long Trichinopoly cheroot, applied the fatal match. A trembling, and a moment later an awful explosion. Sepoys by hundreds perished in that explosion; six of the defenders escaped for a time. A sowar cut down Scully; Willoughby was killed by some treacherous villagers; Forrest, Raynor, Stewart and Buckley managed to reach Meerut in safety. Each of those four received the Victoria Cross, and richly they deserved it.

The Flagstaff Tower was crowded with fugitives. Major Abbott rode up with

a cartload of dead and wounded officers. After the explosion of the magazine, friendly Sepoys advised the fugitives to leave Delhi and push on to Meerut, where they had friends. They followed the advice (as far as leaving Delhi was concerned) and the Sepoys did not hinder them. They pushed on to Kurnaul; but only a few arrived, the rest having been murdered *en route* by villagers on the look out for loot. Those who did arrive were nearly naked. One faithful Sepoy stuck to them through all these dire vicissitudes. Before leaving Delhi they made an ineffectual attempt to blow up the larger magazine. Forty-three European women and children were still in the palace. It was impossible to rescue them; they were all butchered, the women being ravished in the open streets and in broad daylight before being killed.

In Lucknow Sir Henry Lawrence, who saw the magnitude of the danger which hung over them, was doing his best to gain time, knowing that help would come from England. Some days after the disarming of the 7th Oudh Irregulars, he held a Durbar; with great ostentation he rewarded a subadar, a havildar*, and two sepoys. In a brilliant speech, he spoke of British power, the futility of a Sepoy army without officers trying to cope with trained European soldiers under expert leaders; of the punishment which would be inflicted upon those who fought against the government, and of the rewards that would be showered upon those who remained true to their oaths. The speech had the desired effect; a month at least was gained; the defences of Lucknow were strengthened and provisions for a siege laid in.

Contrast Sir Henry's conduct with the supineness and *laisser faire* policy of the commander-in-chief, General Anson. Alas! poor commander-in-chief! not his the nature to swim in troubled waters. As report after report reached him in his cool residence at Simla, each report bringing heavier tidings, even his belief in the trustworthiness of the native army gave way. It seemed to strike him that he was not equal to the task required of him; that the responsibilities of his office were greater than his strength to bear them. He nominally remained in command; but able men in his staff directed his movements. On the 27th May, only seventeen days after the outburst at Meerut, General Anson resigned his command, and was buried with military honors. Cholera relieved him of his responsibilities. An anecdote, well-authenticated, is worth producing here; it is thus told in Cassel's History:—"When he was at Umballa, General Anson, by telegraph, asked Sir John Lawrence whether it would not be wiser to *entrench* and await reinforcements. Sir John, who knew that we could only be saved by showing power, promptly replied. And this message, from one famous whist player and something more to another famous whist player and nothing more, flashed along the wire: 'When in doubt, win the trick. *Clubs* are trumps, not *Spades*.'"

* Native non-commissioned officers.

The crimson-dyed message which ran along the wire from the hand of an operator at Delhi who was standing within a few feet of the men who had murdered his chief and were even then thirsting for his blood was duly received at Lahore. It was transmitted to Sir John Lawrence at Rawul Pindee, and to Herbert Edwardes and others at Peshawur. At Umballa it was read *en route* to its destination at Lahore. The men in command in the Province of the Five Waters (Punj-Ab) were very unlike Hewitt of Meerut and General Anson. They were prompt to decide and quick to execute. They kept to themselves the nature of the telegram they had received from Delhi. Six miles from Lahore, at Mean Meer, were stationed three native regiments of infantry and one of cavalry. For the night of the 12th May a ball had been fixed upon before the massacre at Meerut had occurred. The ball was allowed to take place. Towards morning the officers who attended quietly left the scene of the festivities and made their way to the parade ground, where a parade of the entire force was ordered. In India parades are always held very early in the morning or in the evening. The pretence for the parade was the public reading of an order relating to the disbandment of 34th B.N.I. at Barrackpore. The 81st Foot, and two troops of British cavalry and four companies of Foot Artillery were also stationed at Mean Meer. Brigadier Corbett commanded the force. The real object of the parade was the disarming of the native troops. The force was drawn up, forming three sides of a square; the order relating to Barrackpore was read aloud to the troops. Then a few simple manœuvures were gone through, during which the native troops were separated from the others. Under cover of the 81st the artillery loaded their guns with grape. The sepoys suspected nothing and went through the manœuvres docilely. Then occurred a scene something like that described in "Paradise Lost"; but at Mean Meer the *devils* had not the cannon. The manœuvres suddenly ended with the 81st facing the native troops, the loaded guns being hidden behind them. Then to the 81st came the command "Right and left face!" half the regiment facing right and the rest left. "Quick march!" and they marched outwards. The cannon yawned in front of the astonished Sepoys. "Pile arms!" this to the Sepoys. The arms were quietly piled and the native force stood without a rifle or a bayonet before their intended victims. A Sikh had revealed a plot concocted by the Sepoys to murder all the Europeans on the 15th; on the 13th they were without a weapon. Three companies of the 81st marched into Lahore and disarmed the Sepoys there.

It has been related that the native priests had raked up a prophecy stating that the British rule in India should cease after one hundred years; the Sikhs had their prophecy. In conjunction with the British they were to enter Delhi and avenge the beheading of a Sikh prophet in the palace by order of the famous Aurunghzebe more than 150 years before. The Sikhs had been only recently subjugated by the British; it was a bold experiment to raise a force among them

to help in the fight against the Sepoys. The experiment was tried, and was successful.

On the right bank of the Sutlej, between Lahore and Delhi, is the important fort of Philour. The 3rd B.N.I. was encamped there; there were only eight Europeans in the place. Of these eight one was a Mr. Brown of the telegraph department; he had instructions to connect electrically Philour and Jullundhur, a station of no little importance. The officers commanding at Jullundhur, on learning what had happened at Meerut, at once ordered 150 European soldiers to march to Philour. The eight men in Philour had but one gun; this was loaded with grape and the gates of the fort were closed. All night (May 12) the eight Europeans watched over that gun and the gates. Outside was encamped the 3rd B.N.I.; inside was a strong native guard. Both had to be kept in check by the eight. Early in the morning of the 13th of May the European detachment of 150 men arrived. On the road they had met the famous Probyn and some of his hardy troopers, and two horse artillery guns. These accompanied the 150 men of the 8th Foot to Philour. The Sepoys in the fort were deprived of their weapons and sent out of the place. The Philour Sepoys had arranged with their brethren to seize Philour and murder all the Europeans in it on May 15th; and Philour was chosen as the trysting place of all the Sepoy forces in the Punjab.

(*To be continued.*)

TRUTH is quite beyond the reach of satire. There is so brave a simplicity in her, that she can no more be made ridiculous than an oak or a pine.—*Lowell.*

AFFECTATION in any part of our carriage is lighting up a candle to our defects, and never fails to make us be taken notice of, either as wanting sense or as wanting sincerity.—*Locke.*

PATIENT study and perfect impartiality must precede rational convictions, whether ending in faith or in doubt. Need it be asked how many are capable of such an examination?—*Sharpe.*

The damps of autumn sink into the leaves and prepare them for the necessity of their fall; and thus insensibly are we, as years close around us, detached from our tenacity of life by the gentle pressure of recorded sorrow.—*Landor.*

IT is sufficiently demonstrated in the world, both physical and moral, that the natural orders of existence are not the subject of creation or of providential preservation; and no fancied deity has any part in the production of beings, neither does there exist any such to care about preserving them.—*Epicurus.*

IT isn't true that the laws of nature have been capriciously disturbed; that snakes have talked; that women have been turned to salt; that rods have brought water out of rocks. You must in honesty confess that, if these things were presented to us for the first time, we should smile at them.—*Dr. Conan Doyle*

The Stage and Orchestra.

The Theatres in Toronto.

For the end of the season, we have not done so badly in the matter of theatrical attractions during April ; in fact, at any time of the year, a month which gave us a week of Mr. E. S. Willard would be a notable one. The Grand re-opened early in April with Mr. Digby Bell and his company, presenting us with "The Midnight Bell" and "The Hoosier Doctor." I liked Mr. Bell much better in the *roles* of Deacon Tedd and the Doctor than when he played here in light opera, in which latter line he certainly was not a pronounced success Mr. Bell this time drew fair houses, and did a paying but not a large business.

The production of "Eight Bells" by the Byrne Brothers at the Grand was principally an acrobatic exhibition, and calls for nothing beyond a record.

An old-time favorite in strictly legitimate drama, Mr. Thomas Keene, appeared here for part of the week (including Good Friday) at the Princess Theatre. Outside a few boxing contests, this house has been open so little that one has almost forgotten its existence as a theatre. Mr. Keene presented us with "Richelieu," "Ingomar," "The Merchant of Venice," and "Richard III." He plays with astonishing power, especially to those who are aware of the fearful physical disability from which he labors. The performances should have been, on their merits, to full houses, but they were not. Rightly or wrongly, I am not going to discuss now, but the taste for the legitimate and old classical drama is by no means in the ascendant at the present time, and "heroic" plays must be presented with the attraction of a popular star and elaborate mounting to draw an audience which will satisfy the treasury and cause the actors to enthuse—which latter occurrence is quite necessary to a really good performance of any play or opera. The public taste now is for light comedy and comic opera : light music, light songs, light dialogue (and it is usually very light)—people want these everywhere. Now-a-days a good shapely leg-show, with legs *ad libitum*, fills any ordinary theatre to overflowing, while the old stand-byes of heroic drama, where the stage "is drenched in gore and cumbered with the slain," scarcely draws enough to pay the orchestra.

Certainly the event of the month, if not of the season, in Toronto was the re-appearance among us of Mr. Willard, who bids fair to be *the* popular actor of the day. He gave us a comedy in which the Toronto public have not seen him before, "The Rogue's Comedy," by Henry Arthur Jones. Of course there was a fashionable audience that filled the Grand Opera House, and of course we saw a splendid specimen of acting, but the Toronto public much prefer "The Middleman" and "The Professor's Love Story." "The Rogue's Comedy," of course, was well enough received, but there was not that spontaneity of enthusiasm among the audience (which the habitual theatre-goer recognizes in a few

moments), that emotional sympathy you can feel in the people around you when they are waiting anxiously for a point to be made for them to explode in a tumult of hand-clapping and applause. This feeling was very manifest at each performance of "The Middleman" especially, and also, though not to such a marked extent, when the story of the Professor's rather dilatory love was being told. At the close of the entertainment on Saturday evening, the scene was as enthusiastic and as popular an ovation as I have ever witnessed in any theatre on this continent. The Toronto *Mail*—the only paper that described the incident—on Monday morning told what occurred thus:

"The intention of those present evidently was to give the famous actor a flattering farewell, for the applause was more pronounced and the enthusiasm more marked than at any previous performance of the week. The drop scene had to be rung up after every act, but as the final curtain fell the applause was loud and long; the green baize was raised five or six times, and each time prominent members of the company came to the front in pairs and bowed their thanks to the audience. This, however, was not all the audience wanted, and loud cries of 'Willard!' came from all parts of the vast audience. At last the curtain went up again, and Mr. Willard came forward, bowed several times, and retired amid a hearty round of cheering. Still, the public showed no inclination to leave the house; "a speech" was vociferously demanded, and ultimately Mr. Willard came to the front, and the audience resumed their seats while, in a voice often tremulous with emotion, the popular actor spoke as follows:

"Ladies and Gentlemen,—Permit me to thank you—as I have had to thank you on previous occasions—for the flattering reception you have accorded us on our visit to your charming city—a city we always come to with much pleasure and leave with much regret. I am sorry that imperative engagements in other places make it impossible for me to remain more than a week with you on this occasion; but I have been talking to Mr. Sheppard about the possibilities of my coming to play here for two or three weeks, or perhaps a month, but life is so short that I cannot yet say when that will be. It is, however, my intention and my hope to visit you about this time next year, and ask your verdict on a new play by Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, the author of 'The Middleman.' Ladies and gentlemen, I again sincerely thank you all. I am about to return to London for a few weeks, as an event of imperial consequence is about to occur there which on no account would I miss. And if on that occasion I can approach near enough to Her Majesty, I shall certainly tell her that the people in the city of Toronto all emphatically say, 'God save the Queen!'

"The close of each sentence in the above brief speech was accentuated with much cheering, and Mr. Willard finally retired amid a tumult of applause."

The season at the Grand is now closed, but a return visit from "The Geisha" company is booked for the race week, minus Miss Dorothy Morton, retired

Considering all things, the Toronto Opera House has held its own very well this season, and is the only place of amusement in this city that has made a cent. During the month we have had "Dodge at the French Ball," with John E Henshaw and May Ten-Broeck as the stars; Mr. Henshaw is a clever comedian, and May—well, I would advise her, now the vacation is on, to go in for a severe course of anti-fat, at least if she desires to continue to appear in tights on any stage. No, May, not even costuming in severe black will conceal, even from the most short-sighted of people, your very liberal proportions. "The Great North-West," "The Boys of Kilkenny," etc., wound up the ordinary season at

the Toronto Opera House. But Manager Small is nothing if not energetic and persevering, and he has resolved on a bold experiment for the summer months. He is going to try a season of summer opera. We shall all watch this experiment with interest ; the same kind of thing has been tried here before on several occasions with varying but never with really encouraging success. I am assured that the "Madison Square Opera Company" is composed of fairly good people, and as many artists are only too pleased to close an engagement now "at summer rates," and the house, in preference to being closed altogether, can afford to run on a light commission, I hope to be able to record next month that a plucky piece of enterprise has met with a generous response from the theatre-going public of Toronto.

Among the minor places of amusement, the only incident worth notice was the appearance at the Bijou Theatre of "Miss" Hope-Booth (a Toronto woman of considerable personal attractions) as "a sensational poser." I suppose we all know what this means ; and to any sucking innocents who did not, the colored lithographs afforded liberal means of enlightenment. The little theatre on Yonge Street was packed at every performance ; in fact, many poor fellows full of love for realism in art were foiled in the pursuit of the chaste and the beautiful by not being able to obtain admission. The exhibition was artistically perfect, and, in my opinion, only those people with superheated imaginations and libidinous minds could see anything to object to in the show. One morning newspaper here did make itself ridiculous by an hysterical appeal to the police to interfere with the show ; the attack of course only added to the desire of people to see the "sensational poser," and induced the unkind remark to be persistently made on the street, that Manager Robinson, with his usual astuteness, had paid the paper in question to publish the attack.

——:o:——

Theatrical Notes and Gossip.

Fanny Rice refused an offer of $500 a week for six weeks of vaudeville.

Wilson Barrett's play, "The Daughter of Babylon," is a failure in London.

Frank Daniels will tour California and the south with "The Wizard of the Nile" next season.

The Empire Theatre, New York, made $75,000 this season and only played two attractions, John Drew and "Under the Red Robe."

Charles Frohman, in connection with the Gattis, has arranged for a continuous tenancy of the Vaudeville and Adelphi Theatres, in London.

The revival of "The Yeoman of the Guard" at the Savoy Theatre, London, a week ago, was very successful, and will probably run for the season.

E. H. Sothern is rehearsing a new play, dramatized from one of Anthony Hope's novels. It will be produced in Philadelphia the last night of the season.

Wilson Barrett brought out his revival of "Virginius" at the Lyric Theatre on May 3. He has made several changes in the original work of Sheridan Knowles, which has caused some comment in the press. Fresh illustrative music and scenery have been provided, and the principal characters were assumed by Franklin McLeay as Icilius, Alfred Brydone as Appius Claudius, T. W. Percival as Casius Claudius, Ambrose Manning as Dentatus, Horace Hodges as Numitorius, Maud Jeffries as Virginia and Frances Iver as Servia.

Pass out checks in theatres, as most of us know, are not transferrable, but the practice of transferring is pursued by the wholesale. Kirke La Shelle, manager for Frank Daniels, is looking for a means of stopping this abuse, and is considering the advisability of adopting the Japanese system until some original genius shall invent something more practical. In Japan, when a person wishes to leave the theatre before the close of the performance with the intention of returning, he goes to the doorkeeper and extends his right hand. The doorkeeper has a rubber stamp bearing the private mark of the theatre, and on each hand thus held out to him he imprints the house's mark. There is no denying the fact the fun will be well worth witnessing if Toronto audiences are asked to submit to any such custom.

In the "Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett, M.A.," W. L. Courtney tells how Jowett was induced to aid the movement in Oxford University in favor of the drama. Jowett, as vice-chancellor, agreed to recognize the academic amateurs if they undertook to represent only the Greek or the Shakesperean drama, and if they arranged that the female roles should be represented only by ladies. He afterwards extended his patronage to the scheme for a regular theatre in Oxford, and invited Henry Irving to lecture before the university. "The lecture," says Mr. Courtney, was given at the end of the summer term of 1886, Irving on that occasion staying with Jowett at the Master's Lodge at Balliol. There was an odd result of the meeting between Jowett and Irving, that each took away the same kind of impression of the other. I asked Jowett what he thought of Irving, and he said that what he particularly admired was his fine reserve ; I asked Irving what he thought of Jowett, and the answer was identically the same."

Not all the fun of theatrical life is confined to stage presentation, as is shown by a scene in New York, where a suit was being heard against Sydney Drew, on an unpaid costumer's bill. Mrs. Drew, daughter of McKee Rankin and wife of the defendant, was on the witness stand. The attorney was cross-examining her. "You are an actress ?" Mrs. Drew was asked. "Hum ! I'm supposed to be." "Any doubt about it ?" Mrs. Drew smiled. "What arrangements have you and your husband about your salary ?" "I receive all that comes over $100 a week." "And he gets the $100 ?" "Yes." "How much are you and your husband paid ?" "Two hundred and fifty dollars." "A week ?" "Well, you don't think it's $250 a month ?" snapped Mrs. Drew. "When playing in the legitimate we sometimes received certain salaries and sometimes we didn't receive them—we were supposed to receive them." "Is there any reason why your share should be almost twice as large as that of your husband ?" "None ; unless it is that I have twice as much use for it." "You are too modest to say that you are the better half of the firm in more ways than one ?" "Oh, no ; I don't say that. The fact is, I didn't want to go on the vaudeville stage."

WILFRID WISGAST.

Book Notices.

Martin Luther.

MARTIN LUTHER. By Gustav Freytag ; translated by H. E. O. Heinnemann. Beautifully printed on fine paper, large type, 130 pp. royal 8vo., with many full-page and other engravings, cloth, gilt top, $1. Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago.

Those who have read Gustav Freytag's "Lost Manuscript" will expect a treat in the present volume, and they will not be disappointed. As might be expected, the scholarly author draws a vivid picture of Luther, the man and the reformer. There are some things in Luther's life that we may reasonably excuse a friendly author for keeping out of sight, but every one of us should be glad to see light thrown upon the character of a man whose boldness certainly gave an immense impetus to the revolt against the ecclesiastical tyranny and corruption that had for so long dominated the human mind. Luther's life was cast in an age of ignorance and credulity, and it is not surprising that, with all his boldness and clearness of vision when looking at the corruption and pretensions of the church, he should have fallen into some of its errors. It is amusing, indeed, to note the innocent way in which, in his last chapter, Freytag brings out the fact that Luther necessarily became the Pope of the Protestants. "Before him," says Freytag, "the Pope and his hierarchy had interpreted, misconstrued, supplemented the words of the Scripture ; now he himself was placed in a similar position. Together with a circle of dependent friends, he was compelled to assume the prerogative of rightly understanding the words of the Scripture and applying them properly to the life of his time. It was a superhuman task, and he who took it upon himself must of necessity become the victim of some of the evils against which he had himself made such a grand fight in the Catholic Church." As it is abundantly evident in our own day, infallible Popes, Churches and Bibles all necessarily imply an authoritative and dominant priesthood and an ignorant and slavish laity ; and while these latter remain ignorant—when will they be otherwise?—the infallible authority will naturally proclaim itself.

Paganism and Christianity.

ASTRAL WORSHIP. By J. H. Hill, M.D. Illustrated by numerous engravings and an elaborate Planisphere. Truth Seeker Co. Cloth, $1.

In this work, proceeding on lines somewhat similar to those followed in Taylor's "Diegesis," the author traces most of the myths which lie at the base of the modern religions to their origin in the worship of sun and stars and natural phenomena, and shows that Jesus stands in just the same relation to Christianity that Apollo and other gods did to the ancient astral worship,—that, indeed, our modern Christianity is little else than Paganism with a few new names, and that what was once called astrology now passes under the name of theology. The book will be a great help to those engaged in religious discussions.

A PILGRIMAGE TO BEETHOVEN. A Novelette, by Richard Wagner. With a photogravure of Rodig's painting of Beethoven 40 pp., extra paper, boards, 50c. Open Court Co., Chicago. This beautifully gotten up little book, selected as a type of Wagner's literary work, gives, under guise of a conversation with Beethoven, Wagner's views of musical art, with a quite unnecessary and perhaps unwarrantably discordant gibe at the unmusical Englishman. All lovers of music, and especially of Beethoven's music, will want to possess this booklet.

New Method of Studying Latin.

THE DE BRISAY ANALYTICAL LATIN METHOD, Part I., new edition. Académie De Brisay, Toronto, publishers (25c.)

After all that has been said against the study of Latin, thinking men are still of the opinion that no system of education can be complete which disregards the language which has played such an important part in the history of civilization, and which forms the basis of French, Italian, Spanish, and, to a large extent, of literary English If a sound and practical knowledge of the language can be acquired in a few months' time (as is claimed by the author of the De Brisay Analytical Method) there is certainly no room for the objection so often urged against Latin – that the time which must be devoted to the study of the language is altogether out of proportion to the benefit derived therefrom. Most of us are ready to admit that the language is worth studying, if it can be mastered in two or three months. A careful examination of Mr. De Brisay's system convinces us that such a thing is feasible. We have not space here to dwell on—but to simply mention—the several features of this most ingenious system: (1) The method of learning a dozen words with almost the same effort as one; (2) the method of learning the syntax without rules; (3) the method of reading classical Latin in its natural order; (4) the method of mastering the inflexions of nouns, verbs, etc., without the tedious "grinding" so familiar to every Latin student. Were Latin and Greek always treated in the manner pursued by the author of this system, we imagine few objections would be raised against the study of the classics. Any of our readers interested in the matter cannot do better than send 25c. to the De Brisay Academy, Toronto, for Part I., and examine it for themselves.

ANCIENT INDIA; ITS LANGUAGE AND RELIGION. By Prof. Oldenburg. 25c. Open Court Co., Chicago. This very valuable little work of 120 pages consists of three essays--the Study of Sanskrit, Religion of the Vedas, and Buddhism. Prof. Oldenburg writes in a clear and instructive manner on very important and interesting subjects.

HUME'S ESSAY ON MIRACLES. Truth Seeker Co., N.Y. 10c. This reprint should be put into the hands of every one who has not read it.

INGERSOLL TO THE CLERGY. His answers to their questions and criticisms. Truth Seeker Co., N.Y. 25c. This pamphlet comprises the Colonel's answers to the Minneapolis and Brooklyn preachers, and addresses to the Unitarians, on Thomas Paine, and on God in the Constitution—a valuable pamphlet.

NATIONAL OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS. By Rev. C. H. Vail. Humboldt Library Co., N.Y. 15c. This is No. 83 of the Twentieth Century Library, and is a strong plea for the nationalization of the means of transportation.

THE CHRISTIAN'S LOOKING-GLASS; a Mirror of Christ's Doctrines. By Henry Smith. 48 pp., paper boards, 35c.; Watts & Co., London, Eng. In this little pamphlet, Mr. Smith makes no pretence at an examination of Christ's doctrines as put forward in the New Testament, but simply asks his Christian friends, as he repeats these "Sayings of the Lord": "Do you live up to this?" His conclusion seems to be that there are no real Christians—that professed Christians make not even the pretence of imitating Christ, however much they may talk about performing that impossible feat.

Poems by Walt. A. Ratcliffe.

MORNING SONGS IN THE NIGHT. Poems. By Walt. A. Ratcliffe. With Preface by William Douw Lighthall, M.A., F.R.S.L., Montreal. Cloth, $1. Toronto: William Briggs, 29-33 Richmond-street West; or from the author, Listowel.

Many of our readers, who have enjoyed Mr. Ratcliffe's contributions to our pages, will be glad to have this handsome collection of his poems, many of which are now printed for the first time. Mr. Lighthall says in his preface:

"In style, the quiet force of many of Mr. Ratcliffe's lines, their frequent happiness of phrase or metaphor, strike one. Not that they often come very near the word-wealth of the art-poets, the exquisite music of the lyricists, the fastidious culture of the classicists, or the profundity of the metaphysical specialist; but in clear intelligence and plain good taste they take excellent rank, and few current volumes will be found to contain so many poems which leave the reader earnestly thinking. The author has evidently a sure hold on higher comfort, but it ought to be one source of happiness to him that he can so vigorously sing and teach as to be probably fulfilling a more useful place than the average individual of unimpaired faculties, and that this little work will go on singing and teaching long after him. Perhaps he has been sentinelled at one of the outposts of misfortune to show how bravely misfortune can be borne."

We sincerely hope that Mr. Ratcliffe's volume of poems, which on its merits will take a high rank among the best of our Canadian poetry, will meet with a generous reception from our friends. Mr. Ratcliffe has for years been largely cut off from the ordinary pleasures of life, and from communication with his friends, by almost total blindness and deafness; and it is wonderful that he has been capable of singing so cheerfully and hopefully; possibly too hopefully, for, as Mr. Lighthall well says: "His longings find a remedy for much in a socialistic order of society—perhaps too much; for how can any legislation from without produce an ideal society without a regeneration from within?" The volume can be obtained through the ordinary news-dealers, or direct from the author at Listowel, Ont.

THE MONIST for April, 1897 (Quarterly, 50c.; $2 per ann.; Open Court Co.), fully maintains its high standard. Among its more important articles are—"Hegel To-day," by Prof. Eucken, Jena; "Genesis of Social 'Interests,'" by Prof. J. Mark Baldwin; "The Conflict of Races, Classes, and Societies," by Prof. G. Fiamingo; and a finely illustrated and valuable article by Dr. Carus, "The Mythology of Buddhism."

THE OPEN COURT, in its new monthly dress ($1 per ann.), is taking its place among the best of the literary and philosophical magazines. The April number contained a lengthy article on the "Administration of the City of Chicago," by Hon. Lyman Gage; and a discussion, "Is the Church Responsible for the Inquisition?" by Dr. Carus, elaborately illustrated from old engravings of events of the Inquisition and witch-trials. The chief articles in the May number are "The Prophet of Pessimism," by Dr. Carus, with a fine photograph from Elisabet Ney's famous bust of Schopenhauer; and "An Historical Sketch of the Jews," by Rev. Bernhard Pick, with many illustrations of Jewish rites and ceremonies. This is the first of a series which is to describe the wanderings of the Jews and their fortunes and misfortunes since the Captivity.

From Our Own Observatory.

The Sunday Car Vote in Toronto.

AFTER what has been on both sides the most vigorous campaign to which the Sunday car contest in Toronto has given rise, the electorate on Saturday, May 15th, decided by a majority of 479, in a total vote of 32,387 (over 5,000 more than in 1893), to allow Sunday cars to run. While sufficient to settle the question—unless, as Mr. Milligan says will be the case, the Lord's Day Alliance shall find some means to "balk them yet"—the smallness of the majority on such a large vote shows that the preachers and their assistants were fairly justified in their loud predictions of victory; but that 16,433 votes were cast in favor of freedom also shows that, in their efforts to coerce a very large section of the people into a Puritanical observance of Sunday, they overstepped anything like the legitimate bounds of their own rights, and have met with the just reward of their efforts to force their peculiar notions upon men of more liberal views. It may be interesting to note the votes cast at the three contests :

	Jan., 1892.		Aug., 1893.		May, 1897.	
Total vote	24,638		27,229		32,387	
	For.	Against.	For.	Against.	For	Against.
Ward 1 (East of the Don)	1,047	1,408	1,410	1,386	1,559	1,464
Ward 2 (Don to Jarvis St.)	1,763	2,643	2,353	2,769	2,986	2,947
Ward 3 (Jarvis to Univer'y Av.)	2,669	3,506	3,178	3,236	4,042	3,543
Ward 4 (Univers'y to Bathurst)	2,193	2,777	2,749	2,876	3,684	3,408
Ward 5 (Bathurst to Doverc'rt)	1,585	2,352	2,071	2,290	2,428	2,669
Ward 6 (West of Dovercourt)	1,094	2,602	1,367	1,544	1,734	1,923
Totals	10,351	14,287	13,128	14,101	16,433	15,954
Majorities	—	3,936	—	973	479	—

Echoes of the Contest.

Without desiring to accentuate the many unpleasant features of the contest, it would be absurd to be over-squeamish about referring to some of its incidents. And one point is especially deserving of notice,—the apparent unscrupulousness of the Church advocates. No motive was too vile and mercenary to hurl at the heads of those who advocated Sunday cars In his elaborate letters, Mr. A. Sutherland left no room for honest opinion in his opponents. All were, according to his view, only waiting for the running of Sunday cars to turn the city into a brutal scene of dissipation and vice on Sunday. Mr. Blake tried to frighten his followers—and to a large extent succeeded in doing so—into a belief that the fate of Rome and Greece would soon ensue, even if that of Sodom and Gomorrah did not at once overtake her, if Toronto attempted to follow the example of nearly all the large cities of the world. According to some, the employers were only waiting for the advent of the Sunday car to force the workpeople to labor for seven days per week. And so on. Even the Mosaic law was invoked by many of the parsons, who must have been perfectly well aware that such an argument would only pass among those utterly ignorant of the discussions that have occurred during the preceding contests. That there are many such people

in Toronto seems probable ; for we cannot suppose the case is unique of a young man we spoke with the other day, who told us, "Why, our father never allowed us to read anything but the Bible and the *Sunday School Times*." Such people can naturally be swayed by the most stultifying arguments, and the preachers and their assistants seem fully aware of the fact. The talk indulged in by some of the speakers at the Saturday night meeting (which had been called to hear a declaration of victory, but had to console itself as well as it could under defeat) —that every advantage would still be taken of legal technicalities to prevent the vote being acted upon—is, of course,. childish poppycock that decent citizens would be ashamed of in calmer moments.

Progress – Evolution – not Revolution.

Now that Sunday cars are to run in Toronto, people will possibly take a new and truer view of human life and progress. The lesson is needed by so-called Progressives as well as by the Reactionaries. The lesson is, that all useful and permanent progress must be accomplished slowly and by short stages, not by revolutionary strides. The ideas that a people, by any process of legislation or organized agitation, could be converted from vice and poverty to industry and virtue ; or that the reverse process could occur—that a prosperous and virtuous people could, by the removal of legal restraints, be converted into promoters of immorality and vice—are ideas only possible to believers in miracles and supernaturalism. There are, unquestionably, many such believers in the ranks both of the orthodox and of the unorthodox. But, when the former see the harmless street car running on Sunday without the heavens falling or the prisons being filled, they may be led to ask the reason for such an unaccountable state of things ; and when Mr. Blake has announced that his Bible class and jail preaching will go on just as usual every Sunday, that his religion is as strong and his country just as dear as before, and his character not very much smirched (it can be whitewashed as on a previous occasion), they may have their eyes opened to the lesson that what we term civilization (some call it "religion," though that term is generally used in a very different sense) is a thing of slow growth. The lesson may also be learnt by some of our social reformers, who would alternately open the floodgates of anarchy or shut us up in a cast-iron band of governmental restriction. "One step enough for me," sang Newman in an inspired moment ; and for the true reformer this should be a motto of the deepest significance. Reforms that are likely to be useful and permanent will be such as are called for by some large section of the community, or which carry on their face their credentials of utility. Such a reform is the running of the Sunday street car ; and no doubt Mr. Blake will himself soon bear testimony to its worth by riding in it instead of hiring the equally sacrilegious and much more expensive hack.

The Liberal Avalanche in Quebec.

Coming almost synchronously with the street-car vote in Toronto, the result of the Quebec election is a most encouraging event. Not that we attach any value to it on the ground that it is a "Liberal" victory. That would rather be a source of regret, for Liberal government in Quebec has latterly been attended by the worst sort of corruption. But we hail it as a sign that at length the *habitant*, awakened and encouraged by the discussions which have stirred all Canada during the last few years, has determined to stand boldly upright and to submit no longer to priestly terrorism. The result must also be a relief to the Dominion Conservatives, for it removes a troublesome, and to them a fatal, sub-

ject from the realm of practical politics. It may also show to the Ontario Government the folly of treating an Italian priest as if he were a foreign potentate or as if this Dominion, instead of being a self-governing country, were simply a province of the Pope's dominions. Mr. Mery Del Val himself will doubtless also find his task much easier when he knows he has to deal with a nation of freemen and a few headstrong priests, instead of having to try to dictate terms to the former, with the latter strongly backed by a servile and ignorant section. If he is guided by prudence, he will simply tell the priests to cease howling and to make the best of the settlement already concluded.

Does College Life tend to make Students Sceptical?

Some years ago we had some discussion of the question whether Toronto University was not a "godless" institution, because in it a feature was not made of teaching "theology." A similar discussion is just now being held in California in reference to its State university, the students of which a week or so ago discussed the question at the Trinity Methodist Church, Oakland. The college Y.M.C.A. President defended the institution from the attacks of some orthodox ministers, and said that from his own experience the University of California was as good a place as any in the State for "spiritual growth" The majority of the students seemed to agree with Miss Kemble that, though the State university could not teach theology, the students had no good reason to become un-Christian; but A. G. Van Gorder said he had studied philosophy under Prof. Howison, and he thought doubts had been raised in his mind; and he put the difference between clerical teaching and college teaching in this way:

"We come here without ever having questioned the things told us in childhood or that we have heard from the pulpit but after a bit of Univesity life we come to find that something coming from the University differs from something coming from the pulpit. I believe that one in doubt is just as right in the sight of heaven as one who has never stopped to question at all."

The conclusion Mr. Van Gorder comes to as to the view of heaven may be right or not; but what he and Miss Kemble say marks the difference we note. "I never knew what it was to be criticised for being a Christian until I came here." Just so. The ordinary clerical teaches theology and admits no radical discussion; to doubt is a crime; but the teacher of science and philosophy can face any discussion with confidence, because he knows truth will come out on top always. In the one case scepticism is fatal; in the other, it is of the very essence of progress. It shows thought—a thing the theologian has no use for.

Queen Victoria's Wars.

The following partial list of big and little wars that have distinguished the present reign will be interesting: 1838-49, Afghanistan; 1841, 1st Chinese war; 1845-46, Sikh war; 1846, Kaffir war; 1849, 2nd Chinese and 2nd Afghan wars; 1848-49, 2nd Sikh war; 1850, Burmese war; 1851-52, 2nd Kaffir war; 1852-53, 2nd Burmese war; 1854-56, Crimean war; 1856-58, 3rd Chinese war; 1857-58, Indian mutiny; 1860-61, New Zealand Maori war; 1860 & 1862, Chinese wars; 1863-66, 2nd Maori war; 1864, Ashantee and Bhotan wars; 1867-68, Abyssinian war; 1868, war with Bazetees; 1868-69, 3rd Maori war; 1871, war with Looshaisis; 1878-79, Zulu war; 1878-80, 3rd Afghan war; 1879-81, Transvaal and Basutoland; 1882, Egypt; 1890, Zanzibar and India; 1894-96, Matabele wars; 1895, Chitral; 1896, 3rd Ashantee war, Soudan campaign.

GRAVE AND GAY.

GETTIN' RELIGION.

I ain't much on religion, nor prayer-meeting beside,
I've never jined the church as yet, nor ain't been sanctified;
But a tender sort of feeling draws me nearer to the skies,
Since I got a peep of heaven through a pair of trusting eyes.

Time was when nothing moved my thoughts above this sinful world;
No preacher's words could stir me up, in wrath an' fury hurled;
But lately I've been drifting nigher to the better land,
And the force that leads me upward is a little dimpled hand.

Seems like the bad thoughts sneak away, with that wee chap hard by;
And cuss words that were handy once won't come when he is nigh;
Fact is, it sort o' shames me to see those clear blue eyes
Look at me (when I'm gettin' riled) in pity an' surprise.

I don't know much of heaven or angels an' such things;
But, somehow, when I picture 'em it ain't with harps and wings;
But with yeller curls, all tangled, and tender eyes that shine,
An' lips that's soft an' loving, like that little chap of mine.

Then, when he folds his dimpled hands, in his little bed at night,
An' whispers "Now I lay me," why thar's something ails my sight,
An' my throat gits sort of husky when he blesses me, an' then
I'm dead sure I've got religion by the time he says "Amen!"

—*Ida Goldsmith Morris, in the Louisville Courier-Journal.*

Mr. Grayson—You say that this Mrs. Sappington is a bad woman, and yet you invite her to your house. I'd like to know how you justify yourself?

Mrs. Grayson—Oh, but society hasn't found her out yet.

YOUTHFUL PHILOSOPHY.

A little girl going to church with her mother one Sunday saw some men working on the street-car tracks. "See those men breaking the Sabbath," said her mother, thinking to suggest a moral lesson. The little girl watched them gravely. Then she looked up in her mother's face and said: "And can't God mend it?"

An astute little boy was asked the other day what was meant by "sins of omission," and he responded, without any pause or hesitation, "The sins we have forgotten to commit."

Sweet little Meg came into her Sunday school class one morning, her eyes filled with tears, and looking up into her teacher's face, said: "Our dog's dead, and I guess the angels were scared when they saw him coming up the path, for he's awfully cross to strangers."

A certain young woman teaches a class in a mission Sunday-school. She has a difficult task imparting scraps of religious instruction to her young charges, and often amusing answers are unconsciously returned to questions which she asks. On one occasion she asked her pupils: "What do the high priests do?" And received the reply: "They burned insects before the people," by which the youngster, of course, meant incense.

But one of the funniest experiences, which well shows the queer ideas which the children receive in their lessons, was given when, after a discussion of shipwreck which followed a lesson three or four weeks previously on the well-known story of Jonah and the whale, she happened to ask: "Suppose a big storm arose at sea and it looked as though you were going to be drowned, what would you do?" "I would throw a man overboard for a whale to swallow," was the reply.

The following appears in the Victor (Colo.) *Times*:—"Rev. Mr. L—— is expected to arrive in Victor this evening. He will occupy the pulpit of Rev. M——, whose brokerage business now requires his entire time, rendering it impossible for him to fulfill his duties as pastor."

GIVE HIM A LIFT.

Give him a lift! Don't kneel in prayer,
Nor moralize with his despair;
The man is down, and his great need
Is ready help—not prayer and creed.

'Tis time when wounds are washed and healed,
That the inward motive be revealed;
But now, whate'er the spirit be,
Mere words are shallow mockery.

One grain of aid just now is more
To him than tomes of saintly lore.
Pray, if you must, within your heart,
But give him a lift, give him a start.

The world is full of good advice,
Of prayer and praise and preaching nice;
But generous souls who aid mankind
Are like to diamonds hard to find.

Give like a Christian—speak in deeds;
A noble life's the best of creeds;
And he shall wear a royal crown
Who gives a lift when men are down.

SUPERLUOUS DEVICES.

Who but a man bereft of sense would think
To prop the sky, and thus prevent its fall?
Or stop Niagara at its very brink
By the erection of a mud-built wall?
Or stretch a chain across the boisterous sea,
To force it into slumbrous repose?
Or regulate the law of gravity,
Lest chaos come all order to foreclose?
And who but one demented will contend,
That Truth, unaided by external force,
Successfully her cause cannot defend,
But must to carnal weapons have recourse?
That in religion reason is no guide?
That Liberty to license is allied?

—*Wm. Lloyd Garrison.*

The whale spouted in triumph. "Never you mind!" shouted Jonah, vindictively. "You've given me a good deal of trouble, I'll admit; but you just wait till the latter day theologians tackle you!" With a hoarse chuckle he struck out over the sand-dunes toward Nineveh.

THE LAY JUDGE'S PERPLEXITY.

Some years ago one of the laymen who find places on the bench of the highest court of New Jersey, thanks to political influence and accommodating Governors, was a builder or contractor living in the northern part of the state, a man notoriously ignorant of the law and unfitted for any judicial position. Not long after his appointment a Judge of a Federal Court, who knew the man, met him and with rather an amused smile asked:

"Well, Judge, how do you get along on the bench?"

"Oh," was the reply, "I get along very well. You see I have been on the grand jury a good deal and so had picked up considerable about law. But, Judge," he went on rather earnestly, "I find I have got to study Latin."

"Indeed. That's rather a serious business for a man of your age to take up, is it not?"

"Yes, but I've got to do it. You see there are so many words I don't understand. Now look here, what do they mean when they say *laches*?"

He pronounced the word *latches* and, as he spoke it, made a motion with his index finger as of a man lifting a latch.

The future course of the Judge's study of Latin is not recorded.

A lady of rank, whose Sunday duties had long been neglected, was moved one day to attend with her daughters the morning services at the little chapel of St. James' Palace. Unluckily, there was no room; every seat was filled. "Well, never mind, dears," said my lady to her girls as they turned away. "Anyhow we have done the civil thing." She had paid her "call."

Bad Boy—"What ye talkin' 'bout me goin' to the bad place fer? Our preacher says there is one, but Johnny Stagg's preacher an' lots of other preachers says there ain't. Guess they know 'bout it as well as our preacher does."

His Mother (with decision)—"My son, whenever a preacher says anything that bad boys like to hear, you can jest make up your mind it ain't true."—*New York Weekly.*

And the same may be said of a good deal the preachers say that grown-up people like to hear.