

# The Dominion Review.

VOL. II.

MARCH, 1897.

NO. 3.

## THE MIRACULOUS ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

THE effect produced by the teaching of Jesus and his disciples is, beyond question, the most momentous fact in history. If circumstances, such as the fusion of races under the Roman Empire and the distress attendant on the decline of the Empire, concurred, Christianity was the motive power. The conversion of Saul marks the greatness of the moral change. It is the proclamation of a new ideal of human brotherhood and purity of life. Here, if at any point in history, we may believe that the Spirit of the World, if the world has a spirit, was at work. If evil to a terrible extent as well as good has apparently flowed from the Gospel; if Christianity has given birth to priestcraft, intolerance, persecution, and religious war, as well as to some perversions of morality, it is because the miraculous elements, and the circle of ecclesiastical dogma which under the theosophic influences of the succeeding age formed itself around them, have been allowed to overlay and obscure the character and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

The author of "Supernatural Religion," after demolishing, as he conceives, the authority of the ecclesiastical canon, himself says of the biblical system of Christianity:

"It must be admitted that Christian ethics were not in their details either new or original. The precepts which distinguish the system may be found separately in early religions, in ancient philosophies, and in the utterances of the great poets and seers of Israel. The teaching of Jesus, however, carried morality to the sublimest point attained or even attainable by humanity. The influence of his spiritual religion has been rendered doubly great by the unparalleled purity and elevation of his own character. Surpassing in his sublime simplicity and earnestness the moral grandeur of Çhākya-mouni, and putting to the blush the sometimes sullied, though generally admirable, teaching of Socrates and Plato and the whole round of Greek philosophers, he presented the rare spectacle of a life, so far as we can estimate it, uniformly noble and consistent with his own lofty principles, so that the 'imitation of Christ' has become almost the final word in the preaching of his religion, and must continue to be one of the most powerful elements of its permanence. His system might not be new, but it was in a high sense the perfect development of natural morality; and it was final in this respect among others, that, superseding codes of laws and elaborate details of life, it confined itself to two fundamental principles: love to God and love to

man. Whilst all previous systems had merely sought to purify the stream, it demanded the purification of the fountain. It placed the evil thought on a par with the evil action. Such morality, based upon the intelligent and earnest acceptance of divine law, and perfect recognition of the brotherhood of man, is the highest conceivable by humanity; and, although its power and influence must augment with the increase of enlightenment, it is itself beyond development, consisting as it does of principles unlimited in their range and inexhaustible in their application. Its perfect realization is that true spiritual Nirvâna which Çhâkyâ-mouni has clearly conceived, and obscured with Oriental mysticism: extinction of rebellious personal opposition to divine order, and the attainment of perfect harmony with the will of God." (Vol. II., pp. 487-8.)

Of the four religions which have been styled "universal," Christianity alone is universal in fact. Christianity alone preaches its gospel to the whole world. A Buddhist element has recently found its way into a certain school of European philosophy, but not through Buddhist preaching or under a Buddhist form. Mahometanism and Buddhism are something more than local or tribal, yet less than universal. Mahometanism is military, as its Koran avows. In conquest it lives, with conquest it decays; it also practically belongs to the despotic, polygamic, and slave-owning East. It has never been the religion of a Western race, or of a free and industrial community. By arms it has been propagated, or by local influence and contagion, not by mission. Buddhism, if it is really a religion and not rather a quietist philosophy engendered of langor and suffering, is partly a religion of climate and of race; of its boasted myriads the majority, the Chinese, retain little more than a tincture of Buddha, while all are enclosed within a ring-fence in a particular quarter of the globe. Its European offspring is a philosophy of despair. Judaism, after its rejection of Christianity, itself fell back into a tribalism, which is of all tribalisms morally the most anti-social, since it is not primitive and natural, but self-enforced and artificially maintained in the face of humanity; while the proselytism which was rife when the philosophic Judaism of Philo was verging on universality has since that epoch ceased. It is to be noted also that Christianity is almost alone in its display of recuperative power. No parallel to the revivals of Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley is presented by any other religion. The Wahabi movement will hardly be thought as a spiritual revival to deserve that rank.

Moral civilization and sustained progress have been thus far limited to Christendom. So have distinct and effective ideas of human brotherhood, which implies a common fraternity, and of the service of humanity. In Buddhism, if they have been distinct, they cannot be said to have been equally effective. They seem to be closely connected with the Christian idea of the Church, with its struggle for the emancipation of the world from the powers of evil and with its hope of final victory.

Much, therefore, of what we have cherished would still stand, even if our evidence for the miracles should fall.

We  
of bel  
powe  
ordina  
kind.  
positio  
of natu  
must b  
suspen  
have de  
as has  
place, b  
believing  
There i  
people,  
in char  
mitted t  
of know  
in decla  
raised fr  
or illusi  
On what  
ence, be  
tion. V  
rital tru  
question  
of our o  
mony to  
That t  
self by r  
miracle  
sive evid  
reason th  
our own  
required.  
be to pu  
Theologia  
Faith, to  
things ar  
the evid  
accepted  
divine int  
there mu  
possess?  
In the  
says that

We need hardly expend thought on the discussion as to the possibility of believing in miracles. The very term supposes the existence of a power above nature, able to reveal itself by a suspension of nature's ordinary course, and willing so to reveal itself for the salvation of mankind. There is nothing apparently repugnant to reason in such a supposition. The existence of the power is even implied in the phrase "laws of nature," constantly used by science; for wherever there is a law there must be a law-giver, and the law-giver must be presumed capable of suspending the operation of law. This, Hume himself would hardly have denied. In fact, the metaphysical argument against miracles comes, as has been said before, pretty much to this: that a miracle cannot take place, because if it did it would be a miracle. We could not help believing our own senses if we actually saw a man raised from the dead. There is no reason why we should not believe the testimony of other people, provided that they were eye-witnesses, that they were competent in character and in intelligence, and that their testimony had been submitted to impartial and thorough investigation. Suppose a hundred men of known character, judgment, and scientific attainments were to unite in declaring that they had seen a blind man restored to sight or a man raised from the dead in circumstances precluding the possibility of fraud or illusion, should we, as Hume says, at once reject their testimony? On what ground? On the ground of universal experience? Experience, being only previous uniformity, is broken by a well-attested exception. We assume an adequate object, such as the revelation to man of vital truth undiscoverable by his own intellect would be. It is simply a question of evidence. All will allow that we require either the evidence of our own senses or an extraordinary amount of unexceptionable testimony to warrant us in accepting a miracle.

That the Supreme Being, supposing that he intended to reveal himself by miracle for the salvation of mankind, and required belief in the miracle as the condition of our salvation, would provide us with conclusive evidence, may surely be assumed. A miracle is an appeal to our reason through our senses, and to make it valid either the evidence of our own senses, or evidence equivalent to that of our own senses, is required. To call upon us to believe without sufficient evidence, would be to put an end to belief itself in any rational sense of the term. Theologians always take advantage of proof so far as it is forthcoming. Faith, to which they have appealed in defect of proof, is a belief, not in things unproved, but in things unseen. Miracles may be accepted on the evidence of a church assumed to be itself divine; they may even be accepted on the supposed evidence of a spiritual sense illuminated by divine influence; but if we are to accept them on the evidence of reason, there must be satisfactory eye-witnesses. What ocular testimony do we possess?

In the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul says that the risen Christ had appeared to him. He says simply "ap-

peared." He gives no particulars nor anything which can enable us to judge whether the apparition was certainly real, or whether it may have been the product of ecstatic imagination, like the apparition seen by Colonel Gardiner or those which made Coleridge say that he did not believe in ghosts because he had seen too many of them. Three detailed accounts of the vision are given in the Acts, but not one of them can be traced to St. Paul, though two of them are put into his mouth; and they are at variance with each other, one (Acts 9:7) saying that St. Paul's fellow-travellers heard the voice but saw no man; another (Acts 22:9) saying that they saw the light but did not hear the voice; while the utterances of the voice itself differ widely in the three passages (compare Acts 9:4-7, with Acts 22:7, 8, and more especially with Acts 26:14-19), though it would seem that the words ought to have made an indelible impression; not to mention that "it is hard for thee to kick against the goad" is a strange phrase to be used by a voice from heaven.

In the same passage of the first Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul states "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried; that he had been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures; that he had appeared unto Cephas, then to the twelve; that he had afterwards appeared to about five hundred brethren at once of whom the greater part remained till that time, but some were fallen asleep; then to James; then to all the apostles." It is natural to assume that St. Paul learned this from Peter and James, the two apostles whom he saw on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. But he does not cite their authority, much less does he say that he had taken any measures to sift their evidence. Nor is it likely that he would have taken such measures, being, as he was, an ardent proselyte of three years' standing, and having staked his spiritual life on the resurrection of Christ. Here again he uses the expression "appeared," and leaves us once more to speculate on the effect of enthusiasm in giving birth to visions and on the contagion of excited imagination. He says nothing about the intercourse of the risen Christ with his apostles during the days preceding the Ascension; nor does it seem easy to harmonize his story with that of the Gospels.

Some attestations of miracles given in the Acts are in the first person, implying that an eye-witness is speaking. The eye-witness, however, is anonymous, and we have no means of testing his trustworthiness. The escape of St. Paul at Melita from the sting of the viper which had come out of the burning sticks and fastened on his hand, and his prophetic reliance upon God in the shipwreck, while they are vividly attested, can hardly be called miraculous.

In 1 Corinthians 12:4-11, St. Paul refers in a general way to the existence of miraculous gifts among members of the church:

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but

same G  
of the  
dom  
faith, in  
another  
of spiri  
tongues  
several

Gift  
it will  
self (1  
moder  
the acc  
known  
it as th  
testify  
nor do  
genera  
of Chr

In th  
the res  
his pre  
dient,  
the ark  
legend,  
the Ep  
with re  
of Pete  
city of  
defend

The  
total of  
tianity,  
recorde  
can tell  
Two of  
nesses;  
work of  
Gospel,  
witness  
Gospel  
is pron  
fourth  
cious, s  
authors  
instead



same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; to another faith, in the same Spirit; and to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will."

Gifts of divers kinds of tongues and of the interpretation of tongues, it will be observed, are put on a level with the rest, though St. Paul himself (1 Corinthians 14) treats those gifts as equivocal, and we know from modern experience that they may be the offspring of self-delusion; while the account of the gift of tongues in Acts 2: 8, as that of speaking divers known languages, is at variance with the words of St. Paul, who describes it as that of speaking in a tongue unknown to all. St. Paul does not testify to the occurrence of any specific miracle other than his own vision, nor does he profess to have performed a specific miracle himself. His general appeal is not to miracles, but to the divine character and merits of Christ.

In the first Epistle of St. Peter there are allusions (1: 3 and 3: 18) to the resurrection of Christ. But they are connected with an allusion to his preaching "unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing;" a tradition which implies belief in the Noachic legend, while its character seems to militate against the authenticity of the Epistle as the work of a companion of Christ, since actual contact with reality usually sets bounds to imagination. In the second Epistle of Peter there is an allusion to the Transfiguration. But the authenticity of the second epistle of St. Peter is strongly impugned and feebly defended.

The testimony comprised in the above passages is, apparently, the sum total of the ocular evidence producible for the miraculous part of Christianity. Besides this, there is nothing but tradition of unknown origin, recorded by unknown writers at a date uncertain, and, for aught that we can tell, many years after the events. The four Gospels are anonymous. Two of them, the second and third, are not even ascribed to eye-witnesses; while the preface to the third distinctly implies that it is not the work of an eye-witness, but of one of a number of compilers. The first Gospel, if Matthew were really its author, would be the work of an eye-witness. But it seems to be certainly attested that, if Matthew wrote a Gospel at all, it was in Hebrew, whereas the first Gospel is in Greek and is pronounced to be not even a translation from the Hebrew. In the fourth Gospel there is an attestation; but it is anonymous and suspicious, serving rather to shake than to confirm our belief in its apostolic authorship; for why should not the writer himself have given his name instead of leaving the authenticity to be attested by an unknown hand?

Of the proof tendered for the authenticity of this Gospel as the work of St. John, it may safely be said that it is not such as would be accepted in the case of any ordinary work. Of the most recent experts, there is a decided and apparently growing majority on the other side. The Apocalypse as well as the Gospel was ascribed by the Church to St. John, and as the difference in character and style is such that the two cannot have been by the same hand, whatever makes for the authenticity of the Apocalypse makes against the authenticity of the Gospel. Nothing can seem more unlikely than that a Gospel tinctured with Alexandrian theosophy should be the work of a simple fisherman of Galilee. Nor is there any similarity between the character of John depicted in the first three Gospels and that with which the first Gospel is suffused. The writer's attitude of aversion towards the Jews, and his references to their laws and customs as those of another nation, are scarcely compatible with the supposition that he was himself a Jew.

Not one of the four Gospels can be shown with any certainty to have existed in its present form till a period had elapsed after the events fully sufficient, in a totally uncritical age, for the growth of any amount of miraculous legend, as the biographies of numerous saints in the Middle Ages prove. This much at the very least seems to have been established by the author of "Supernatural Religion," whose main argument, as Matthew Arnold says, is not to be shaken by pursuing him into minor issues and discrediting him there. It is alleged that the Gospels must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, because they do not refer to that catastrophe, but seem to speak of the "altar" as if it were still existing. The answer appears to be that, if the traditions worked up by the Evangelists were anterior to the fall of Jerusalem, there is no reason why that event should be imported into them. Legends do not ordinarily mention intervening events. Besides, there does appear in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 to be an allusion to the flight of the Christians in the day of conflict.

In the narratives of the first three Evangelists there is found a large common element. It appears that if the whole text of the Synoptics is broken up into one hundred and seventy-four sections, fifty-eight of these are common to all three; twenty-six besides to Matthew and Mark, seventeen to Mark and Luke, thirty-two to Matthew and Luke; leaving only forty-one unshared elements, of which thirty-one are found in Luke, seven in Matthew, and three in Mark. (See Martineau's "Seat of Authority in Religion," p. 184.) This similarity in the selection of a limited portion of the Life, combined with the identity of so many passages, has been justly thought to preclude the hypothesis of independent authorship and to suggest compilation on a common basis. There must on that supposition have been an interval of time between the events and the compilation during which the common basis was formed.

*(To be concluded.)*

## A VISION OF HELL.

BY WALT. A. RATCLIFFE, LISTOWEL, ONT.

UPON an isle that seemed a garden fair  
 By hidden cords dependent 'twixt two seas  
 Of rarest blue, I stood and watched the sun,  
 A ship of golden flame, glide thro' the gates,  
 Where, in a radiant flood of regal glory,  
 Those oceans blent their billows.

A gentle breeze swept o'er the nether sea,  
 And lo! adown the wake of that fair ship  
 A million million rubies burn'd to show  
 Where it had pass'd, while eastward from the shore  
 The glacier slopes of snow-crowned crags gave back  
 Its parting smile. The dark'ning cliffs along  
 The margin of the main beheld their face  
 With ev'ry strange fantastic line that Time  
 And Ocean, with unwearying briny hands,  
 Had written there in play or frenzied passion --  
 Within the shadow'd waters.

And o'er the gathering gloom and waning light  
 And through the trees there swept soft slumbrous strains  
 As of the vesper-hymn the night wind sings  
 With murm'ring rills where fairy ferns bend low  
 And tell their beads by Venus' constant lamp.  
 Lo! in a woodland dell hard by the sea,  
 I saw an altar rear'd, and round it stood  
 Strong men and goodly women, and they sang.  
 And standing on the beach the night-wind bore  
 The voice of all their gladness to my ear.  
 "No fetter forged by father binds the son ;  
 No son shall pay the debt the father ought ;  
 I live where Freedom reigns, and free I live  
 Unto myself, unto myself I die."  
 While thus they sang the night soar'd down upon me,  
 And by the sea I slumber'd.

The dank, dark night went down into the sea,  
 And o'er the hills the sun, in hot pursuit,  
 Shot crimson arrows at him as he went.  
 Then Sleep, with gentle hands, undid the bands

With which, the day before, she bound my limbs,  
 Then left me, and I stood upon my feet.  
 The boundless sea, the everlasting hills,  
 The cliffs, the dell, the music of the rills,  
 Were all as fair as when I fell asleep.  
 But where the altar was a fire blazed,  
 And round it danced a naked, savage tribe.  
 Each jostl'd each to clutch with bloody hands  
 At half-broiled fragments of a brother's form,  
 And sang the while their war-song shrill and wild—  
 A song no man of any other land  
 Save this could sing, save this could understand.  
 My heart grew sick, my limbs support denying,  
 And once again I slumbered.

Again the night had fled before the day,  
 And like an artist's canvas fair outspread,  
 The landscape, sky and sea around me lay.  
 The rills, kissed into smiling by the sun,  
 Sang back their love from many a grassy glebe,  
 And ev'ry breath of ev'ry breeze that pass'd  
 Was heavy freighted with the rose's sigh.  
 No answer voice was there in all that land  
 No robin's note, no love-lorn maidens lay,  
 No gleeful laugh of children by the brook,  
 No ploughman's cheery call across the glebe,  
 No gentle mother's soothing lullaby—  
 For all things animate had ceased to be.  
 No creature moved save loathesome, shapeless things,  
 That squirmed within the slimy depths unfathom'd  
 Of dim, plague-haunted marshes.



It is p  
 laws of  
 not ma  
 dislikes  
 fundam  
 within  
 examin  
 a phen  
 those la  
 itself.  
 no phil  
 phenom  
 Some  
 tion of  
 without  
 facts of  
 have co  
 or how  
 depends  
 constitu  
 If he do  
 it in diff  
 foot-pou  
 satisfy n  
 necessity  
 so many  
 more, gre  
 much lin  
 So if suc  
 as the or  
 verified i  
 There  
 any scien  
 of physic  
 both phe

## PHYSICAL AND "SPIRITUAL" PHENOMENA.

BY PROFESSOR DOLBEAR.

It is plain that every kind of a question is, in the last analysis, referable to the laws of physical phenomena, and that from these there is no appeal. There are not many who like this, it is true; but the test for truth is not what one likes or dislikes, but whether the proposition is in accordance with the best and most fundamental knowledge we have. Some of those fundamental truths discovered within the past fifty years, and not questioned by any one who can stand an examination on them, have been given; and whoever sees, or thinks he sees, a phenomenon which he interprets in a way which plainly contradicts or ignores those laws, does not so much have a contention with any man as with science itself. If those laws are not irrefragably true, then we have no science at all, no philosophy, knowledge is scrappy, and what we call the interdependence of phenomena is a myth.

Some of the phenomena alleged to happen at spiritual *seances*, such as levitation of human bodies, writing between closed slates, the moving of matter without contact, and so forth, are said to be as thoroughly proved as any of the facts of the fundamental knowledge I have treated. Such a statement cannot have come from any one who knows how the knowledge I spoke of was obtained, or how it may be verified by anybody who cares to take the pains. None of it depends in any degree upon anybody's dictum. If anyone has doubts as to the constitution of water, he can determine it himself in half-a-dozen different ways, if he doubts that the earth is eight thousand miles in diameter, he can measure it in different ways. If he thinks a pound of coal does not have eleven million foot-pounds of energy, he can himself try it and be satisfied. Any one can satisfy himself by himself; assistance of others is only a convenience, not a necessity, and the fundamental statements are now believed by so many because so many have tested them, and all have reached the same conclusion. Furthermore, great commercial enterprises are founded upon some of them, as when so much limestone and coal are mixed with a given ore of iron for its reduction. So if such alleged facts be true, it cannot be true they are as thoroughly proved as the ones I stated, and they will not be so proved until each one can be verified in like manner.

There is another excellent reason for denying that these facts are proved in any scientific sense. All physical phenomena, so far as they have become a part of physical science, have been examined and reported upon by physicists; and both phenomena and their interpretation have been the subject of remorseless

criticism, and have been adopted, if at all, on *compulsion*; their acceptance has been a matter of last resort. This is true in all departments. Why should one believe that the world turns round, unless there is no other possible way to explain and account for all the facts which must be reckoned with in any explanation? The theory itself is so remote from the common experience of mankind that nobody suspected it for thousands of years, and it is not at all obvious to one who is not acquainted with phenomena out of the range of ordinary experience. The form of the earth, the aberration of light, the apparent change of latitude, and so forth, have to be considered even more than the recurrence of day and night. For most of the purposes of life, it does not matter whether it turns round or not, and most men have no interest in the question further than as it accords with their other beliefs and feelings. But the answer to the question, "Does it turn?" is not one that can be settled by submitting it to the vote of the world. The judgment of one Galileo is worth more than that of all the rest of the world on that point. Once admit that no department of science is independent of other departments, and that no phenomenon occurs independent of relations which must be satisfied by any attempted explanation, and it follows that no explanation of an event should be adopted and considered as a part of science, unless it is shown to be in agreement with what is known. Hence, if an event is reported which appears to be out of relation with those established relations which there is general agreement upon, there is the best of reasons for thinking, either that the event did not take place, or that it did not happen as reported, especially if the one reporting it is unacquainted with the variety of ways in which it is possible to do the same thing. If one sees a wheel turning round, but does not see its connections, how can he tell whether it is turned by muscular action, or water power, or wind power, or gravity, or heat, or electricity, or magnetism, every one of which is capable of turning a wheel? Even if he can see the connections, he cannot always tell what makes the wheel go without further investigation. Air and steam will make a motor go as well as water itself, and the presence of electrical devices would not insure that the wheel was turned by electricity, and the absence of such electrical devices would not insure that it was not driven by electrical agency. Hence, the testimony of witnesses only, even though they were otherwise competent, would be of little weight in deciding what made the wheel go. If the question were one of any importance, it could be determined only by a competent investigator with proper appliances, and unhindered by restrictions of any sort. One cannot trust his sense of sight implicitly. Many persons have lost fingers because the buzz-saw looked as if it were still; and it is easy with the zoetrope, and in other ways, to produce the impression of movements that are not taking place. So it might be, after all, that the wheel was not turning, or even that there was no wheel at all.

Admitting, for the argument's sake, that the alleged phenomena at *seances* are

real occ  
possibl

1. to mak  
of man  
able to  
skilful  
such, d

2. Su  
duplic  
embodi  
absurd  
reasona  
rubbish,  
Huxley  
against s

3. Th  
genuine,  
force n  
Professo

As to  
remarked  
race to g  
of prop  
some int  
peopled  
and inte  
fetish; th  
useful no  
always be  
and even  
denounce  
don't kno

It is sai  
intellig  
inference  
vered tha  
been supp

He knew  
therefore s  
law of gra

real occurrences and must be accounted for, there are certainly three different possible ways :

1. By more or less skilfully devised tricks, and fraudulent only in the attempt to make others believe they are not tricks. Whether or not they are the results of manipulative skill on the part of some one, only a skilful juggler might be able to find out. It is known that hundreds have thus been imposed upon ; and skilful jugglers, such as Hermann and Maskelyne, who have investigated many such, declare themselves satisfied that the whole of it is trickery.

2. Suppose some of the surprising things done are not the result of conscious duplicity, then they may be, as most interested persons contend, the work of disembodied spirits, who, through the agency of mediums, do apparently the most absurd and irrational things, but are never willing or able to do the simplest reasonable thing to satisfy a competent judge ; who mutter no end of maudlin rubbish, add nothing to man's store of wisdom or knowledge, and justify Prof. Huxley in saying that, if such is the state of the dead, we have another reason against suicide.

3. There are a small number who think some of the *phenomena* to be genuine, but who attribute them, not to spirits, but to some obscure physical force not yet understood, and but little investigated. This is the attitude of Professor Crookes and of the Milan experimenters.

As to the class that is satisfied with the spiritualistic interpretation, it may be remarked that such an explanation is in accordance with the attempts of the race to give a rational explanation of all kinds of phenomena. In the absence of proper knowledge, what seems simpler or more natural than to assume some intelligent agency as the cause of any obscure event ? This it was that peopled the mountains, glens, trees and rivers with unseen beings, watchful and interested in the affairs of men. The more ignorant, the closer was the fetish ; the more enlightened, the higher these agencies retreated into the sky, useful now chiefly for literary and artistic purposes. For some reason it has always been discreditable to be without some theory for all sorts of occurrences, and even to-day, in the most enlightened communities, a man is liable to be denounced for his stupidity or his cowardice if he says, about such matters, " I don't know."

It is said, however, that some of the phenomena at *seances* bear the marks of intelligence such as do not belong to natural occurrences, and that it is a fair inference that other minds than the witnesses are present. When Kepler discovered that the planets moved in elliptical orbits instead of circular ones, as had been supposed, he felt bound to give some reasonable explanation of the facts. He knew of nothing but intelligence that could maintain such motions, and he therefore supposed that each planet must have some guiding spirit. When the law of gravitation was applied, it was found that a circular orbit was the only

unstable orbit in the system, and that gravity alone was sufficient to account for the order, the harmony, and all the variety of motions; so the spirits were dismissed from further duty. When a crystal of quartz is seen to replace a part accidentally lost, so as to complete its symmetry before it begins to grow elsewhere, it appears as if mind was at work here quite as much as in the other case, only in the latter most persons are content not to follow the implications, for they quickly see the philosophical rocks ahead. The real truth is that the further one pursues the causes of phenomena the more clearly does it appear unlikely that disembodied intelligence is behind any particular phenomenon.

Among all those who make up the great class of believers in the spiritualistic theory of physical phenomena, there is not a single physicist; that is, not one to whom one would go for an explanation of any complicated physical process. It is assumed he is no better qualified to investigate *seance* phenomena than others who do not know what to expect and look out for in simpler cases, and that he is unreasonable if he does not accept the statements of untrained observers as being as good as his own observations.

It is true that he has some prepossessions. He does not believe the multiplication table should be trifled with. He knows that most things may be done in many different ways, independent of appearances. He knows a man may sometimes not perceive what is plainly before his eyes, simply because he was not looking for it. He deems it right to exhaust the possibilities of the known before summoning some unknown and hypothetical factors in any given case. He knows it to be well-nigh impossible for a man to give an entirely accurate account to-day of what occurred yesterday. He knows that a photograph is a better witness of an event, and that a stenographic report of statements made is more reliable than any man's memory. He knows that the interpretations of events by mankind have never been true interpretations, and that the general beliefs of mankind have never been confirmed by science in any particular; and that, so far as anything has been settled, it has been decided against the opinions and judgment of mankind and its leaders. He is aware that his key has unlocked every one of the doors in Doubting Castle that have been unlocked, and therefore he believes that the implications of physical science as a whole are against any generally received interpretation of any event that has not been subjected to its scrutiny.

The people contact  
It is will be book.  
In di ourselve  
It wor of the st  
The f history f Rome -  
The C yore. A  
All his thus per when we  
Babyloni brought  
earliest ti onian ac  
Let us does the  
He is a upon the came thes beginning  
He is Biblical p infinitely r  
For the ook upon can disper the thousa literalness ational w



## THE CREATION STORY—A JEWISH VIEW.

BY RABBI B. A. ELZAS.

The Bible contains the history of the rise and development of the Israelitish people and religion, and incidentally of those nations who were brought into contact with them, and who, in any way, contributed to that development.

It is history, then, of which we speak, and the history contained in the Bible will be treated in exactly the same way as the history contained in any other book.

In discussing the Bible story it will be well, especially at the outset, to ask ourselves the question: "What does the writer wish to teach?"

It would be well if we always asked this question, for it gives us a better grasp of the subject, and much needless difficulty is thereby saved.

The first historian of the Roman people, desiring to give his contemporaries a history from the earliest times, tells in epic verses the story of the foundation of Rome—interweaving the legends of Romulus and Remus.

The Greek historian, too, sings about the deeds of the great heroes in days of yore. And what is true of Greece and Rome is true of every nation.

All history begins with tradition—legends handed down from father to son and thus perpetuated. The early Bible story—that from the creation until Abraham when we are fairly on historical ground—is based upon a similar story in the Babylonian literature. This embodies traditions which were in all probability brought by Abraham from Ur, (his birthplace and an important city from the earliest times)—and modified by him to suit his monotheistic ideas—the Babylonian account being polytheistic.

Let us now come back to the Bible; let us open it and ask ourselves, "What does the writer wish to convey?"

He is a historian. He looks up to heaven with its sun, moon, and stars, and upon the earth with its robe of many folds and colors, and asks himself, "Whence came these?" With an exquisite simplicity he begins his narrative. "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," etc.

He is a poet too, and a poet of magnificent endowments. Compare the Biblical poem with its prototype, the Babylonian, and you will at once see how infinitely more glorious in conception is our own.

For the account of creation in the Bible is a poem. I do not think we are to look upon it as a record of fact. See this clearly, and how much we gain! We can dispense with Mr. Gladstone's "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," and the thousands and myriads of books that have been written in defence of the literalness and scientific accuracy of the early portion of the Bible. The only rational way of regarding it is as a poem, and it will be the universal way of

looking at it when the results of Assyriological research shall have become more generally known. Then, too, will the greatest stumbling-block in the way of faith have been removed; and the Bible, placed in its true light, will be studied as it should be. There will be no more need for the washy talk and writings with which we are still favored on the subject of "Science and the Bible."

Let us now look at the view that is unfolded to us by the poet. He finds himself in the world surrounded by all the beauties of animated nature, he lifts up his eyes on high and asks, "Who hath created these things?" and he answers, "God."

But how did God do all this? His primitive mind now pictures in the most natural way, the gradual unfolding out of chaos of the world as he found it.

An old tradition told how "the earth was without form and void," etc. Then God said, "Let there be light." Land and water were next separated; sun, moon, and stars created; the barren earth clad with vegetation; animals appear on the earth and fishes in the sea—and when the world becomes habitable, man—the glory of creation—is made. And now there is nothing more to be done. God sees that His work is very good—His world might now go on by itself, and so He rests.

It has always seemed to me that we have in this most simple narrative an illustration of how man's ideas of the working of God are a reflex of his own mind. The poet actually pictures how he would have done the work had he been in the place of God—naturally enough attributing his own ideas to Deity. We should all of us, I fancy, have gone to work in the very same way as the writer of Genesis conceived God to have proceeded. We, too, should first have said, "Let there be light!" "Let land and water be separated!" "Let vegetation appear!" and so forth.

I need not refer to the fact that there are clearly two accounts of creation in Genesis, nor to the time-old question that has been asked me a hundred times by my class, "Where did the light come from on the first day, when the sun, moon and stars were only created on the fourth?" Those who wish to see the length to which commentators have had to go to explain the difficulty, can find an apt illustration in any of the numerous works that purport to reconcile Scripture difficulties. In our view of Genesis, the answer is most simple and evident.

The question whether Genesis and geology are reconcilable, does not concern us in the least. If they agree, then well—if they do not, then well also. To quote the time-worn commonplace: "The Bible is not a textbook of science."

Is it, then, the word and thought of God? Yes, but only in the sense that every thought that seeks to discover the origin of things with a view to elevate and uplift mankind is His work.

Let us cease to prate, as men have done in the past, about the science of the Bible. Let us look upon the early chapters of Genesis in the broad and open true light. The glory of our Bible will not thereby be diminished, nor will its light become dim. We shall no longer be compelled to answer the many unanswerable questions of the past. They will have disappeared, and Scripture will indeed be the impregnable rock claimed by its defenders.

If all n  
mental  
lotted to  
These  
Correlat  
The c  
of the c  
sions of  
The c  
call its fr  
maximum  
the cereb  
of a long  
rings and  
every sen  
impulse  
If ther  
and read  
A bell re  
activity of  
these circ  
which cou  
implies m  
purpose, t  
duration o  
follow it  
But the  
which has  
or less diff  
this genera  
may term  
are familia  
During o  
ideation is  
call them, s  
new trains  
rapidity and

## THE PROCESS OF THOUGHT.

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

If all mental states are effects of physical causes, it follows that what are called mental faculties and operations are, properly speaking, cerebral functions, allotted to definite, though not yet precisely assignable, parts of the brain.

These functions appear to be reducible to three groups—namely, Sensation, Correlation, and Ideation.

The organs of the functions of sensation and correlation are those portions of the cerebral substance, the molecular changes of which give rise to impressions of sensation and impressions of relation.

The changes in the nervous matter which bring about the effects which we call its functions, follow upon some kind of stimulus, and rapidly reaching their maximum, as rapidly die away. The effect of the irritation of a nerve-fibre on the cerebral substance with which it is connected may be compared to the pulling of a long bell-wire. The impulse takes a little time to reach the bell; the bell rings and then becomes quiescent, until another pull is given. So, in the brain, every sensation is the ring of a cerebral particle,—the effect of a momentary impulse sent along a nerve-fibre.

If there were a complete likeness between the two terms of this very rough and ready comparison, it is obvious that there could be no such thing as memory. A bell records no audible sign of having been rung five minutes ago, and the activity of a sensigenous cerebral particle might similarly leave no trace. Under these circumstances, again, it would seem that the only impressions of relation which could arise would be those of co-existence and similarity. For succession implies memory of an antecedent state. (It is not worth while, for the present purpose, to consider whether, as all nervous action occupies a sensible time, the duration of one impression might not overlap that of the impression which may follow it in the case supposed.)

But the special peculiarity of the cerebral apparatus is, that any given function which has once been performed is very easily set a-going again, by causes more or less different from those to which it owed its origin. Of the mechanism of this generation of images, of impressions, or ideas (in Hume's sense), which we may term "Ideation," we know nothing at present, though the fact and its results are familiar enough.

During our waking, and many of our sleeping hours, in fact, this function of ideation is continual, if not continuous activity. Trains of thought, as we call them, succeed one another without intermission, even when the starting of new trains by fresh sense-impressions is as far as possible prevented. The rapidity and the intensity of this ideational process are obviously dependent

upon physiological conditions. The widest differences in these respects are constitutional in men of different temperaments ; and are observable in oneself under varying conditions of hunger and repletion, fatigue and freshness, calmness and emotional excitement. The influence of diet on dreams ; of stimulants upon the fulness and the velocity of the stream of thought ; the delirious phantasms generated by disease, by hashish, or by alcohol—will occur to every one as examples of the marvellous sensitiveness of the apparatus of ideation to purely physical influences.

The succession of mental states in ideation is not fortuitous, but follows the law of association, which may be stated thus : that every idea tends to be followed by some other idea which is associated with the first, or its impression, by a relation of succession, of contiguity, or of likeness.

Thus the idea of the word " horse " just now presented itself to my mind, and was followed in quick succession by the ideas of four legs, hoofs, teeth, rider, saddle, racing, cheating ; all of which ideas are connected in my experience with the impression, or the idea, of a horse and with one another, by the relations of contiguity and succession. No great attention to what passes in the mind is needful to prove that our trains of thought are neither to be arrested, nor ever permanently controlled, by our desires or emotions. Nevertheless, they are largely influenced by them. In the presence of a strong desire or emotion, the stream of thought no longer flows on in a straight course, but seems, as it were, to eddy round the idea of that which is the object of the emotion. Every one who has " eaten his bread in sorrow " knows how strangely the current of ideas whirls about the conception of the object of regret or remorse as a centre every now and then, indeed, breaking away into the new tracks suggested by passing associations, but still returning to the central thought. Few can have been so happy as to have escaped the social bore, whose pet notion is certain to crop up whatever topic is started ; while the fixed idea of the monomaniac is but the extreme form of the same phenomenon.

And as, on the one hand, it is so hard to drive away the thought we would be rid of ; so, upon the other, the pleasant imaginations which we would so gladly retain are, sooner or later, jostled away by the crowd of claimants for birth in the world of consciousness, which hover as a sort of psychical possibilities in the inverse ghosts, the bodily presentments of spiritual phenomena to be, in the limbo of the brain. In that form of desire which is called " attention," the train of thought, held fast for a time in the desired direction, seems ever striving to get on to another line—and the junctions and sidings are so multitudinous

—From " *Life of Hume.* "

DREAM  
of the  
the wa  
all. ?  
always  
when t  
do we  
Alth  
acquiri  
attache  
cases, a  
times fr  
self. S  
sermon  
sleep ar  
those se  
conditi  
suspend  
When t  
continu  
notes, v  
Evident  
though  
his cons  
are auth  
well, an  
that the  
Condi  
dreams s  
and Col  
which he  
as he aw  
visitor w  
could ne  
a fragme  
We ha  
the corre  
and of a  
had vain  
Gregory  
which we

## DREAMS AND DREAMING.

BY B. F. UNDERWOOD, CHICAGO, ILL.

DREAMING is commonly regarded, and correctly, no doubt, as the activity of the mind in complete sleep, which leaves sometimes distinct traces in the waking consciousness; at other times indistinct traces, or none at all. The phenomena of sub-consciousness indicate that the mind is always, even in the most profound sleep, more or less active. Only when the results of the thinking process come into the conscious mind, do we take note of the mental activity.

Although Zeno recommended examination of dreams as a means of acquiring knowledge of the true self, and many philosophers have attached the greatest importance to dreams, they are probably in most cases, as Dryden says, "a medley of disjointed things." Yet they sometimes furnish evidence of intellectual capacity which surprises the waking self. Spurgeon relates that once when he had been unable to prepare a sermon for the following Sunday, one Saturday night he arose in his sleep and prepared the notes of a discourse which was not inferior to those sermons which he thought out and prepared in his normal conscious condition. The work was done without that consciousness which was suspended when he went to sleep and which was resumed when he awoke. When the notes were completed he returned to bed and his repose was continued until his usual hour of awaking. He was surprised to see the notes, when he went to his study, all prepared and ready for use. Evidently his mind had been in active operation during the night, though the activity was not perceptibly connected with the memories of his conscious state. This case, and others of a similar character which are authenticated, point not only to mental but to muscular activity as well, and to a precision of movement which is surprising considering that the eyes are usually closed under these circumstances.

Condillac, while engaged in writing one of his works, completed in his dreams a train of thought where he had left off on retiring for the night; and Coleridge, as is well known, wrote from memory one of his pieces which he had composed in his sleep. He commenced the writing as soon as he awoke in the morning, continuing till he was interrupted by a visitor with whom he conversed for a while on business matters, but he could never recall the thread of the story, and "Kubla Khan" remains a fragment.

We have the testimony of mathematicians who while asleep dreamed the correct solution of problems which had baffled them while awake, and of authors who in dreams were directed to authorities which they had vainly sought to find when regularly engaged in their work. Dr. Gregory states that ideas and phraseology occurred to him in dreams which were so apt that he made use of them in giving lectures before his

college classes; and Sir Thomas Browne composed comedies in his dreams which amused him greatly when he awoke. Samuel Johnson relates that he once in a dream had a contest of wit with some other person, and that he was mortified by imagining his antagonist had the better of him. Goethe often recorded during the day ideas which had occurred to him during sleep on the preceding night. Helen Hunt, when she sent her last poem for publication, wrote to her editor: "I can hardly say that I wrote this poem, for I awoke with it on my lips." James Grant, of New Haven, Conn., an electrician, relates that in a dream he located a break in the insulated cables which the electric experts had tried in vain to discover. He dreamed that the difficulty was where it was thought not likely to be found, and he was laughed at for the suggestion when he offered it. But the examination was made and the break was found at the exact point designated in his dream.

The dreamer often sees beautiful pictures, hears melodious strains of music, and feels the presence of departed or distant friends as vividly as though the external organs were in active exercise. Taste and smell are in like manner excited in sleep.

These and a multitude of similar facts prove that the activity of the organs of sense is not necessary to excite those impressions which were originally received through the senses, and they show, too, that what is originally perceived is not the external object, but the effect which the object has produced upon the mind—a symbolical representation of the external thing. Thus, when the avenues of the body are closed, the impressions may be as vivid as when the senses are alive to the outward world.

What is still more wonderful, if possible, is that the imagination may during this time, indulge in flights of fancy, the reasoning powers may be exerted in solving the most abstruse problems, or memory may be exercised in recalling from the dim past some long forgotten incident.

There is a large amount of testimony, including statements by persons whose intelligence and veracity are beyond question, which would seem to show that the mind, during natural sleep and hypnotic trance, possesses clairvoyant powers of seeing what is occurring at a distance. The most careful investigators of psychical phenomena assert this as a fact experimentally proven, thus confirming the testimony in support of the claim of thousands who have had the experience, but who have never systematically investigated the subject.

Sleep, the half-brother of death, as Homer calls it, certainly, while giving rise to very perplexing problems, indicates that the mind has powers which are not observable in the ordinary conscious state. From the subliminal regions of our nature emerges at times into our conscious life through dreams, knowledge not obtained by means of the sensory channels, but apparently in some unknown supernormal manner.

Is there in a man, as Mr. F. W. H. Myers suggests, a larger and more comprehensive consciousness, in which all the apparently different per-

sonality  
much a  
of the  
may y  
of the  
to the  
What  
varies s  
facultie

personalities unite, and to which what we define as the sub-conscious is as much a part of the conscious mind as are the thought and experiences of the ordinary waking state? This view, if now only a speculation, may yet come to be recognized as an important fact in the psychology of the future. Be this as it may, all who have given careful attention to the subject will agree with Dr. Edward von Hartman when he says: "What we possess to-day in the way of history and among contemporaries suffices to convince me that the human organism contains more faculties than exact science has discovered and analyzed."



## PROGRESS.

BY ELIA WHEELER WILCOX.

LET there be many windows to your soul,  
That all the glory of the universe  
May beautify it. Not the narrow pane  
Of one poor creed can catch the radiant rays  
That shine from countless sources. Tear away  
The blinds of superstition; let the light  
Pour through fair windows broad as Truth itself,  
And high as God.

Why should the spirit peer  
Through some priest-curtained orifice, and grope  
Along dim corridors of doubt, when all  
The splendor from unfathomed seas of space  
Might bathe it with the golden waves of Love?  
Sweep up the débris of decaying faiths;  
Sweep down the cobwebs of worn-out beliefs,  
And throw your soul wide open to the light  
Of Reason and of Knowledge. Tune your ear  
To all the wordless music of the stars  
And to the voice of Nature, and your heart  
Shall turn to truth and goodness as the plant  
Turns to the sun. A thousand unseen hands  
Reach down to help you to their peace-crowned heights,  
And all the forces of the firmament  
Shall fortify your strength. Be not afraid  
To thrust aside half truth and grasp the whole.

## CONWAY'S DEFENCE OF THE SPANISH INQUISITION.

BY C. P. BOLLMAN, EDITOR "AMERICAN SENTINEL."

IN the very outset, it will be observed that, in the times of which Mr. Conway writes, "the Church of Christ," by which he means the Roman Catholic Church, "ruled with the sceptre of faith the civilized world." The same fact, namely the universality of Rome's political domination at the era of the Inquisition, is emphasized all through the first part of Mr. Conway's article. This fact itself insisted upon by Mr. Conway, is sufficient to show that Rome, and Rome alone, was responsible, not only for the Inquisition, but for the untold horrors which everywhere attended its operations, not only in Spain, but also in France, Italy, and the Netherlands, and, indeed, wherever it was established.

It is true that, later in his article, Mr. Conway attempts to explain away some of the most damaging facts relating to the operations of the Inquisition, and that he even denies that the number of its victims was as great as is generally stated; but denials are not proof, and the facts of history concerning the work of both the Spanish and the Roman Inquisitions are too well authenticated to be successfully disputed at this late day.

To plead that "the Inquisition was a very merciful tribunal," indeed "almost a compassionate tribunal," as Mr. Conway does, because "a man was only allowed to be racked once," is puerile. One racking was sufficient to dislocate many of the joints and to leave the victim a physical wreck, and yet we are assured, in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, that the tribunal which habitually inflicted this fiendish torture was almost compassionate!

But why, believing as he does that the Inquisition was right, Mr. Conway cares to enter even a partial denial of the charges against it is more than we can understand. If, as he insists, "the Church" was justified in punishing heretics even to the death, then the exact number so punished can make no material difference. If, as Mr. Conway also insists, it was the bounden duty of the Church to root out heresy, she certainly could not be blamed for using whatever means seemed most likely to accomplish that result in the shortest time; and certainly nothing could have been more effective than the utter extinction of the incorrigible.

It must be remembered that the Catholic Church claims infallibility through its head, the Pope. If this claim were true, the state of society and the customs of the times could make no difference with the acts of the Church. They may be right. It is true that this infallibility is claimed only in "matters of faith and morals;" but certainly the right of the Church to persecute dissenters, even to the death, is a question both "of faith and morals." Members of that Church

eviden  
action  
simp  
that fo  
by ma  
never  
Inquis  
the con  
and kil  
in thes  
"H  
bunals  
Great o  
the oth  
the Ro  
upon th  
ment th  
And in  
found th  
In th  
Spanish  
origin, w  
gether to  
but in d  
from int  
he appea  
The c  
particula  
remainin  
themselv  
and even  
this hidd  
not only  
A pert  
they did  
State whi  
corruption  
and State  
It is mad  
faith, mar  
use their



evidently realize this, and practically admit it when they attempt to justify the action of the Church in establishing and maintaining the Inquisition. Were it simply a question of expediency, of church discipline, or of anything outside of that for which they claim infallibility, they would certainly not stultify themselves by making any defence. Then might they well afford to say: "The Church has never claimed infallibility in discipline; and in establishing and maintaining the Inquisition she erred." But as the dogma that the Church has a right to coerce the conscience, to compel obedience, is a matter of "faith," and as torturing and killing men is a question of morals, they dare not say that the church erred in these things.

"History," says Mr. Conway, "divides the Inquisition into two distinct tribunals—the Roman Inquisition and the Inquisition of the Spanish Government. Great care must be taken not to confound the two. One is purely ecclesiastical, the other strictly secular." In the light of this full and candid admission that the Roman Inquisition belonged wholly to the Church, it is needless to dwell upon that phase of the subject. We shall examine briefly, therefore, his statement that "the other," namely, the Spanish Inquisition, was "strictly secular." And in so doing, we shall find that "great care" is indeed required not to confound the two, so much alike are they in origin, purpose, and operation.

In the first part of the latter half of his article, Mr. Conway discusses the Spanish Inquisition at considerable length, and gives quite an account of its origin, which he endeavors to show was purely political. He ascribes it altogether to the desire of the king to establish such a tribunal for political reasons; but in doing this he himself very clearly shows that this desire sprang primarily from intense religious feeling; and, as in his defence of the Roman Inquisition, he appeals in its justification to the customs of the people who lived at that time.

The claim made by Mr. Conway is that the Spanish Inquisition was directed particularly against the Jews, many of whom, "thirsting for wealth, while secretly remaining Jews, pretended to profess the Catholic faith, were baptized, pushed themselves into the courts and kingly palaces, became holders of large estates, and even were found among the priests and prelates of the Church of God. In this hidden, underhanded manner, they were seeking to overturn the institutions, not only of the Catholic Church, but also of the Spanish nation."

A pertinent question would be, Why did the Jews thus profess a faith which they did not believe? Was it not because of the corrupt union of Church and State which placed a premium upon hypocrisy, and upon moral and political corruption? and is it not evident from this that the logic of any union of Church and State is unbounded corruption in both? or an inquisition? because where it is made a matter of financial or political profit for men to profess a certain faith, many will be found to do so, and when they have so professed they will use their influence and positions for their own aggrandizement. To discover the

secret thoughts of the hearts of such men the methods of the Inquisition must be used. Therefore Mr. Conway's statement of facts constitutes a powerful argument against all union of Church and State, because such union must, in the first place, beget and foster hypocrisy; and hypocrisy can be completely discovered only by wringing from men the secrets of their hearts; and this can be done only by torture.

But let us examine the political element which Mr. Conway insists entered into this matter. He says that these Jews in this "hidden, underhanded manner" "were seeking to overturn the institutions, not only of the Catholic Church but also of the Spanish nation." The last accusation, namely, that they were seeking to overturn the Spanish nation, must be understood in the light of other utterance by the same writer, who, in his attempted justification of the persecution of "the heretic," styles him "a foe to civilization." Roman Catholics believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the only efficient promoter of civilization, consequently anything that is opposed to the Catholic faith is, as they view it, opposed to civilization. In like manner they believe that the Catholic Church is the only adequate conservator of stable, civil government; thus runs their theory. So that in its last analysis that which is here assumed and asserted to be political was in fact religious; and to reach this and stamp it out the Spanish Inquisition, equally with the Roman Inquisition, was established.

Again, Mr. Conway gives his whole case away when, in attempting to show that the Spanish Inquisition was "secular," he admits the fact that before it could be established the consent of the Pope was necessary; and seeing himself the incongruity of having to receive the consent of the Church for the establishment of something "strictly secular," he asks: "What need was there of the permission of the Popes? If the Inquisition was purely secular what had the Pope or the Church to do with its actions?" And answering his own question he says: "The permission of Rome was necessary for many reasons, but chiefly for two, first, because the men who were appointed as inquisitors by the Court of Spain were priests and prelates and theologians of the church, and were for that reason under the *jurisdiction of the popes*: and secondly, and most especially, because the Inquisition was instituted to try people on *matters of faith*."

These facts thus clearly stated by a prominent Roman Catholic writer in a prominent Roman Catholic paper ought certainly to satisfy any candid mind as to the nature of the Spanish Inquisition. It existed by permission of the Church, was administered by priests, prelates and theologians of the Church, and existed for the purpose of trying people in matters of faith, and the punishments inflicted were for departures from the faith of the church.

One important point remains to be noticed—namely, the parallel between the "justification" of intolerance in the era of the Inquisition and the justification

of int  
extr  
Tenn  
impris  
the pa

By a  
the civ  
for reli  
of Chu  
howeve  
Jesus C  
institut  
exempt  
part of  
in gove  
ministe  
imperf  
because  
his dist  
suffer fo  
majority

He w  
Inquisit  
Roman  
Holland  
As was  
ginia in  
rity] to a  
the Chri  
back to t

of intolerance in our own day. We shall show this parallel by quoting a short extract from Judge Hammond's dictum, given on August 1, 1891, at Memphis, Tenn., in the case of R. M. King, a Seventh-day Adventist, tried, convicted and imprisoned for practical dissent from the religious faith of his neighbors as to the particular day to be observed as the Sabbath :

By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom, and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . The courts cannot change that which has been done, however done, by the civil law in favor of the Sunday observers. The religion of Jesus Christ is so interwoven with the texture of our civilization and every one of its institutions, that it is impossible for any man or set of men to live among us and find exemption from its influences and restraints. Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it. . . . It is idle to expect in government perfect action or harmony of essential principles, and whoever administers, whoever makes, and whoever executes the laws, must take into account the imperfections, the passions, the prejudices, religious or other, and the errings of men because of these. . . . If one ostentatiously labors for the purpose of emphasizing his distaste for, or disbelief in, the custom [of keeping Sunday], he may be made to suffer for his defiance by persecutions, if you call them so, on the part of the great majority, who will compel him to rest when they rest."

He who assents to Judge Hammond's reasoning in defence of the Tennessee Inquisition, cannot consistently dissent from Mr. Conway's in justification of the Roman Catholic Inquisition of the Middle Ages, as it existed in France, Spain, Holland, and other countries. There can be no compromise on this question. As was clearly recognized by the Presbyterians, Quakers, and Baptists of Virginia in their memorial of 1785, it is "impossible for a magistrate [civil authority] to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith, without creating a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome."

---

### LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!

---

THE prayer of Ajax was for light;  
Through all that dark and desperate fight,  
The blackness of that noon-day night  
He asked but the return of sight,

To see his foeman's face.  
Let our unceasing, earnest prayer  
Be, too, for light, for strength to bear  
Our portion of the weight of care,  
That crushes into dumb despair  
One half the human race.—LONGFELLOW.

## THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

Now upon these gospels that I have read the churches rest ; and out of these things, mistakes and interpolations, they have made their creeds. And the first church to make a creed, so far as I know, was the Catholic. It was the first church that had any power. That is the church that has preserved all these miracles for us. That is the church that preserved the manuscripts for us. That is the church whose word we have to take. That church is the first witness that Protestantism brought to the bar of history to prove miracles that took place eighteen hundred years ago ; and while the witness is there Protestantism takes pains to say : " You cannot believe one word that witness says, *now*."

That church is the only one that keeps up a constant communication with heaven through the instrumentality of a large number of decayed saints. That church has an agent of God on earth, has a person who stands in the place of deity ; and that church is infallible. That church has persecuted to the exact extent of her power—and always will. In Spain that church stands erect, and is arrogant. In the United States that church crawls ; but the object in both countries is the same—and that is the destruction of intellectual liberty. That church teaches us that we can make God happy by being miserable ourselves ; that a nun is holier in the sight of God than a loving mother with her child in her thrilled and thrilling arms ; that a priest is better than a father ; that celibacy is better than that passion of love that has made everything of beauty in this world. That church tells the girl of sixteen or eighteen years of age, with eyes like dew and light ; that girl with the red of health in the white of her beautiful cheeks—tells that girl, " Put on the veil, woven of death and night, kneel upon stones, and you will please God."

I tell you that, by law, no girl should be allowed to take the veil and renounce the joys and beauties of this life.

I am opposed to allowing these spider-like priests to weave webs to catch the loving maidens of the world. There ought to be a law appointing commissioners to visit such places twice a year and release every person who expresses a desire to be released. I do not believe in keeping the penitentiaries of God. No doubt they are honest about it. That is not the question. These ignorant superstitions fill millions of lives with weariness and pain, with agony and tears.

This church, after a few centuries of thought, made a creed, and that creed is the foundation of the orthodox religion. Let me read it to you :

" Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith ; which faith except every one do keep entire and inviolate

without  
worship

Of  
plaining  
You see  
substan

" For  
Holy G  
Ghost is  
in majes  
Ghost.

The Fat  
prehensi  
Father i  
three ete  
incompr

" In li  
almighty  
is God, t  
likewise,  
are not t

ledge ev  
the Cath  
is made o  
not made  
the Son,

You kn  
" So th

fathers, a  
not thre  
nothing g  
other and

and the T  
thus think  
that he als  
right of th  
Christ, the  
his Father

That wa  
" And  
God and p

without doubt, he shall everlastingly perish." Now the faith is this : " That we worship one God in trinity and trinity in unity."

Of course you understand how that is done, and there is no need of my explaining it. " Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance." You see what a predicament that would leave the deity in if you divided the substance.

" For one is the person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost ; but the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one"—you know what I mean by Godhead. " In glory equal, and in majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, such is the Holy Ghost. The Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible." And that is the reason we know so much about the thing. " The Father is eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal, and yet there are not three eternal, only one eternal, as also there are not three uncreated, nor three incomprehensibles, only one uncreated, one incomprehensible."

" In like manner, the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Ghost almighty. Yet there are not three almighties, only one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God, and yet not three Gods ; and so, likewise, the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, the Holy Ghost is Lord, yet there are not three Lords, for as we are compelled by the Christian truth to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord, so we are all forbidden by the Catholic religion to say there are three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of no one ; not created or begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is from the Father and the Son, not made nor begotten, but proceeding."

You know what " proceeding " is.

" So there is one Father, not three Fathers." Why should there be three fathers, and only one son? " One Son, and not three Sons : one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts ; and in this Trinity there is nothing before or afterward, nothing greater or less, but the whole three persons are co-eternal with one another and co-equal, so that in all things the unity is to be worshipped in Trinity, and the Trinity is to be worshipped in unity. Those who will be saved must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now the right of this thing is this : " That we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and man. He is God of the substance of his Father begotten before the world was."

That was a good while before his mother lived.

" And he is man of the substance of his mother, born in this world, perfect God and perfect man, with a rational soul in human flesh subsisting ; equal to

the Father according to his Godhead, but less than the Father according to his manhood, who being both God and man, is not two, but one ; one not by conversion of God into flesh, but by the taking of the manhood into God."

You see, that is a great deal easier than the other way would be.

"One altogether, not by a confusion of substance but by unity of person, for as the rational soul and the flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ, who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, and he sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and He shall come to judge the living and the dead."

In order to be saved it is necessary to believe this. What a blessing that we do not have to understand it. And in order to compel the human intellect to get upon its knees before that infinite absurdity, thousands and millions have suffered agonies ; thousands and thousands have perished in dungeons and in fire ; and if all the bones of all the victims of the Catholic church could be gathered together, a monument higher than all the pyramids would rise, in the presence of which the eyes even of priests would be wet with tears.

That church covered Europe with cathedrals and dungeons, and robbed men of the jewel of the soul. That church had ignorance upon its knees. That church went in partnership with the tyrants of the throne, and between those two vultures, the altar and the throne, the heart of man was devoured.

Of course I have met, and cheerfully admit that there are thousands of good Catholics ; but Catholicism is contrary to human liberty. Catholicism bases salvation upon belief. Catholicism teaches man to trample his reason under foot. And for that reason it is wrong.

Thousands of volumes could not contain the crimes of the Catholic Church, they could not contain even the names of her victims. With sword and fire, with rack and chain, with dungeon and whip, she endeavored to convert the world. In weakness a beggar—in power a highwayman—almsdish or dagger—tramp or tyrant.

---

#### PROGRESS.

PROGRESS is

The law of life ; man's self is not yet man :  
Nor shall I deem his object served, his end  
Attained, his genuine strength put fairly forth,  
While only here and there a star dispels  
The darkness, here and there a towering mind  
O'erlooks its prostrate fellows.

ROBERT BROWNING.

The h  
romanc  
away b  
it starts  
and Po  
monop  
and its  
all matt  
Compar  
it by, fo  
and not

One  
large po  
oppositi  
sitting i  
at their  
again an  
houring  
grew by  
itself al  
army of  
British  
Bombay  
India be  
ment bei  
cies, but  
extent th  
100,000  
regiments  
(rank) we  
gulars wa  
and 18 ir  
these, the  
called "c

\* This  
History of  
is indebted

## THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.\*

THE history of the Honorable East India Company reads more like a thrilling romance than the sober record of a money-making corporation. Its inception away back in the sixteenth century ; its early combats with home rivals ere yet it started on its adventurous career ; its struggles for supremacy with the Dutch and Portuguese companies, who were as eager as were the English to establish a monopolizing trade with India ; its bloody fight to the finish with the French ; and its long, continuous skirmishes and wars with native tribes and nations, are all matters of entrancing interest. But, however attractive the story of John Company (as the association was familiarly called) may be, the writer must pass it by, for his purpose is to write a brief account of the great Mutiny of 1857, and not to undertake the history of the British occupation of India.

One peculiarity about the extension of the Company's empire is this : a very large portion of the subjugated territory was brought under its sway in direct opposition to the reiterated orders sent out to India by the Court of Directors sitting in Leadenhall Street, London. These peace-loving merchants were scared at their own marvellous success. The greatness was literally thrust upon them ; again and again their representatives in India found it impossible to keep neighbouring tribes or nations quiet except by absorbing them. So its possessions grew by accretions more or less important, until in 1857 the Company found itself almost absolute monarch of an enormous empire, maintaining a standing army of upwards of 200,000 men.

British India was then divided into three Presidencies—Bengal, Madras, and Bombay—each with its local governor and government, the supreme power in India being vested in the Governor-General and his Council, the seat of government being Calcutta. Bengal was not only the most important of the presidencies, but it was also pampered and favored by the Directors to a far greater extent than either Madras or Bombay. Its army in 1857 numbered more than 100,000 men. There were 74 regiments of Native Infantry, and 20 additional regiments termed irregulars. All of the officers (except a few of subordinate rank) were Europeans. The only difference between the regulars and the irregulars was this,—the latter had fewer officers. Of cavalry, there were 10 regular and 18 irregular regiments ; and there were several brigades of artillery. Besides these, there were five small armies furnished by five native states. These were called "contingents ;" the most important being the Gwalior Contingent.

\* This account of the Indian mutiny follows closely the order observed in Cassell's History of England, to which the writer, who was resident for many years in India, is indebted for many details.

The Sepoys made a fine appearance on parade ; they were well drilled, and went through the usual military manœuvres with precision. On many a hard fought field they proved themselves to be brave fellows ; and more than once showed a devotion to their white officers that stands unparalleled. Once, for instance, when a small force was in dire distress, the sepoys begged their officers to eat the rice and let them have the water in which the rice had been boiled, saying that they were more accustomed to privations than the " Sahib lōg." But in Bengal, in 1857, this kindly feeling towards their officers had all but completely died out.

Years ago, in one of the Chinese wars, a friend of mine owned and commanded a ship carrying troops, provisions and ammunition. A quantity of the powder was found to be moist, so the captain ordered the explosive to be spread out on sails and exposed to the rays of the sun. Strict injunctions were issued that while the drying process was going on no one was to smoke pipe or cigar. In every crowd there is sure to be at least one fool. If the fool only suffered for his folly, few would raise serious objections to his methods of enjoying life. Unfortunately, he generally escapes scot free, and the suffering falls on others. One man did smoke ; one spark did fall on the sail covered with powder, and one man was blown up into the air. The man who suffered was not the smoker ; it was the captain of the ship. He was not killed ; his eyelids were burnt off, half his nose suffered the same fate, two or three fingers were blown off and his face and body much scarred and injured. John Purdie, who was for years well known at Lloyd's, was the captain and owner of the troop-ship.

In the beginning of 1857 everything seemed quiet and in its normal state throughout British India ; but, unseen by all except a few, the gunpowder was lying exposed in all directions, and only a spark was wanted to bring about a terrible explosion. The spark fell at last, and the explosion followed in the month of May.

The Bengal army was rotten to its core. Many causes combined brought about this rottenness. In my opinion the government made a fatal mistake in its way of selecting staff officers. The appointments depended nearly wholly upon the lingual accomplishments of those chosen, a little interest at headquarters aiding. By depriving regiments of those officers who could converse fluently and intelligently with the Sepoys in their own language, one great chord of sympathy between the native and the white man was ruthlessly snapped. The officers who remained with the regiment were usually unable to carry on conversation with a sepoy, and were therefore compelled to limit their remarks to a few commonplace sayings. A sepoy going to his company officer with a tale of woe, full of domestic troubles, would receive a reply somewhat in the style : " All right ; you may retire." And away would go the sepoy, with a heart overflowing with bitterness and wrath against his officer. And yet, had that officer



understood in what sad plight his sepoy was, I am sure, in nine out of ten cases, he would have deprived himself of some little luxury and administered to the needs of his humble suppliant.

Another cause which helped to bring about this rottenness was the suicidal policy of encouraging the men, if they wished to make a complaint, to write to the general commanding the division, or even to a member of the government, instead of submitting it to their own officers. Naturally enough this led to a stultification of the commanding officers, and made them look ridiculous in the eyes of their men.

And yet another cause was the pampering of the Bengal army by the government. Most of the men in the regiments were of high caste; it was contamination for them to mix with one of lower caste. So to please these proud fellows many a good soldier was dismissed and many a good man who came to serve in the ranks was rejected. Of course the priests fostered this pride of caste; and growing upon what it fed, and becoming more exacting after each yielding to its haughty demands, it at last resulted in cavalry soldiers refusing to clean and tend their own horses. Men of low caste were actually hired to do this for the lazy and insolent cavalry soldier! So here lay the powder all around, and sparks, unseen but numerous, were floating in the air!

More than one warning note was blown, notably by Colonel Jacob as far back as 1851; but those warning notes struck upon ears deaf as if the apathy of death had fallen upon them! The native soldiers became daily prouder and more insolent; and, as the authorities granted nearly every demand made by them, they naturally inferred that the white man was afraid of them.

Near the beginning of 1857 a singular incident was noticed. A native policeman, carrying a couple of *chupatties* (little cakes) in his hand, walked suddenly into an Oudh village, showed them to the local policeman, told him to make a dozen or so more cakes like those he saw, and give two to every policeman in the neighborhood. These had to carry the mysterious cakes and the mysterious message to other policemen in their vicinity. Soon these chupatties were flying round all the presidency. When any native was asked the meaning of this strange proceeding, the answer was oracular—"You'll know by and by!"

The fatal spark fell in January, 1857; but not until May did the explosion follow. The rotten, insolent native army of Bengal was to be armed with the Enfield rifle. In those days the cartridges were encased in brown paper. The rifles were loaded at the muzzle, and a part of the paper at the powder end of the cartridge had to be torn off with the teeth before the cartridge was rammed down the barrel. This was done to expose the powder to the action of the percussion cap. The cartridges were greased. At Dumdum there was a cartridge factory; and one day a man employed in the building asked a grenadier for the loan of his *lot h* (a brass drinking pot) to get a drink of water. The grenadier

cursed the workman for his impudence in daring to make such a request. Nettled by the grenadier's haughty refusal, the workman laughed at him and said he had no good reason to act in that proud way. Many times had the grenadier broken the rules of his caste; in fact, he had done so every time he had bitten a cartridge! Were not the cartridges greased with the contaminating fat of cows and of swine? The Government was bent upon abolishing caste! This was the spark! The story, exaggerated in every way, was told in every town and village where troops were stationed. The priests naturally fomented the excitement, and soon the explosion occurred with a roar which was heard in every part of the civilized world!

The ridiculous story of the cartridges, with exaggerations colossal and absurd, flew from one native mouth to another until the whole population of the presidency had heard it. It embraced, among other extraordinary additions, this, the strangest of all, that the Company had sent out Lord Canning to enforce the conversion to Christianity of the whole army, and, in fact, of all the native population. Of course, the priests were not slow to add to the indignation and wrath of the people; they blew into fiercest blaze the combustible material that lay around. The first tentative flame showed itself at Berhampore, where a detachment of the 34th B.N.I.\* had arrived towards the latter end of February. The native soldiers refused to handle the cartridges. A weak compromise was effected by Colonel Mitchell, commanding the troops at that station. In fact, the colonel could do nothing else; he had not a reliable force under his control. On the other hand, the native soldiers were not yet prepared to go to extremes. A few incendiary fires occurred, but nothing more serious was done at that time. The refusal of the men to use the cartridges was an act of insubordination dangerously near to open mutiny; so thought the Government. The 84th regiment (British Army) was ordered at once to leave Burmah (where it was then stationed) and to proceed as quickly as possible to the scene of disturbance. The native regiment (the 19th B.N.I.) in revolt was marched down to Barrackpore, where it was to be disbanded. A sepoy was secretly sent out by the natives of the 34th B.N.I. with the offer that, if the 19th men would murder their European officers, the sepoys of the 34th would kill theirs and join with the 19th to raise the standard of revolt. The 19th refused, and marched peacefully into Barrackpore.

A day or two previous to the disbandment, a serious disturbance arose on parade. A sepoy, Mangul Pandey by name, addressed the men of his regiment (the 34th B.N.I.) and urged them to slay their officers. Acting upon his own suggestion, he made a rush at an English officer, Adjutant Baugh, and wounded him seriously. An English sergeant, attempting to rescue the adjutant, was felled to the earth by a blow from a heavy tulwar (a native sword, generally of great weight). General Harsey and a faithful Mahometan then dashed to the assistance

ance  
Mal  
acted  
not fa  
caste  
wrong  
and he  
refuse  
They p  
pardon  
the mu  
have g

It is  
This p  
success  
of what  
most o  
trusted  
Gener  
bolder  
reflected  
that the  
slumber

Gener  
good wh  
for natio  
from the  
tion with  
stances, G  
In a time  
been a fa  
fastened  
the flood  
of the hill  
1857, the  
formed h  
school at  
went forth  
treated wi  
officers.

polluted a

ance of the adjutant and rescued him. Mangul Pandey was hanged, and the Mahometan and the sergeant were duly rewarded. General Hearsey, who had acted throughout this rough ordeal with the greatest coolness and courage, did not fare so well. The Government, true to its policy that the haughty, high-caste sepoy of the Bengal army were angels in disguise and could never do wrong, reprimanded the General. The 19th regiment, however, was disbanded, and here again the Government acted unwisely. The men of the 19th had refused to join with the 34th in the proposal to murder the European officers. They pleaded hard to be forgiven, and volunteered to go on foreign service if pardoned. Had this pardon been granted and the regiment sent off to Burmah, the mutineers would have lost their services and the Government would probably have gained more men than those of the 19th B.N.I.

It is a trite saying that those whom the gods wish to destroy they make insane. This preliminary act does not redound greatly to the glory of the gods; but success attends it all the same. In the face of several warnings, and in the face of what had taken place at Berhampore and at Barrackpore, the Government and most of the military officers believed in and trusted the sepoy. And these trusted men, how did they act? Looking upon the reprimand administered to General Hearsey as a proof that the government feared them, they became bolder in outrages. Incendiarism was the order of the day; nightly the Ganges reflected the flames from buildings that had been set on fire. It was no secret that the sepoy held frequent and prolonged meetings. But the Government slumbered; the Commander-in-Chief amused himself.

General Anson was the Commander-in-Chief of the Bengal army. He was a good whist-player; and, like Falstaff, he loved to take his ease. Unfortunately for nations, "promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south." It does not come even from the north; it comes from connection with those in power and the interest they can wield. Under any circumstances, General Anson would have proved inefficient as a Commander-in-Chief. In a time of peace, wherein he might have reasonably trusted, he would have been a failure as a leader; "in the swelling of Jordan" he was like a millstone fastened around the necks of those who could swim and who could have breasted the flooded stream. The General was enjoying himself in the cool atmosphere of the hills; he pooh-poohed ominous signs; he trusted the sepoy. In March, 1857, the General proceeded to his cool retreat at Umballa; the 36th B.N.I. formed his escort. Two non-commissioned officers were attending the rifle school at Umballa. Hearing that their own regiment was near the place, they went forth to meet and greet their companions in arms. The sepoy of the 36th treated with utmost scorn the friendly greetings of the two non-commissioned officers. These officers had been using greased cartridges; the officers were polluted and unfit to associate with the sepoy. The non-commissioned officers

told their story to General Anson, and General Anson reprimanded the two faithful fellows! The men of the 36th, however, were compelled to use the hated cartridges; they revenged themselves by setting fire to Government buildings!

A Sikh made known to the Commander-in-Chief that a wide-spread and well-organized mutiny was determined upon; that it would break out in May, when the hot weather (so telling on the health of Europeans) would begin, and that the first blow would be struck at Meerut and Delhi. The Commander-in-Chief shuffled his cards and played away at whist. He was not such a fool as to listen to the *guf* (gossip) of the bazaars! The king of Delhi was busy intriguing with the mutinous sepoy; the priests were aiding him; and certain Hindoo pundits raked up (or invented) an old prophecy, that the English rule in India was to last 100 years and no longer. Like Christian commentators on Bible prophecies, these pundits made events fit into very dubiously worded predictions. The British occupation of India, they said, began with the victory at Plassey in 1757, and was to end with the death of all Europeans in India that very year, 1857.

There was one man in India who was as unlike the Commander-in-Chief as it was possible for a man to be. That man was destined to save the British power in India from becoming a total wreck. Sir Henry Lawrence, Commissioner of Oudh, was a man of action, and with him decision and prompt action followed quickly the first apprehension of danger. No undue haste, but no hesitation, no doubtful measures. Mutiny had shown itself in one of the regiments under his command; that regiment was at once disarmed and disbanded. The 7th Regiment (Oudh Irregulars) would not use the cartridges served out to them. They frankly acknowledged that the cartridges were exactly like those which they had been accustomed to use; but, all the same, they declined to touch them. More than that, they openly threatened to kill their European officers. The timely arrival of a trustworthy detachment cowed these men: they were disarmed and disbanded. This happened at Lucknow.

The Government at Calcutta awoke with a yawn; the news from Lucknow had disturbed its slumbers. A native officer was caught red-handed at Barrackpore inciting the 70th B.N.I. to revolt and murder their officers. He was tried by court martial and sentenced to be dismissed the service. He ought to have been shot; but both the Government and Commander-in-Chief were unwilling to shoot angels in disguise. The sepoy was jubilant when they heard how light was the punishment meted out to a rebellious native officer. With them the cry was, "The white people are afraid of us! *Deen! Deen! Deen!* Death! Death to all Europeans!"

(To be continued.)

DEFIN  
object  
my pe  
modes  
are id  
image  
of exi  
tial to  
we der  
social  
The  
temple  
which  
Agnost  
Being-  
that he  
very g  
Wisdom  
This is  
which  
ineffabl  
you are  
choice s  
before i  
it you n  
trifle yo  
twice as  
Therefo  
eyes!"  
Fiddle  
ing of pi  
that que  
in the c  
intellige  
Althoug  
universa  
travel an  
carries t  
that the  
more thi  
of Lake C

## PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC IDOLATRY.

BY CHARLES ETLER.

DEFINING "idolatry" as the worship or religious exaltation of some object or image presented to our physical or mental apprehension, my position is: That while they differ somewhat as to the objects and modes of their worship, Catholics and Protestants (myself in the crowd) are idolatrous alike; that the perception of some material or spiritual image, some limited and definable aspect of that inconceivable potency of existence we so glibly call "God," or "Deity," is absolutely essential to all religious life; and therefore, that between the idolatry which we denounce as sinful, and that blank atheism, whose logical outcome is social disintegration, there is no possible middle term.

The Christian theologian, standing before the closely drawn veil of the temple, says to the simple worshipper: "Behold I show you a mystery which baffles the wit of angels above and men below! Not in the wicked Agnostic's *Behind*, but in your good Ecclesiastic's, there is a wondrous Being—The Great Incognoscible Absolute—of whom *I know*, for certain, that he has no body, parts, or passions, like ourselves; and, speaking very guardedly, that he has at least four distinctive attributes, Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and Mercy, each of which is an infinite quantity. This is something you cannot understand; it is a Divine Mystery, before which you must reverently prostrate yourself. You can pray to the ineffable mystery till you drowse on your knees; you can sing to it till you are hoarse; you can flatter, and so 'get round' it with every choice superlative you can find in Webster's Unabridged; you can crawl before it like a worm, or whine before it like a whipped cur; and before it you may, *and must*, lay your gold and your silver, or any other goodly trifle you may have about you; but, I tell you, 'tis awfully wicked, and twice as dangerous, to come too near it, to touch it, or to look into it. Therefore doff your hat and boots, stand well back, and shut your eyes!"

Fiddlesticks! The only curtain to be drawn aside is a large stretching of professional slang which shuts us off from the light and leading of that quenchless lamp which the The Great Mystery itself has placed in the divine sanctuary within us,—even our native, undebauched intelligence.

Although we cannot *think* an inch outside our language, the lithe and universal jointed tongue is under no such narrow limitation. That can travel any and everywhere; and, as a rule, the less weight of thought it carries the faster and the farther it goes. Thus a geometrician may *say* that the Euclidian square *is not* bisected by its diagonal, but he can no more think it than he can stand on the city wharf and scoop the waters of Lake Ontario into the hollow of his hand. Similarly, he can talk of a

square contained by four infinitely extended sides, but he cannot *think* it; i.e., he cannot make a mental image of it true to his language concerning it. And this fact is so fundamental, that its mere restatement in other terms is all the demonstration it requires and admits. The square that fits so easily to our thoughts excludes as well as includes space, the other excludes none: for its area is infinite, and this infinity subtracted from itself leaves a naught for the remainder. The real square has four angles: the containing sides of the other being infinitely extended, never meet, and failing in that particular thing, neither exclude nor include any part of space whatever, and the square they contain is as much like Euclid's as the tune of "Greensleeves." In other words, the *unimaginary* square which every schoolboy can talk about without the slightest difficulty, includes the absurd and impossible, and by the mysterious and *natural* operations of our own minds we are compelled to exclude it from the list—the very long list—of realities. And—to put the point softly—it will be as well to get through with *that* list before we worry with any other.

Now let us look into the theological square, and, taking our multiplication table with us, test one of its sides, say "omnipotence." When a man, or Deity, just able to carry two bags of flour on his back, shoulders one, he puts out just one-half his strength. In this case the two-bag line separates, and by separating correlates and *unites* the two attributes, *ability* and *inability*, i.e., the positive and negative sides of a mental image which constitutes the only possible handle for taking up the problem. Shift this correlating line to the millionth bag. Then with one or two bags on his back the carrier will have "lots" of strength to spare, but under the whole load, not an ounce. But, wherever we shift the dividing line between "I can" and "I can't," the correlation holds good. Now, let us say that the number of bags to be borne is infinite, and that the carrier, being omnipotent, shoulders the whole lot. In this case, we expunge the correlating line, and by so doing we extinguish the correlation itself, i.e., the apprehensible image of a compound positive and negative condition. We also reject one of the terms of the correlation, inability, and retain the other; but now the word "ability" is perfectly void of thought; and it is just as empty if we enlarge it into "omnipotence." Of the two factors in the strength correlation we make one a cipher and we call their product "Almighty God." In short, as in Euclid's square, where there is no exclusion of space, there can be no inclusion of area, so in the theological square, where there is no exclusion of ability, there can be no inclusion of power; and the imaginary side disconnects itself from the mystery and drops plumb into the limbo of things which are not. This point is vital, therefore let us look at it under another aspect: A man, or god, exerts his power to overcome resistance or difficulty, and the amount of resistance overcome is the exact measure of the power put forth. Now, omnipotence does not stagger with a million, or even with a billion bags of flour on its back

there  
no d  
is no  
idle, t  
where  
culty i  
up to t  
discha  
simple  
undert  
load on  
Spac  
square  
adulter  
anthin  
from t  
Thus th  
tions, h  
with th  
contigu  
is so t  
operate  
religiou  
been ex  
specime  
1. Pa  
solution  
to say th  
at all; a  
doctrine  
sea-wate  
theory, I  
2. Sor  
Professo  
attempt  
for the n  
look dee  
But we a  
complex  
fore, to n  
the same  
i.e., their  
the subst  
3. Aga  
science of  
we do no

there is not the slightest straining or heaving required, for there is no difficulty felt, no resistance to contend with, and, therefore there is no power expended to overcome it. The omnipotence is absolutely idle, for it does not, and cannot put forth a particle of its strength where there is not a particle of difficulty to exercise it. Here the difficulty is expressed in the term *weight*; and in order to fill omnipotence up to the brim we simply shake every atom of flour out of the bags, and discharge the whole load of the property of weight. Why, under this simple rule for making omnipotence easy, I, a poor one-bag man, would undertake any number of bags, and "run" the whole universe with the load on my back.

Space will not serve to test the remaining sides of the theological square; but under the simple light of our native intelligence and unadulterated common sense, the result would be precisely the same,—an unthinkable and impossible attribute standing absolutely self-excluded from the test of realities and the domain of actual human thought. Thus the Mystery behind the veil of the temple is a fasciculus of negations, bringing the *Theos* of one school of thought into exact coincidence with the *Atheos* of the opposite school,—so wonderful, sometimes, is the contiguity of extremes. Thus, too, the great religious difficulty of to-day is so to formulate our knowledge of the force and intelligence which operate and illuminate existence as to satisfy the exigencies of modern religious thought. Various solutions have been attempted, but they have been evasions rather than solutions, as may be seen from the three specimens following:

1. Pantheism reduces deity to an impalpable and infinitely subtle solution pervading all things; but, as I have already indirectly shown, to say that God is everywhere is virtually to affirm that he is nowhere at all; and thus the amount of religious sentiment expressible from this doctrine is comparable to the amount of gold to be taken from a pail of sea-water. Under very refined analysis, there may be enough to gild a theory, but certainly not enough to "run" a religion.

2. Some able scientific men (notably that profound thinker, the late Professor W. K. Clifford) have made what appears to be a half-hearted attempt to utilize what they call "cosmic emotion" as the raw material for the manufacture of our religious sentiments. No one, indeed, can look deeply into the universe without experiencing some such feeling. But we are as often crushed as exalted by it, and it is as variable and as complex as the aspects of existence we hold in contemplation. Wherefore, to make cosmic emotion the basis of religious sentiment is much the same as if astronomers should work their "personal equations," i. e., their little jolts, and shakes, and nods, and winks, and slips, into the substructure of astronomical science.

3. Again, science has a negative as well as a positive side; and the science of our own ignorance, the methodic handling of all the things we do not know, is one of no little importance. The relation of the

positive side of science to the negative is that of wealth to poverty. Our accumulated intellectual wealth is the working capital we require in order to bring under cultivation the still unreclaimed portions of our environment, and the "attitude" of the lamp we hold in hand towards the surrounding shading of ignorance is distinctively and aggressively penetrative. As a patent historical fact, for some,—nay, many,—thousands of years past mankind—and woman-kind too—have utilized one huge block of this unreclaimed environment,—viz., religion, and its metaphysical borderlands,—as the common dumping-ground for a full moiety of all the things they do not know, and this huge mass of piled-up darkness has lately led to a terrible complication. Huxley, one of the very ablest men of the century, shied at it, called his attitude Agnosticism, and the pile, The Unknowable. I cannot meddle with this muddle here, but, with the matters in hand, it is strictly in order to offer an opinion, which is: Agnosticism is science in a funk, faith in a dead faint, and Atheism preaching with a gag in its mouth. Moreover, what we want is more light; what Agnosticism offers is petrified darkness; and that is no foundation-stone for religion.

Keeping all these preliminary considerations well in sight, we shall be able to handle the subject of idolatry much more effectually.

We, now as ever, idolize *Power*. We fear it, and are awe-struck by it. We alternately supplicate and deprecate it; we sing and caper to it; we fawn upon it, and flatter it for all we are worth; we prostrate ourselves and grovel to it; we curse it; oftener we bless it, and with our blessings we intermingle our bribes of gold and silver, of service and sacrifice, of tears and blood, the last being sometimes our own, but oftener another's. In fact, *we idolize it*. The two greatest visible embodiments of Power are Man and the Sun. Hence, these two objects have constituted the main pillars of mythological structure, all the world over. Here I shall confine myself exclusively to the former; and in this connection it is necessary to bear in mind that a man, especially if he be qualifying for deity-ship, is beyond all comparison the concentrated impersonation of the two divinest attributes,—Power and Knowledge.

(To be concluded.)

#### DEFINITIONS.

In his volume of essays and sketches entitled "Without Prejudice," Mr. Isaac Zangwill, the Jewish author, gives the following clever definitions of some cardinal things:—

"Philosophy—All my I.  
Art—All my Eye.  
Religion—All my Ay."

WHEN  
of affai  
since tl  
sign is  
of 325  
There c  
when w  
Commis  
the arist  
Napoleo  
tional a  
French;  
autocrat  
people n  
enlighte  
to get ric  
populariz  
and stron  
elements  
it is safe  
Spanish I  
cultivat  
It is sa  
all know  
sympathy  
trade con  
country  
enlisted t  
certain th  
Turkey, it  
can hardly  
war betwe  
most mon  
The mo  
be, that at  
from the  
Whatever



## FROM OUR OWN OBSERVATORY.

### The European War Scare.

WHATEVER may be its outcome, it is unquestionable that the present situation of affairs in Europe is one of the most dangerous that the world has witnessed since the termination of the Crimean War. And perhaps the most significant sign is that presented by the demand of the German Emperor for an expenditure of 325 millions of marks during the next two years on the building of new ships. There can hardly be two interpretations put upon such a proposal; especially when we note the disclosures made by Cecil Rhodes before the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry into the Transvaal raid, and the state of tension between the aristocratic and jingo party in Germany and the Socialists. Just as, in 1870, Napoleon the Little found no way out of a complete surrender to the constitutional and reform party except by an appeal to the military instincts of the French; so there seems to William the Foolish no way out of a surrender of his autocratic pretensions except by a war in which the national prejudices of his people may be used to swamp the patriotic and progressive work of the most enlightened sections of his people. A special effort, it appears, is to be made to get rid of those college professors who have helped to discuss, elucidate and popularize the principles upon which the progress of the nation must depend; and strong measures are to be taken to exterminate the democratic and socialistic elements. Without in any way endorsing the principles of the Socialistic party, it is safe to say that the Emperor and his friends, in adopting the methods of the Spanish Inquisition to destroy them, must in the end necessarily fail, even if, by cultivating the jingo spirit, they may delay the final day of reckoning.

It is said that the war feeling in Britain is not just now very strong; but we all know how rapidly such a feeling can be cultivated; and it is likely that the sympathy shown with Dr. Jameson's raid and the animosity arising from German trade competition, point to the existence of feelings that would rapidly lead the country on to the war-path. The position taken up by the Greeks has certainly enlisted the sympathy of large sections of the British people; and it seems certain that, if Lord Salisbury allows them to be coerced in the interests of Turkey, it will be a severe trial to the stability of his government. The matter can hardly fail to take on a decided shape before another week elapses; and if a war between the great European powers should result, it will doubtless be the most momentous one of the present century.

### Rome in Canada.

The most prominent result of the General Election of June, 1896, appears to be, that at the present moment Canada's statesmen are waiting for permission from the Pope before they proceed to the business of the new Parliament. Whatever may be, or may have been, the intentions of the new Government,

certain it is that any paltering with the ecclesiastics will be fatal to their power, even if they eat their own words and sell their liberal friends. There is only one honorable course for them to pursue, and that is, to settle the Manitoba school question on the lines already agreed upon. To make any further concessions to the hierarchy will be fatal to them at the next election, which in such a case may occur sooner than perhaps they expect.

#### Prisons of Ontario.

Inspector Chamberlain's annual report has just been presented to the Legislature. The inspector makes a feature of the abuse of prisons in using them for the accommodation of aged paupers, sometimes to the serious detriment of the criminal discipline. It certainly is a disgraceful thing in any supposed-to-be civilized community that comfortable provision should not be made for aged and impecunious persons. Practically, such a community does deliberately what the missionaries sometimes—though generally falsely—tell us the semi-barbarous heathen occasionally do—leaves its aged members to starve to death or be killed by dogs or ruffians. To send them to prison to mix with the scum of the earth is fully as bad as to leave them on the banks of the Ganges for crocodile food. Surely a Christian community like that of Ontario could afford to keep its aged poor alive in comfort without sending them to jail. It might even stretch a point by saving some of the blankets, rum, and tobacco sent to Africa to convert the heathen in order to support its own paupers. Considering that the report for the Central Prison shows that the gross cost per head of the prisoners in this very expensive establishment is only 45 cents per day, surely it should not be a difficult job to provide reasonable accommodation for these poor old people without subjecting them to the degradation of prison life, and prison discipline to the resulting laxity.

#### Prison Statistics.

Mr. Chamberlain gives these details of the nationalities, religions, etc., of the Ontario criminals:

NATIONALITY.		RELIGION.	
	1895.		1896.
Born in Canada	5,413	Roman Catholic	3,071
Born in England	1,368	Church of England	2,771
Born in Ireland	1,203	Methodist	1,526
Born in Scotland	420	Presbyterian	1,184
Born in United States	672	Other religions	828
Born in other countries	304		
		HABITS.	
SEX.		Temperate	3,461
Male	8,196	Intemperate	5,919
Female	1,184		
SOCIAL CONDITION.		EDUCATIONAL STATUS.	
Married	3,113	Could read and write	7,889
Unmarried	6,267	Could not read	1,491

The report in regard to the Central Prison states that many prisoners are sent there for hard labor on medical certificates who are only fit for the hospital. The total cost for maintenance, with an average of 386.6 prisoners, amounted to \$63,272.32, an average of 44.8 cents per head per day, against which there was a sum of \$25,661.43 realized from industries carried on, which reduced the cost to 26.6 cents per head per day.

#### General Items.

The senate of Cambridge University has recommended that women should in future be allowed to receive the B.A. and M.A. degrees, and has also decided to confer honorary degrees upon women.

Lord Salisbury says that God's work in confounding the speech of men at the Tower of Babel is being rapidly undone. Newspapers and magazines printed in English will soon become the common literature in all parts of the world, so fast is a knowledge of the English language spreading.

Don Squarzanti, a canon of the Cathedral of Ferrara, Italy, died recently and bequeathed his very large fortune to the statue of the Virgin of the Graces in the cathedral. His poor relatives appealed to the chapter to revoke the bequest, on the ground that a statue could not be a legal heir, but in vain. Who ever heard of the church disgorging money it had once secured for the "glory of God?" Why, this would be acknowledging that a priest could commit a crime.

The case of Mrs. Castle, who was discharged from prison after being convicted of extensive shop robberies, has been followed by a wave of kleptomania. In a letter to the press, one storekeeper tells how he dealt with one culprit whom he caught committing a theft. Taking the apparently well-to-do lady to his office, he offered her the alternative of being arrested or of receiving a good birching. He says he did this to avoid the risk, trouble and expense of prosecution. The lady chose the birching, which was administered so vigorously by the manageress of the store that the lady thief howled for mercy. This species of voluntary lynch law would naturally be a very dangerous plan for storekeepers to pursue, and could hardly be recommended for imitation.

It seems to us that, if the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is put into the hands of the Canada Pacific, with the privileges already granted to the British Columbia Southern, the keystone will be put into that arch of monopoly and jobbery that has over-loaded Canada with debt. The whole system of subsidies and exemptions from taxation is one that should be abolished if Canada is ever to be a free country. At present, instead of needed railways being built at a fair cost, and industries being started at the best commercial centres, the one question is always, How can we secure the biggest bonus? and in most cases the bonus is nearly all the cash invested. In this latest project, the bonuses being angled for would appear to be worth many times the value of the railway to be built.

## LENT.

ALAS ! the solemn days have come,  
 The hungriest of the year,  
 When saints fill up on eggs and fish,  
 On matins and on beer.

How pleasing it must be to God,  
 When we with scorn eschew  
 A slice of ham, a mutton chop,  
 Or good old Irish stew.

While yearn we for our beef and pork,  
 And swallow fish in chunks,  
 How must the heavenly harpists twang  
 Their plinketty planky plunks.

If fasting will appease God's wrath,  
 And hunger wounds will cure,  
 I'll live on codfish all my days  
 And go to heaven sure.

And when I reach the pearly gate,  
 I'll note the glad event  
 By writing on my card, "A fool  
 Who starved to death in Lent."

Barrie, Ont.

C. NAYLOR.

—:0:—

## PESSIMISM.

Nothing to breathe but air ;  
 Nothing to eat but food ;  
 Nothing to wear but clothes  
 To keep us from going nude.

Nothing to do but things.  
 Quick as a flash they're gone!  
 Nowhere to fall but off,  
 Nowhere to sit but on ;

Nothing to quench but a thirst ;  
 Nowhere to sleep but in bed,  
 Nothing to have but what we've got ;  
 Nothing to bury but dead.

Nothing to weep but tears.  
 Ah me! Alas and alack!  
 Nowhere to go but out;  
 Nowhere to come but back.

Nothing to comb but our hair;  
 Nothing to wed but a wife.  
 Only to suffer and bear:  
 What is the value of life ?

—Malakand Foghorn.