

The Dominion Review.

VOL. III.

JUNE, 1898.

NO. 6.

THE BIBLE AND ATHEISM:

SOME THOUGHTS ON READING MR. UNDERWOOD'S ARTICLE IN
THE *DOMINION REVIEW*.

BY HON. SENATOR CHARLES A. BOULTON, OTTAWA, ONT.

ATHEISM is Mr. Underwood's propaganda. The Bible is the writer's propaganda. The former springs from the power of intellect, the latter from the simplicity of faith. Though the Bible may be warped from its intent, this in no sense impairs its truthfulness. Science develops the intellectual power; the Bible develops the spiritual power. Atheism limits the material power of man to this world; the Bible places no limit upon the spiritual power of man; it is eternal. Material man dies; spiritual man lives. The Atheist can dispose of his material body at will; he can never get rid of his spiritual body. It may pass into the next world deadened by doubt and scepticism, or it may pass into the next world quickened by knowledge and faith, to a new life. There is no earthly satisfaction to the Atheist equal to the realization of that latter fact to the Christian. That quickening to a deadened spirit may come early in our material life or it may come late; science can never produce it. Through its chemical knowledge science can create an egg, but it cannot make that egg produce a chicken. Science may even go so far as to produce a chicken by its knowledge and application of chemistry, but it cannot give that chicken life.

Man is endowed with great creative power. In that respect he is after God's own image, but his power to create is limited to things material. He cannot create anything with a force of its own. The will power of man applied to it is necessary to give it force. The throttle of an engine must be opened to give the engine force. The phonograph cannot utter its sounds unless the voice or sound is put into it. Not so with man. God created man, and he became what he is to-day through the spirit that was breathed into him, and which has been transmitted from generation to generation down to the advent of Christ, when that spirit was

renewed or elevated to a higher plane. That is the difference between the creative power of man and the creative power of God. Man being after God's own image, is endowed with similar powers, but they are only material powers in this world. A realization of that fact should make the Atheist look farther afield for wisdom than the materialism he cases himself in, which shuts him out of the realization of the future life which must inevitably be faced.

In two periods of the world's history has the spiritual power of God been directly planted in man: through Adam and through our Savior. That latter spirit has to be imparted to the whole world through the influence of the Bible. The Atheist may refuse to acknowledge those facts, but he cannot do away with them. The waters of mighty Niagara may dry up, but the influence of the Bible can never cease. God's creative powers are material and spiritual; he alone gives life, with the natural force of reproduction. Animal and vegetable life are endowed with the power of reproduction—a life-giving power which alone rests with God. Science will develop the intellectual power of man, and his creative power will ever be on the increase, but it will fall short of the attribute which alone pertains to the Almighty—namely, the power to impart life in this world, whatever the next may develop.

Although the Bible is the bugbear of the Atheist, it is stored knowledge of a divine character, and the history of the world has proved the correctness of its revelations. The fact that one set of men takes one portion of the scriptures for their guide, and a second set takes another portion under divine guidance and in the name of religion, is no argument against the spiritual life contained in its pages; nor is the Bible weakened by the fact that all those men do not show in their lives the influence or power of their knowledge. To say that one body adopts one system of imparting the knowledge of the Bible, or interprets it to fit their doctrines, and that another body adopts another system and another interpretation, is no guide to the critical Atheist. The Bible is the bulwark of Christianity. It is the light of the world to those who search all its pages. It alone keeps alive the spiritual life in man. That spiritual life goes on through generations, growing upwards or growing downwards, until it passes into eternity in one state or the other. The spiritual life that was born with man, though killed by a vicious life, may be quickened at any period by a returning consciousness of good and evil and the saving power of a Savior, and may pass into eternity to live for ever. The Atheist calls upon the world to alone regard the

material li
the univer
by refus
the higher
and, per e
through it
into the ne
in limiting
ever, posse
it will be g
vate it in t
tion we ha

The affe
inward ple
the excepti
character a
power of m
tween the r
become mo

We know
must cultiv
alive his sp
man the sa
Man in this
in the worl
great world
in this worl
till it is tra

Mr. Und
"These doc
chance to ex
of those tin
companied
characterist
absurd posi
acumen or c

There is
ters, but th
few, when i

material life in this world, and elevates science to the foremost power of the universe, with natural causes as its ally. He kills the spiritual life by refusing the sustenance upon which it lives, namely, the Bible. All the higher attributes of our nature come through our spiritual nature, and, per contra, all the pain, anguish, sorrow, and suffering are felt through it. If the Atheist could kill the spiritual life that must pass into the next world alive as it passes out of this, there would be reason in limiting the sensitive enjoyment of life to this world. This life, however, possesses the germs that will be reproduced in the next world, and it will be good seed or bad seed according to the way in which we cultivate it in this, and it will perform its functions according to the disposition we have made of our opportunities.

The affection of a dog is nature's contribution to its animal life as an inward pleasure to its existence, and a strictly moral dog is by no means the exception. The material power of a horse, with all its nobleness of character and intelligence, is brought into subjection by the spiritual power of man, and in those distinctions may be found the difference between the material forces and the spiritual forces of this life, which will become more marked in the next.

We know nothing of the mysteries of the next world, but the Atheist must cultivate the good seed, which is the Bible, if he desires to keep alive his spiritual life in the next world. The Almighty bears to spiritual man the same relation that an earthly parent bears to material man. Man in this world is spiritually an infant, and only grows into manhood in the world to come. As a babe is weak, helpless, and ignorant of the great world into which it has come, its spiritual life, which commences in this world, remains in its infancy, and is weak, helpless and ignorant till it is transferred to the next world.

Mr. Underwood, in referring to prominent Christian beliefs, says: "These doctrines were all accepted during the Dark Ages, and had every chance to exercise their legitimate influence. To say that the Christianity of those times was a corruption of the pure article, because it was accompanied by great ignorance and moral darkness, when, in truth, its characteristic teachings never had greater prominence, is to take a most absurd position, and one which, it seems to me, implies a want of logical acumen or offers evidence of actual disingenuousness."

There is no doubt that the Dark Ages produced fine Christian characters, but they were the days when the Bible was only for the privileged few, when it was printed in a dead language, and for the most part was

chained to the reading-desk. Wyckliffe translated the Bible; a hundred and fifty years after his doing so, Luther's Reformation resulted, and the Dark Ages disappeared, after some eight hundred years of darkness. Since that time the Bible has been translated into every living language, and has been distributed in millions, and to-day in Great Britain some five million children are for half-an-hour daily taught its precepts, in accordance with the law of the land, either through their voluntary schools, which are denominational, or through their national schools, which are undenominational in their teaching of the scriptures.

The Atheist who does not believe the Bible may not regard that principle of education as worth anything; but as sure as the sun gives light to the world, so sure will spiritual light prevail in that nation, and it will stand forth as an example of the strength of the Bible, and show its value as a force in strengthening the nerve power of the nation in every trial and difficulty, and save it from that decay which has been the fate of nations and empires which were either ignorant of or ignored the underlying principles inculcated in its pages.

The class Mr. B. F. Underwood is writing for is undoubtedly guided by a high sense of morality to apply to the nations and their own self-government. They will doubtless, in fitting their children for their life's work, impress them with the idea that this world is the limit of their efforts and of their usefulness. They will advise them to concentrate those efforts on extracting the fullest measure of moral enjoyment while in it. There is no future for them; their lives may extend over thirty, fifty, or seventy years, and then they cease to exist. In the struggles and temptations of their lives, however, they may not be able to withstand the influence of the world around them. They are separated from the influence that guides their minds to a haven of rest beyond this world, and consequently they yield to abandon. If they were taught that the life they have been brought into is only a preparation for a future life, and not alone a passing existence, and that there is a sustaining power who, if appealed to, will not allow them to be tempted more severely than they are able to bear, abandon would yield to hope, hope to effort, effort to a conquering of self, and to a simple trust in the unseen. All this is learnt from the Bible, and the Bible alone—not in one part or in another part, but all over it, only some parts require greater understanding than others, just as some parts of science require greater understanding than others.

The writer believes the Atheist can produce little effect in Canada, so

long as free
Atheism, b
undertakes
the former
and assert
fraught wit
progress to
to the grea
imperfect s

BY V

A PROFESSOR
discussing th
compatible w
gives is on th
without brea
ledges that so
far throw ne
to admit that
of meaning, fo
a little arbitra
in a new sens
The point, i
learned profes
time, so as to
object. Let t
It is admitt
us to "view ty
as "artificial r
We must rath
past generatio
other acquired
are not, he dis
testations of d

long as free thought prevails; not the free thought that seeks to justify Atheism, but the free thought that justifies Christianity. If the Atheist undertakes to guide the thought of the people of the United States in the former direction, where intellectual power is very highly developed and asserts its supremacy over nature, he assumes a responsibility fraught with danger to the nation he belongs to. To thwart its national progress to higher lines on the basis of Christianity will not contribute to the great design of the creation of the world, as displayed to our imperfect senses in its latter days.



THE CLAIMS OF SCIENCE.

BY WM. JAY YOUMANS, EDITOR "POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY."

A PROFESSOR of biology in one of our leading universities has lately been discussing the question how far an acceptance of the doctrine of evolution is compatible with religious orthodoxy of the evangelical type. The answer he gives is on the whole comforting to those who desire to recognize new truth without breaking entirely away from old and cherished opinions. He acknowledges that science has rectified our understanding of the word "create," and so far thrown new light upon the interpretation of a Hebrew term. We are ready to admit that a term in present use in our own language may undergo a change of meaning, for this is a process which we see in constant operation; but it seems a little arbitrary to say that a word in a virtually extinct language must be taken in a new sense simply because the new sense better fits lately discovered facts. The point, however, is not one which we care to discuss at length; and if the learned professor says that the Hebrew lexicon should be revised from time to time, so as to keep it abreast of modern physical science, we see no reason to object. Let the authorities on Semitic philology look to it.

It is admitted by the writer to whom we are referring that evolution compels us to "view types and design in a new light." Types are not to be considered as "artificial models to which all actual cases must more or less closely conform." We must rather look on them as "the generalized results of variations during past generations, the accumulated effects of growth and variations somehow or other acquired in the past and, we know not why, persisting by heredity." They are not, he distinctly says, "a stamp impressed from without." As to the manifestations of design, we must regard them as "dependent on some internal

qualities by which organisms become accommodated to the exigencies of their place in the world. The choice is presented to them, we are told, of becoming so accommodated or perishing; some manage the accommodation and some perish. It is needless to say that there is very little left here of the old and venerable doctrine of design, and that in the account above given of type the classical idea is equally attenuated. There is, nevertheless, we are assured, no reason why we should not "regard all these phenomena as illustrating the method of divine creation and government."

Coming down to particular theological doctrines, the writer claims that they may one and all be held consistently with a full acceptance of the evolutionary standpoint; and here again we have no desire whatever to dispute his contention. What science demands above all things is intellectual sincerity and integrity. Science in its infinite variety interests different minds in many different ways; and he who has the true scientific spirit will, so far as the order of facts in which he is especially interested is concerned, follow to the very best of his ability a rigorous scientific method. In other regions of thought or speculation he may be less exacting as to proof and more disposed to indulge what Bagehot called "the emotion of belief." Science grows by what is done for her in different fields by men who themselves may be widely at variance with one another as regards large sections of their thought. It is therefore unwise for anyone to attempt to set up, in the name of science, one scheme of opinion upon all subjects for all classes of minds. We have known, or at least heard of, graceless zealots of materialism who called in question Faraday's claims to be a true man of science because he did not carry the inductive method into questions of religious belief. It is fortunate that the interests of science are not committed to the hands of such; for no possible rigor of method could make amends for the incurable narrowness of their imagination.

Science, we have said, demands intellectual integrity, and it rests with each individual, upon his own responsibility as an individual, to satisfy its demands. Science means truth; it exists to establish and advance truth, to build up in the world a coherent system of doctrine valuable for the guidance of human life and the further enlargement of human thought. It is not for one worker unnecessarily to judge another, or to impugn his fidelity to the great cause to which all owe a common allegiance. All that we can require of any man is that he should honestly present any facts with which he may be called upon to deal, and that he should not refuse a candid examination to any relevant evidence in matters that lie within the scope of his inquiries. It is no part of the business of science or of any one speaking in the name of science to say how a given individual shall assess the evidence on a given question. There is such a thing at times as *force majeure* in intellectual as well as in political or military matters, and where this manifestly exists for one who works strenuously for science in his

own field, or
ful comment
in some me
delusion, of
the appeal m
the most con
scientific ene
Holding th
to reconcile i
views. *How*
of each indiv
responsibility
gion, reduced
true!" and th
much happier
time that Eph
simple work in
establish order
or some of th
conditions of
law, to which
and to keep o
into those as y
certainties, mi
over the other
endency to a
general indiffer
ness and accep
higher type of
Science, it
adhesion of th
and not deterr
therefore a som
says: "We wil
moral nature an
and that the ta
We will conti
evidence, or
we will believ
ave "somehow
understand, in th

own field, others who do not feel the stress may properly refrain from disrespectful comments. We hold that the message of science comes home to every man in some measure or other, bidding him to work for the truth, to rid his mind of delusion, of partiality, of prejudice, of distorting self-interest. Some respond to the appeal more perfectly than others; but it would not be safe to say that, where the most complete *tabula rasa* has been produced, there the greatest amount of scientific energy will be disengaged.

Holding these views, we are prepared to allow the fullest freedom to every one to reconcile in any way he pleases his religious convictions with his scientific views. How the reconciliation is effected is not our concern; it is the concern of each individual that it shall be an honest one. It is his concern and it is his responsibility; why should a stranger meddle therewith? The message of religion, reduced to its simplest terms, is identical with the message of science: "Be true!" and the man who consciously fails of intellectual sincerity will not feel much happier on the religious than on the purely intellectual side. It is high time that Ephraim ceased to envy Judah, and Judah to vex Ephraim. There is ample work in the world both for science and for religion. There is to establish order among ascertained phenomena and to deduce from them the laws, or some of the laws, which govern the succession of events and prescribe the conditions of human life. It is for religion to uphold the sanctity of the moral law, to which science might be tempted not to assign any special pre-eminence, and to keep open an outlook into the origin and essential nature of things, and into those as yet unrealized possibilities of existence which science, full fed upon certainties, might be disposed to ignore. Science and religion may each watch over the other with advantage, seeing that each has a besetting sin—science a tendency to a hard intellectual pride, and religion a tendency to superstition and general indifference to external evidence. If each would recognize its own weakness and accept in good part the services of the other, the result would be a higher type of moral and intellectual life than has hitherto prevailed.

Science, it must, however, be understood, is unyielding in its demand that the adhesion of the mind to any opinion or conclusion shall be governed by evidence and not determined by mere views of expediency or convenience. There is therefore a somewhat unscientific tone in the remarks of our professor when he says: "We will continue to believe that in our creation we received from God a moral nature and an immortal spirit; that we have somehow become demoralized, and that the taint of our degeneracy is hereditary." It is not scientific to say "We will continue to believe" anything; if we *will* to believe we turn our back on evidence, or at least are prepared to do so. And if it is not scientific to say "we will believe," it is not very strictly theological to speak of believing that we "somehow become demoralized." There is no "somehow," so far as we understand, in the orthodox view of this question, but a very definite "how." It

is again very doubtful to our mind whether it is consistent with a profession of evolutionism to hold that the nature of man was originally pure and "somehow" degenerated. The course of evolution in the moral sphere is from actions guided by lower impulses to actions guided by higher impulses, from purely self-regarding impulses to actions in which the welfare of others in ever-widening circles is taken into account. It is hard to imagine an evolution from a higher to a lower moral state.

There is a story told of John Wesley that a certain man who had come under his influence consulted him one day as to whether he might continue to wear a very handsome and expensive coat which he had bought. "Oh, yes," said Wesley, "just wear it as long as you can—as long as your conscience will allow you." More than this the great religious reformer would not say. Science has a very similar answer to give to certain inquirers: they are quite free to hold this or that opinion as long as they can—honestly. So long as they hold it honestly, Science has no fault to find with them. When the day comes, if it ever comes, that they can hold it honestly no longer, Science says, "Put it off." And any religion worthy of the name would say the same thing.



SAVIORS OF THE WORLD.



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

ELLA WHEELER WILCOX.

Each nation
 creators.
 invariably
 patriotic, an
 praise, flatt
 and the sm
 fame. All
 and the prie
 and the prin
 god, and to
 together.

These god
 according to
 some a hund
 some are ari
 lers, and son
 show themse
 were jealous
 into swans, s
 and made lo
 —all ought t
 from all eter
 into gods an
 gods were re
 depended up
 excite our as
 These gods
 but supposed
 ened by stop
 the walls of a
 they had crea
 were so ignor
 desire, or as t
 tion, reason,
 of these gods
 All were wofu
 were most mi
 to the averag

THE GODS.

BY COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

An Honest God is the Noblest Work of Man.

Each nation has created a god, and the god has always resembled his creators. He hated and loved what they hated and loved, and he was invariably found on the side of those in power. Each god was intensely patriotic, and detested all nations but his own. All these gods demanded praise, flattery, and worship. Most of them were pleased with sacrifice, and the smell of innocent blood has ever been considered a divine perfume. All these gods have insisted upon having a vast army of priests, and the priests have always insisted upon being supported by the people, and the principal business of these priests has been to boast about their god, and to insist that he could easily vanquish all the other gods put together.

These gods have been manufactured after numberless models, and according to the most grotesque fashions. Some have a thousand arms, some a hundred heads; some are adorned with necklaces of living snakes, some are armed with clubs, some with sword and shield, some with bucklers, and some have wings as a cherub; some were invisible, some would show themselves entire, and some would only show their backs; some were jealous, some were foolish, some turned themselves into men, some into swans, some into bulls, some into doves, and some into Holy Ghosts and made love to the beautiful daughters of men. Some were married—all ought to have been—and some were considered as old bachelors from all eternity. Some had children, and the children were turned into gods and were worshipped as their fathers had been. Most of these gods were revengeful, savage, lustful, and ignorant. As they generally depended upon their priests for information, their ignorance can hardly excite our astonishment.

These gods did not even know the shape of the worlds they had created, but supposed them perfectly flat. Some thought the day could be lengthened by stopping the sun, that the blowing of horns could throw down the walls of a city, and all knew so little of the real nature of the people they had created, that they commanded the people to love them. Some were so ignorant as to suppose that man could believe just as he might desire, or as they might command, and that to be governed by observation, reason, and experience, was a most foul and damning sin. None of these gods could give a true account of the creation of this little earth. All were woefully deficient in geology and astronomy. As a rule, they were most miserable legislators, and as executives they were far inferior to the average of American presidents.

These deities have demanded the most abject and degrading obedience. In order to please them, man must lay his very face in the dust. Of course, they have always been partial to the people who created them, and have generally shown their partiality by assisting those people to rob and destroy others, and to ravish their wives and daughters.

Nothing is so pleasing to these gods as the butchery of unbelievers. Nothing so enrages them, even now, as to have some one deny their existence.

Few nations have been so poor as to have but one god. Gods were made so easily, and the raw material cost so little, that generally the god market was fairly glutted, and heaven crammed with these phantoms. These gods not only attended to the skies, but were supposed to interfere in all the affairs of men. They presided over everybody and everything. They attended to every department. All was supposed to be under their immediate control. Nothing was too small—nothing too large; the falling of sparrows and the motions of the planets were alike attended to by these industrious and observing deities. From their starry thrones they frequently came to the earth for the purpose of imparting information to man. It is related of one that he came amid thunderings and lightnings in order to tell the people that they should not cook a kid in its mother's milk. Some left their shining abodes to tell women that they should, or should not, have children, to inform a priest how to cut and wear his apron, and to give directions as to the proper manner of cleaning the intestines of a bird.

When the people failed to worship one of these gods, or failed to feed and clothe his priests (which was much the same thing), he generally visited them with pestilence and famine. Sometimes he allowed some other nation to drag them into slavery—to sell their wives and children; but generally he glutted his vengeance by murdering their first-born. The priests always did their whole duty, not only in predicting these calamities, but in proving, when they did happen, that they were brought upon the people because they had not given quite enough to them.

These gods differed just as the nations differed; the greatest and most powerful had the most powerful gods, while the weaker ones were obliged to content themselves with the very off-scourings of the heavens. Each of these gods promised happiness here and hereafter to all his slaves, and threatened to eternally punish all who either disbelieved in his existence or suspected that some other god might be his superior; but to deny the existence of all gods was, and is, the crime of crimes. Redden your hands with human blood; blast by slander the fair fame of the innocent; strangle the smiling child upon its mother's knees; deceive, ruin, and desert the beautiful girl who loves and trusts you, and your case is not hopeless. For all this, and for all these, you may be forgiven. For all this, and for all these, that bankrupt court established by the gospel will give you a discharge—but deny the existence of these divine ghosts, of these gods, and the sweet and tearful face of Mercy becomes livid with

eternal hat
course ring
commenc
mortal vag
One of t
and our wo
is worship,
laws of war
then proclai
peace, and
found there
And if it wi
then thou s
it into thy
the sword.
that is in th
and thou sh
hath given t
far off from
the cities of
inheritance,
Is it possi
Can you beli
infinite fiend
was one of in
submitting si
the courage t
then the swor
And we are
and tell him
is love. We
trample unde
refuse to stult
ated, traduce
sorment us in
our naked, he
we will educat
The book c
unjust and atr
make our chil
recognized in c
Strange! th
believing God
thinking him g
alist for sayin
of the very hig

eternal hate. Heaven's golden gates are shut, and you, with an infinite curse ringing in your ears, with the brand of infamy upon your brow, commence your endless wanderings in the lurid gloom of hell—an immortal vagrant—an eternal outcast—a deathless convict.

One of these gods, and one who demands our love, our admiration, and our worship, and one who is worshipped, if mere heartless ceremony is worship, gave to his chosen people for their guidance, the following laws of war: "When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it. And when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thy hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword. But the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself, and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies which the Lord thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations. But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save nothing alive that breatheth."

Is it possible for man to conceive of anything more perfectly infamous? Can you believe that such directions were given by any being except an infinite fiend? Remember that the army receiving these instructions was one of invasion. Peace was offered upon condition that the people submitting should be the slaves of the invader; but if any should have the courage to defend their homes, to fight for the love of wife and child, then the sword was to spare none, not even the prattling, dimpled babe. And we are called upon to worship such a god; to get upon our knees and tell him that he is good, that he is merciful, that he is just, that he is love. We are asked to stifle every noble sentiment of the soul, and to trample under foot all the sweet charities of the heart. Because we refuse to stultify ourselves—refuse to become liars—we are denounced, hated, traduced, and ostracized here, and this same god threatens torment us in eternal fire the moment death allows him to fiercely clutch our naked, helpless souls. Let the people hate, let the god threaten—we will educate them, and we will despise and defy him.

The book called the Bible is filled with passages equally horrible, unjust and atrocious. This is the book to be read in schools in order to make our children loving, kind and gentle! This is the book to be recognized in our Constitution as the source of all authority and justice! Strange! that no one has ever been persecuted by the church for believing God bad, while hundreds of millions have been destroyed for thinking him good. The orthodox church never will forgive the Universalist for saying "God is love." It has always been considered as one of the very highest evidences of true and undefiled religion to insist that

all men, women and children deserve eternal damnation. It has always been heresy to say, "God will at last save all."

We are asked to justify these frightful passages, these infamous laws of war, because the Bible is the word of God. As a matter of fact, there never was, and there never can be, an argument, even tending to prove the inspiration of any book whatever. In the absence of positive evidence, analogy and experience, argument is simply impossible, and at the very best, can amount only to a useless agitation of the air. The instant we admit that a book is too sacred to be doubted, or even reasoned about, we are mental serfs. It is infinitely absurd to suppose that a god would address a communication to intelligent beings, and yet make it a crime, to be punished in eternal flames, for them to use their intelligence for the purpose of understanding his communication. If we have the right to use our reason, we certainly have the right to act in accordance with it, and no god can have the right to punish us for such action.

The doctrine that future happiness depends upon belief is monstrous. It is the infamy of infamies. The notion that faith in Christ is to be rewarded by an eternity of bliss, while a dependence upon reason, observation, and experience merits everlasting pain, is too absurd for refutation, and can be relieved only by that unhappy mixture of insanity and ignorance called "faith." What man, who ever thinks, can believe that blood can appease God? And yet, our entire system of religion is based upon that belief. The Jews pacified Jehovah with the blood of animals, and according to the Christian system, the blood of Jesus softened the heart of God a little, and rendered possible the salvation of a fortunate few. It is hard to conceive how the human mind can give assent to such terrible ideas, or how any sane man can read the Bible and still believe in the doctrine of inspiration.

Whether the Bible is true or false is of no consequence in comparison with the mental freedom of the race.

Salvation through slavery is worthless. Salvation from slavery is inestimable. As long as man believes the Bible to be infallible, that book is his master. The civilization of this century is not the child of faith, but of unbelief—the result of freethought.

All that is necessary, as it seems to me, to convince any reasonable person that the Bible is simply and purely of human invention—of barbarian invention—is to read it. Read it as you would any other book; think of it as you would of any other; get the bandage of reverence from your eyes; drive from your heart the phantom of fear; push from the throne of your brain the cowed form of superstition—then read the holy Bible, and you will be amazed that you ever, for one moment, supposed a being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and purity, to be the author of such ignorance and such atrocity.

Our ancestors not only had their god-factories, but they made devils as well. These devils were generally disgraced and fallen gods. Some

had headed in the sh gods. The to them a and religio than the g children an were alway the most n child with sent by the brutality.

One of th with the ex and the hel the most fe conceived, v ignorantly leave upon gods, havin of all the savagery?

One of th concerning shall he serv he came in then his wif wife, and sh ren shall be servant shall I will not go he shall also master shall forever."

According would desert upon a husba Who can wo monster? W

All these g Did any dev recorded of th that was done decide a little the character

had headed unsuccessful revolts; some had been caught sweetly reclining in the shadowy folds of some fleecy cloud, kissing the wife of the god of gods. These devils generally sympathized with man. There is in regard to them a most wonderful fact: In nearly all the theologies, mythologies, and religions, the devils have been much more humane and merciful than the gods. No devil ever gave one of his generals an order to kill children and to rip open the bodies of pregnant women. Such barbarities were always ordered by the good gods. The pestilences were sent by the most merciful gods. The frightful famine, during which the dying child with pallid lips sucked the withered bosom of a dead mother, was sent by the loving gods. No devil was ever charged with such fiendish brutality.

One of these gods, according to the account, drowned an entire world, with the exception of eight persons. The old, the young, the beautiful, and the helpless were remorselessly devoured by the shoreless sea. This, the most fearful tragedy that the imagination of ignorant priests ever conceived, was the act, not of a devil, but of a god, so-called, whom men ignorantly worship unto this day. What a stain such an act would leave upon the character of a devil! One of the prophets of one of these gods, having in his power a captured king, hewed him in pieces in sight of all the people. Was ever any imp of any devil guilty of such savagery?

One of these gods is reported to have given the following directions concerning human slavery: "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free, then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him unto the door, or unto the doorpost; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever."

According to this, a man was given liberty upon condition that he would desert forever his wife and children. Did any devil ever force upon a husband, upon a father, so cruel and so heartless an alternative? Who can worship such a god? Who can bend the knee to such a monster? Who can pray to such a fiend?

All these gods threatened to torment forever the souls of their enemies. Did any devil ever make so infamous a threat? The basest thing recorded of the devil, is what he did concerning Job and his family, and that was done by the express permission of one of these gods, and to decide a little difference of opinion between their serene highnesses as to the character of "my servant Job."

II.

THE first account we have of the devil is found in that purely scientific book called Genesis, and is as follows :

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made, and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eye, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. . . . And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken. So he drove out the man, and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life."

According to this account, the promise of the devil was fulfilled to the very letter. Adam and Eve did not die, and they did become as gods, knowing good and evil.

The account shows, however, that the gods dreaded education and knowledge then just as they do now. The church still faithfully guards the dangerous tree of knowledge, and has exerted in all ages her utmost power to keep mankind from eating the fruit thereof. The priests have never ceased repeating the old falsehood and the old threat: "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." From every pulpit comes the same cry, born of the same fear: "Lest they eat and become as gods, knowing good and evil." For this reason, religion hates science, faith detests reason, theology is the sworn enemy of philosophy, and the church with its flaming sword still guards the hated tree, and, like its supposed founder, curses to the lowest depths the brave thinkers who eat and become as gods.

If the account given in Genesis is really true, ought we not, after all, to thank this serpent? He was the first schoolmaster, the first advocate of learning, the first enemy of ignorance, the first to whisper in human ears the sacred word Liberty, the creator of ambition, the author of modesty, of inquiry, of doubt, of investigation, of progress, and of civilization.

Give me the storm and tempest of thought and action, rather than

the dead calm of ignorance and faith ! Banish me from Eden when you will ; but first let me eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge !

Some nations have borrowed their gods. Of this number, we are compelled to say, is our own. The Jews having ceased to exist as a nation, and having no further use for a god, our ancestors appropriated him, and adopted their devil at the same time. This borrowed god is still an object of some adoration, and this adopted devil still excites the apprehensions of our people. He is still supposed to be setting his traps and snares for the purpose of catching our unwary souls, and is still, with reasonable success, waging the old war against our god.

To me, it seems easy to account for these ideas concerning gods and devils. They are a perfectly natural production. Man has created them all, and under the same circumstances would create them again. Man has not only created all these gods, but he has created them out of the materials by which he has been surrounded. Generally he has modelled them after himself, and has given them hands, heads, feet, eyes, ears, and organs of speech. Each nation not only made its gods and devils speak its own language, but put into their mouths the same mistakes in history, geography, astronomy, and in all matters of fact, generally made by the people. No god was ever in advance of the nation that created him. The negroes represented their deities with black skins and curly hair. The Mongolian gave to his a yellow complexion and dark almond-shaped eyes. The Jews were not allowed to paint theirs, or we should have seen Jehovah with a full beard, an oval face, and an aquiline nose. Zeus was a perfect Greek, and Jove looked as though a member of the Roman Senate. The gods of Egypt had the patient face and placid look of the loving people who made them. The gods of northern countries were represented warmly clad in robes of fur ; those of the tropics were naked. The gods of India were often mounted upon elephants ; those of some islands were great swimmers ; and the deities of the Arctic zone were passionately fond of whale's blubber. Nearly all people have carved or painted representations of their gods, and these representations were, by the lower classes, generally treated as the real gods, and to these images and idols they addressed prayers and offered sacrifice.

"In some countries, even at this day, if the people after long praying do not obtain their desires, they turn their images off as impotent gods, or upbraid them in a most reproachful manner, loading them with blows and curses. 'How now, dog of a spirit,' they say, 'we give you lodging in a magnificent temple, we gild you with gold, feed you with the choicest food, and offer incense to you ; yet, after all this care, you are so ungrateful as to refuse us what we ask.' Hereupon they will pull the god down and drag him through the filth of the street. If, in the meantime, it happens that they obtain their request, then, with a great deal of ceremony, they wash him clean, carry him back, and place him in his temple again, where they fall down and make excuses for what they have done. 'Of a truth,' they say, 'we were a little too hasty, and you were a little

too long in your grant. Why should you bring this beating on yourself? But what is done cannot be undone. Let us not think of it any more. If you will forget what is past, we will gild you over brighter again than before."

Man has never been at a loss for gods. He has worshipped almost everything, including the vilest and most disgusting brutes. He has worshipped fire, earth, air, water, light, stars; and for hundreds of ages prostrated himself before enormous snakes. Savage tribes often make gods of articles they get from civilized people. The Todas worship a cow-bell. The Kotas worship two silver plates, which they regard as husband and wife; and another tribe manufactured a god out of a king of hearts.

Man, having always been the physical superior of woman, accounts for the fact that most of the high gods have been males. Had woman been the physical superior, the powers supposed to be the rulers of Nature would have been women, and instead of being represented in the apparel of man, they would have luxuriated in trains, low-necked gowns, laces, and back-hair.

Nothing can be plainer than that each nation gives to its gods its peculiar characteristics, and that every individual gives to his god his personal peculiarities.

Man has no ideas, and can have none, except those suggested by his surroundings. He cannot conceive of anything utterly unlike what he has seen or felt. He can exaggerate, diminish, combine, separate, deform, beautify, multiply, and compare what he sees, what he feels, what he hears, and all of which he takes cognizance through the medium of the senses; but he cannot create. Having seen exhibitions of power, he can say, Omnipotent. Having lived, he can say, Immortality. Knowing something of time, he can say, Eternity. Conceiving something of intelligence, he can say, God. Having seen exhibitions of malice, he can say, Devil. A few gleams of happiness having fallen athwart the gloom of his life, he can say, Heaven. Pain, in its numberless forms, having been experienced, he can say, Hell. Yet all these ideas have a foundation in fact, but only a foundation. The superstructure has been reared by exaggerating, diminishing, combining, separating, deforming, beautifying, improving, or multiplying realities, so that the edifice or fabric is but the incongruous grouping of what man has perceived through the medium of the senses. It is as though we should give to a lion the wings of an eagle, the hoofs of a bison, the tail of a horse, the pouch of a kangaroo, and the trunk of an elephant. We have in imagination created an impossible monster. And yet the various parts of this monster really exist. So it is with all the gods that man has made.

Beyond nature man cannot go even in thought; above nature he cannot rise; below nature he cannot fall.

(To be continued.)

EMERSON
religious p
him, or ev
of Emerso
veracity an
This realit
(Vol. II., p
Emerson
whose essa
the hands
additional i
Visiting
a tomb, tha
formed him
dall found p
have many
a special bi
the first pag
"There is
inlet to the s
the right of
The words
record of the
the manifold
the human ra
withheld by l

EMERSON AND MODERN THOUGHT.

BY CHARLES C. CATTELL.

EMERSON anticipated many of the popular views of our time. Even the religious party with which he was once connected have not yet overtaken him, or even reached the same level. Few Christians realize the truth of Emerson's view: "I look upon the simple and childish virtues of veracity and honesty as the root of all that is sublime in character. . . This reality is the foundation of friendship, religion, poetry, and art." (Vol. II., p. 447.)

Emerson, like many others, had his favorite author—Montaigne—whose essays he found in his father's library. He also traces them to the hands of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and others, which created an additional interest.

Visiting Pere la Chaise in 1833, Emerson found, by an inscription on a tomb, that there had been one who had "lived to do right and had formed himself to virtue on the Essays of Montaigne." Professor Tyn-dall found pleasure in reading the essays of Emerson, and so doubtless have many other good and great men. There is always some book with a special biographical interest, mine being "The Essays of Emerson," the first page of which I saw exposed in a bookseller's window:

"There is no great and no small
To the soul that maketh all;
And where it cometh all things are;
And it cometh everywhere.
I am owner of the sphere
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar's hand, and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart, and Shakespeare's strain.

"There is a mind common to all individual men. Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the same. He that is once admitted to the right of reason is made a free man to the whole estate." (I., p. 1.) The words quoted head the chapter on "History," described as the record of the working of the universal mind, the manifestation of it to the manifold world. To me, it was a new idea that a humble unit of the human race was heir to freedom and knowledge, hitherto unjustly withheld by kings, priests, and churches. But even my logic master,

Dr. Ingleby, failed to make sense of Emerson's new evangel. He called him a "propounder of enigmas;" and, in illustration, quoted "Man is a golden impossibility," as being on a par with "the peace of God that passeth understanding." Still, it may well be a "golden impossibility" to unite in one member of the species Cæsar, Plato, Christ, and Shakespeare, to make a perfect man.

But, apart from this, the mere announcement of an equality of rights in the world of intellect gave me faith in the competence of each man to judge all things, unawed by all authority but Truth. The advice of Emerson is, "TRUST THYSELF; every heart vibrates to that iron string." (I, p. 19.) Then, "We are no longer minors or invalids, intellectual dependents or imbeciles, but claimants for culture and liberty; the integrity of our own mind being the only sacred thing. Whoso would be a man must be a Nonconformist." (I, p. 20.)

No one knew better than Emerson what it cost to be one. Social ostracism was the penalty for being a known reader of the pious Unitarian preacher. As he says, "For Nonconformity the world whips you with its displeasure. And therefore a man must know how to estimate a sour face. The bystanders look askance on him in the public street or in the friend's parlor." (I, p. 23.) At the time referred to, not only the bishops and the clergy practised persecution, but even employers and their agents lent a hand. It is as absurd, however, to attempt to coerce the intellect by bodily or mental penalties as to attempt to storm a castle by logic.

Not only in tracts written for circulation among ignoramuses, but in works for which a thousand guineas were paid for the writing, Emerson's works were placed under a ban. "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction." But he was in good company, for the list included the names of most great modern writers. Even Coleridge, orthodox as he thought himself, was scolded for writing—

"He prayeth best that loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all."

To say the least, this attitude of persecution indicated a low estimate of culture and morality.

To form a judgment of Emerson's views on vital points of theology and religion, we must read his utterances on the relation of man to God, the Bible, and the Church, as taught fifty years ago. The difference in

the metho
the host o
not a Rea
"Thus sa
endless se

We nev
not used;
his descri

"We v
Logic is t
its virtue
tions, and

Thus, i
that the h
aspire to

"Bewa
all things
be turned
heart, the
all at the

Emerso
quences o
it may cor
mind and
classes of
to the obs
ancient an
book issue
was not fa

Like Sh
source of
at men an
heroes of
have shed
Conceding
of the pas
one thing
accept its
The axe an

the method of Emerson from that of Locke, Adam Clarke, Paley, and the host of reasoning theologians, will be obvious at a glance. He was not a Reasoner, but a Seer, an Asserter. In front of every sentence read: "Thus saith Emerson." Or, as he puts it: "I simply experiment; an endless seeker, with no past at my back." (I., p. 132.)

We never meet with an argument; the syllogism is mentioned, but not used; and the word argument is scarcely even mentioned. Here is his description of logic:

"We want a long logic in every man, but it must not be spoken. Logic is the procession or proportionate unfolding of the intuition, but its virtue is a silent method; the moment it would appear as *propositions*, and have a separate value, it is worthless." (I., p. 136.)

Thus, it will be seen, he does not "argue;" he is a Thinker, and holds that the hardest task in the world is to *think*. How very few of our race aspire to this distinction is well known.

"Beware when the great God lets loose a thinker on this planet. Then all things are at risk. . . There is not a piece of science but its flank may be turned to-morrow. . . The very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind, are all at the mercy of a new generalization." (I., p. 128.)

Emerson points out the only refuge of safety: to escape the consequences of this visitor, man must prefer truth, from whatever quarter it may come, to his past apprehension of truth. This implies an open mind and trust in new truths, not common among men. There are two classes of men who may never appreciate Emerson: those unaccustomed to the observation of natural phenomena, and those unacquainted with ancient and modern philosophy. We can scarcely name any important book issued before the middle of the nineteenth century with which he was not familiar. The more we study him, the more is this evident.

Like Shakespeare, Emerson evinces his indebtedness to nature, the source of all life, knowledge, and felicity. At the same time, he looks at men and things through the eyes of others. Without the thinkers and heroes of Greece, Rome, Italy, and Britain, these two authors would not have shed on human life and its vicissitudes one-half the light they did. Conceding what we may to their original insight, the thinkers and heroes of the past largely determined their places in the literary world. It is one thing to repudiate the dictation of the past, and quite another to accept its aids to thought, although much that is old is useless and false. The axe and the crowbar are not the only instruments of progress, al-

though they may be necessary pioneers. Readers of Emerson will find innumerable references to a great variety of subjects, a collection of sentences expressing different thoughts on the same subject at different times and under varying feelings and circumstances. Moreover, it will be seen that he is never anxious about what he writes at one time agreeing with what he writes at another time.

For instance, he speaks of the soul loving its old home and making friends with matter, "which the chatter of the schools would bid us despise;" yet, referring to Materialists, "it does not matter what oxen think." Again, he insists on the ever-working, eternal law; yet he says, "I see not, if one be once caught in this trap of so-called science, any escape for the man from the links of the chain of physical necessity." While he says in one place, there is a power in all nature that works for the right for ever, he declares in another place that the earthquake kills men like flies, and the sea swallows up ship and sailor alike like a grain of dust.

His definition of "Spiritual" is: that which is its own evidence; yet "Existence appears to me a self-evident principle; is the universe therefore Spiritual?" In the view of many, his spiritual philosophy resembles what he describes as "party promises." "A political orator wittily compared our party promises to western roads, which opened stately enough, with planted trees on each side to tempt the traveller, but soon became narrower and narrower, and ended in a squirrel-track and ran up a tree." But Emerson's method cannot be better explained than in his own lines:

"Work of his hand
He nor commands nor grieves:
Pleads for itself the fact;
As unrepenting nature leaves
Her every act." —(I., p. 191.)

The process of thinking precedes that of reflection: the current of thought floats to us, and all events are connected by uniform law. "We do not determine what we shall think. We only open our senses, clear away as we can all obstruction from the fact, and suffer the intellect to see. We have little control over our thoughts. We are prisoners of ideas." (I., p. 136.)

The suggestiveness of Emerson's writings will become plain when it prompts the reader to feel, whether the feeling be uttered or unexpressed, "That's just as I think." As he remarks on Montaigne's Essays, it was

just such
state, before

MUCH con
question:

of meeting
plays were
Shakespear
has been t
be believe
Shakespear
dates exist
had existed
different ge
right in th
upon the m
might be tr
debts in all
355. As
have done
poaching at

While it
new constr
immortal se
investigatio
nature and

Chaucer fro

is the proper
observes tha

is the one t
member of

thoughts lef
authorship o

Put in the
contemporari

writers before
Shakespeare

Bacon. If
the claims o

just such a book as he might have written himself, in a pre-existing state, before visiting this planet.

THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE CRAZE.

Much controversy has taken place on what seems to many an idiotic question: "Did Bacon write Shakespeare?" The most practical way of meeting the question is by showing under what circumstances the plays were produced—and that Emerson has done in his essay on Shakespeare, v. 1, p. 132. (The manner in which his plain statement has been twisted and mis-applied by the pro-Baconites must be seen to be believed.) Briefly put, Emerson's view amounts to this: When Shakespeare went to London, stage plays by various writers of different dates existed in MS. and were produced on the boards in turn. They had existed so long, been so improved, altered and added to, by so many different geniuses, that no one man could any longer lay claim to copyright in them. Shakespeare, in common with his comrades, looked upon the mass of old plays as waste stock, on which any experiment might be tried. "In point of fact, it appears that Shakespeare did owe debts in all directions, and was able to use whatever he found," v. 1, p. 355. As Dr. Ingleby says, in his "Man and Book," whatever he may have done in Lucy's park, Shakespeare certainly did a good deal of *poaching* at the Globe Theatre in London.

While it may be impossible to trace the original play-writers, the new *construction* and *additions* of Shakespeare sufficiently attest his immortal services. If there is a demand for originality, this process of investigation will reveal it to the student. All great minds borrow from nature and each other; as instance, Shakespeare from Chaucer and Chaucer from Rome, Greece and Italy. Emerson rules that "Thought is the property of him who can entertain it," (v. 1, p. 336), and elsewhere observes that the next best man to the one who can originate a thought is the one that can make it travel. Dr. Johnson held him to be a useful member of society who only recalled the attention of mankind to thoughts left behind. I do not think any injustice will result to the authorship of Shakespeare, if the question is left as Emerson puts it. Put in the form of an argument, it is—Shakespeare and Bacon were *contemporaries*: much of the writing of Shakespeare has been traced to writers before his time, hence Bacon could not have been the original of Shakespeare. The priority of authorship claimed for others excludes Bacon. If there were no other reason historical facts alone dispose of the claims of Bacon.

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.

LET us inquire to what end is Nature. All science has an aim, namely, to find a theory of the universe. While religious teachers dispute and hate each other and speculative men are esteemed unsound, yet the most abstract truth is most practical. "Whenever a true theory appears, it will be its own evidence. Its test is that it will explain all phenomena. Philosophically considered, the universe is composed of nature and the soul," (II., p. 141). Hence he concludes that art and nature, all that is distinguished as not me—"all must be ranked under this name nature." The same law is applicable to mental and moral life as to suns, stars, plants, and animals, and he recognizes its unity with will and thought. "Against all appearances" he sees "the nature of things works for truth and right for ever" (II., p. 401). There is a remarkable passage written and published before the "Origin of Species," in which he recognizes the discoveries of astronomy and geology, as giving the two necessary cardinal points, "boundless space and boundless time." These dispose of the teachings of Moses, Ptolemy, and the dame school of our youth.

Of man and his modifications, the difficulty to-day is to find causes powerful enough and time long enough to render them possible, to say nothing of man's origin. To express the time in years, like the distances of astronomers, would not enable us to comprehend it. To-day we have traced the early forms of animals that still survive, facts unknown when Emerson wrote: "Now we learn what patient periods must have rounded themselves before the rock is formed, then before the rock is broken, and the first lichen race had disintegrated the thinnest external plate into soil, and opened the door for the remote Flora, Fauna, Ceres, and Pomona to come in. How far off yet is the trilobite! how far the quadruped! how inconceivably remote is man! All duly arrive, and then race after race of men. It is a long way from granite to the oyster farther yet to Plato and the preaching of the immortality of the soul. Yet all must come, as surely as the first atom has two sides" (I., p. 228). While this was being written, Darwin and Wallace were collecting facts to establish the theory. But to-day even divines use the word Evolution—the meaning and bearing of which they do not yet appear to have mastered.

In his latest essay, Emerson finds that "The fossil strata show that nature began with rudimental forms, and rose to the more complex, a

fast as the
perish the h
finished m
eeding quad

The term
through Em
The popular
p. 118). It
Although Bil
questioned d
authority; b
not faith. T
the withdraw
nounced by C
It is not or
"Miracles co
To-day som
law of nature
Still it is not
ervation; b
in divines. I
our books a
present hour
out rectitude,
business—do b
As it was in
logical proble
be like. The
and those wh
prescribe thei
who found th
the liver the r
nitarian (I.,
free from dysp
"As men's
ese of the int
and divine—

fast as the earth was fit for their dwelling-place, and that as the lower perish the higher appear. Very few of our race can be said to be yet finished men. We still carry sticking to us some remains of the preceding quadruped organization" (II., p. 378).

RELIGION.

The terms in common use received a new translation in passing through Emerson's mind. "*Revelation* is the disclosure of the soul. The popular notion of a revelation is that it is a telling of fortunes" (I., p. 118). It is still held to foretell events, and the fate of unbelievers; although Bible dates and its exemptions from error have been much questioned during the past thirty years. The Bible is still held as an authority; but Emerson urges, "The faith that stands on authority is not faith. The reliance on authority measures the decline of religion, the withdrawal of the soul" (I., p. 124). "The word *miracle*, as pronounced by Christian churches, gives a false impression; it is a monster. It is not one with the blowing clover and falling rain" (I., p. 194). "Miracles come to the miraculous, not to the arithmetician" (II., p. 410). To-day some divines maintain that miracle is not contrary to any known law of nature, but is the manifestation of some unknown law of nature. Still it is not one with "the falling rain;" it is beyond reason and observation; but so are all the causes of the operations of nature, according to divines. Emerson's cure for false theology is mother wit—"Forget your books and traditions, and obey your moral perceptions at the present hour" (II., p. 399). He elsewhere says, nothing can keep you out rectitude, rectitude for ever more—and to fill the hour, that is happiness—do broad justice now.

As it was in his time, "Our young people are diseased with the theological problems of original sin, the origin of evil, predestination, and the like. These are the soul's mumps, measles, and whooping-coughs, and those who have not caught them cannot describe their health or prescribe their cure" (I., p. 56). He says he knew a witty physician who found the creed in the biliary duct—that if there was a disease in the liver the man became a Calvinist, and if that organ was sound, a Unitarian (I., p. 175). He accounts for his own robust faith to his being free from dyspepsia.

"As men's prayers are a disease of the will, so are their creeds a disease of the intellect" (I., p. 33). Burns prayed for blessings temporal and divine—

"For me and mine, keil and potatoes."

Prayer with Emerson does not mean the demand on God for a miracle, not a craving for some commodity, or the promoting of some private end. "Prayer is the contemplation of life from the highest point of view." Prayer is seen in all action, as the prayer of the farmer kneeling in his field to weed it. Canatach, when admonished to inquire the mind of the god Audate, replies—

"His hidden meaning lies in our endeavors,
Our valors are our best gods."—(I., p. 33.)

The immortality of the soul, the employment of heaven, the state of the sinner, men ask about. "They even dream that Jesus has left replies precisely to those interrogations. Never a moment did that sublime spirit speak in their patois" (I., p. 118). He says immortality will come to those who are fit for it, and insists on the qualification that "he who would be a great soul in future *must be a great soul now*" (II., p. 410). Jesus he calls "the providential man." Christianity "dwells with noxious exaggeration about the 'person' of Jesus. The soul knows no persons. It invites every man to expand to the full circle of the universe, and will have no preferences but those of spontaneous love" (I., p. 195). The instinct of man presses eagerly onward to the impersonal and illimitable, and he arms himself against the dogmatism of bigots, gladly following a generous text out of the book itself, specially prized by every young philosopher bred in the Christian church: "Then shall also the Son be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

SCEPTICISM.

SCEPTICISM was a word which shocked many eminent persons of Emerson's time, not excepting Emerson himself. When his brother returned from Germany so full of doubts as to bar his career in the pulpit, Emerson spoke of it as a painful family affliction instead of as the sign of a healthy mind. Yet, if any one search through all literature, he will not find a better exposition and defence of scepticism than Emerson's "Montaigne; or, the Sceptic." Later in life he wrote:

"Nor do I fear scepticism for any good soul. A just thinker will allow full swing to his scepticism. . . . God builds his temple in the heart on the ruins of churches and religions."

The sceptic is not the scoffer and jeerer at the good and true, but one, as Bacon would say, given to "weigh and consider." Doubting is not

a fad or
all real

"Ever
—I shou
balances
formalists

Yet to
on religio

But Em

mation t

enemy of

tellec an

extirpate

polarity t

that of th

not those

these affir

and effect

fantastic,

regarded

Life gave

church sti

of persec

run uphill
actors be

MODERN V

"Unknow

one passag

God exists

nature, an

universe."

centre is e

the prima

which can

that every

unbounded

the ineffab

a fad or an eccentricity; it is obeying the laws of thought. The road to all real belief is through the portals of doubt:

"Every superior mind will pass through this domain of equilibration. —I should rather say, will know how to avail himself of the checks and balances in nature, as a natural weapon against the exaggeration and formalism of bigots and blockheads."

Yet to-day, scepticism is still the scarecrow of the pulpit and writers on religion—the irrepressible enemy of the faith.

But Emerson did not consider that spirit of inquiry which, in Reformation times, fluttered the churches of Rome and England was the enemy of any principle worthy of preservation. "I think that the intellect and moral sentiment are unanimous; and that, though philosophy extirpates bugbears, yet it supplies the natural checks of vice, and polarity to the soul." But then his definition of "belief" differs from that of the churches. It is "accepting the affirmations of the soul," not those of Popes, Catholic or Protestant. Unbelief is the denial of these affirmations—denial of the facts of existence, the relation of cause and effect. "Great believers are always reckoned infidels, impracticable, fantastic, atheistic, and really men of no account." As to theology, he regarded it as pulverized; every aspiring soul has already left it behind. Life gave the lie to it; men were better than their theology. Yet the church still offers the sceptic violence and vituperation. "The history of persecution is the history of endeavors to cheat nature, to make water run uphill, to twist a rope of sand. It makes no difference whether the actors be many or one, a tyrant or a mob."

GOD AND NATURE.

MODERN views on these subjects are those of Emerson long ago. The "Unknowable" is fairly matched by his "Unnameable." There is only one passage in the common language of our day—"O, my brothers, God exists;" but it is followed by—"There is a soul *at the centre* of nature, and *over the will* of every man, so that none of us can wrong the universe." He quotes Augustine—"The *nature* of God is a circle whose centre is everywhere and its circumference nowhere,"—the circle being the primary figure in nature, repeated throughout without end, and which cannot be measured. He refers to the philosophers, and remarks that every fine genius has essayed to represent by some symbol "the unbounded substance," but "the baffled intellect must still kneel before the ineffable cause that refuses to be named." The eternal All includes

causation in every atom, which by structure does what mind does by knowledge. "The true doctrine of Omnipresence is that God re-appears with all his parts in every moss and cobweb."

His illustration of our relation to the universe has been repeated in various forms. "Where do we find ourselves? In a series of which we do not know the extremes, and believe that it has none. We wake and find ourselves on a stair: there are stairs below us which we seem to have ascended; there are stairs above us, many a one, which go upward and out of sight."

Emerson constantly dwells on Nature and the Soul as constituting the universe—its totality: there is no Personality recognized anywhere; and though he names the First Cause, Eternal Cause, the Omnipresent, he notes the fact, recognized by modern science, that "Cause and Effect are two sides of one fact." Cause and Effect denote only unlimited changes in nature. As its operations are interminable, there can be no first or last. His God is no watchmaker, chairmaker, or worldmaker living outside his work. He notes the fact that even the strongest intellects cannot recognize God except in the phraseology of some ancient or modern prophet or saint; but "when we have broken our God of tradition, and ceased from our God of rhetoric, then may God fire the heart with his presence." After this abandonment of the popular notion comes the remedy, to accept which we must share his view of the method of Nature. Here is his solution of the riddle:

"The rounded world is fair to see,
Nine times folded in mystery;
Though baffled seer cannot impart
The secret of its laboring heart,
Throb thine with Nature's throbbing breast,
And all is clear from east to west."

If for us the last line should fail to be true, we must attribute the cause to our inability to comply with the conditions laid down by the prophet. Omnipresent thought is as inexplicable as omnipresent matter:

"Since neither now nor yesterday began
These thoughts, which have been ever, nor can
The man be found who their first entrance knew."

As regards living things, he holds with the illustrious John Hunter and the poet Spencer:

"For, of the soul, the body form doth take,
For soul is form, and doth the body make."

Emerson

"The
him now
life above
Causation
the univer
true Em
the rose
The cons
and how

EMERSON
their thou
charm. N
to caution
strife, to a

"In th
life. The
and gold
the breath

"At th
to leave h
knapsack
these prec
which disc

I write
flowing riv
With such
make the
they have
other holy

Emerson's own words are :

" Spirit that lurks each form within
Beckons to spirit of its kin ;
Self-kindled, every atom glows,
And hints the future that it owes."

"The consciousness of each man is a sliding scale which identifies him now with the First Cause, and now with the flesh of his own body ; life above life, in infinite degrees." While I can imagine Universal Causation in, not outside, Nature, I am unable to ask another to believe the universe is *alive* and *conscious* ; which seems to be required by the true Emersonian faith. The self-same Power may bring both me and the rose on the planet ; but what more do I know of it than the rose ? The consciousness of the universe does not appear to me self-evident—and how can it be proved ?

ASPECTS OF NATURE.

EMERSON is an eloquent admirer of Nature, of which few can express their thoughts, most men being dumb in the presence of delight and charm. Nature needs no Swiss guide to prepare us for sublime emotion, to caution us against being elevated above the scenes of cities and human strife, to a state in which we can give the best of thoughts, the best of words.

"In this refulgent summer it has been a luxury to draw the breath of life. The grass grows, the buds burst, the meadow is spotted with fire and gold in the tint of flowers. The air is full of birds, and sweet with the breath of the pine."

"At the gates of the forest, the surprised man of the world is forced to leave his city estimates of great and small, wise and foolish. The knapsack of custom falls off his back with the first step he takes into these precincts. Here is sanctity that shames our religion, and reality which discredits our heroes."

I write this in a country of mountains, forests, and waterfalls, and flowing rivers whose pebbled beds shine through the transparent water. With such surroundings, Emerson is a fit companion. His words never make the heavens appear as brass or the earth a sterile, gloomy abode ; they have a youthful freshness and vigor unknown to the writings of other holy men. He is like the

" Olympian bards who sung
Divine ideas below,
Which always find us young,
And always keep us so."

ANIMISM.

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

IN investigating that great religious doctrine of mankind, the belief in the soul's continued existence in a life after death, let us just call to mind the consideration which cannot be too strongly put forward, that the doctrine of a Future Life as held by the lower races is the all-but-necessary outcome of savage Animism. The evidence that the lower races believe the figures of the dead seen in dreams and visions to be their surviving souls, not only goes far to account for the comparative universality of their belief in the continued existence of the soul after the death of the body, but it gives the key to many of their speculations on the nature of this existence, speculations rational enough from the savage point of view, though apt to seem far-fetched absurdities to moderns in their much-changed intellectual condition. The belief in a Future Life falls into two main divisions. Closely connected and even largely overlapping one another, both world-wide in their distribution, both ranging back in time to periods of unknown antiquity, both deeply rooted in the lowest strata of human life which lie open to our observation, these two doctrines have in the modern world passed into wonderfully different conditions. The one is the theory of the Transmigration of Souls, which has indeed risen from its lower stages to establish itself among the huge religious communities of Asia, great in history, enormous even in present mass, yet arrested and as it seems henceforth unprogressive in development; but the more highly educated world has rejected the ancient belief, and it now only survives in Europe in dwindling remnants. Far different has been the history of the other doctrine, that of the independent existence of the personal soul after the death of the body, in a Future Life. Passing onward through change after change in the condition of the human race, modified and renewed in its long ethnic course, this great belief may be traced from its crude and primitive manifestations among savage races to its establishment in the heart of modern religion, where the faith in a future existence forms at once an inducement to goodness, a sustainer through suffering and across the fear of death, and an answer to the perplexed problem of the allotment of happiness and misery in this present world, by the expectation of another world to set this right.

In investigating the doctrine of Transmigration, it will be well first to trace its position among the lower races, and afterwards to follow its developments, so far as they extend in the higher civilization. The temporary migration of souls into material substances, from human bodies down to morsels of wood and stone, is a most important part of the lower psychology. But it does not relate to the continued existence of the soul after death, and may be more conveniently treated of else-

where, in
fetish wo
tenancy o
Permar
other hun
a decease
Indians o
them by t
by, and so
we hear o
his hands
head of a
recipient o
name of
accounted
as themse
Greenland
widows an
a helpless
dead child
thus gaini
ancestral o
this kind o
highly phi
general res
more specia
the Kolosh
transmitted
Island, in 1
a mark like
that a chief
had returne
born soon
Wanika con
this is why i
a strong res
to have inhe
with the sal
ancestral sou
births are c
divining by
observations
progenitors h
northern tril
apps repeat
ature mothe

where, in connection with such subjects as dæmoniack possession and fetish worship. We are here concerned with the more permanent tenancy of souls for successive lives in successive bodies.

Permanent transition, new birth, or re-incarnation of human souls in other human bodies, is especially considered to take place by the soul of a deceased person animating the body of an infant. North American Indians of the Algonquin districts, when little children died, would bury them by the wayside, that their souls might enter into mothers passing by, and so be born again. In North-West America, among the Tacullis, we hear of direct transfusion of soul by the medicine-man, who, putting his hands on the breast of the dying or dead, then holds them over the head of a relative, and blows through them; the next child born to this recipient of the departed soul is animated by it, and takes the rank and name of the deceased. The Nutka Indians, not without ingenuity, accounted for the existence of a distant tribe speaking the same language as themselves, by declaring them to be the spirits of their dead. In Greenland, where the wretched custom of abandoning and even plundering widows and orphans was tending to bring the whole race to extinction, a helpless widow would seek to persuade some father that the soul of a dead child of his had passed into a living child of hers, or *vice versa*, thus gaining for herself a new relative and protector. It is mostly ancestral or kindred souls that are thought to enter into children, and this kind of transmigration is therefore from the savage point of view a highly philosophical theory, accounting as it does so well for the general resemblance between parents and children, and even for the more special phenomena of Atavism. In North-West America, among the Koloshes, the mother sees in a dream the deceased relative whose transmitted soul will give his likeness to the child; and in Vancouver's Island, in 1860, a lad was much regarded by the Indians because he had a mark like the scar of a gun-shot wound on his hip, it being believed that a chief dead some four generations before, who had such a mark, had returned. In Old Calabar, if a mother loses a child, and another is born soon after, she thinks the departed one to have come back. The Wanika consider that the soul of a dead ancestor animates a child, and this is why it resembles its father or mother; in Guinea, a child bearing a strong resemblance, physical or mental, to a dead relative, is supposed to have inherited his soul; and the Yorubas, greeting a new-born infant with the salutation, "Thou art come!" look for signs to show what ancestral soul has returned among them. Among the Khonds of Orissa, births are celebrated by a feast on the seventh day, and the priest, dividing by dropping rice-grains in a cup of water, and judging from observations made on the person of the infant, determines which of his progenitors had reappeared, and the child generally, at least among the northern tribes, receives the name of that ancestor. In Europe, the Lapps repeat an instructive animistic idea just noticed in America; the future mother was told in a dream what name to give her child, this

message being usually given by the very spirit of the deceased ancestor, who was about to be incarnate in her. Among the lower races generally the renewal of old family names by giving them to new-born children may always be suspected of involving some such thought. The following is a curious pair of instances from the two halves of the globe. The New Zealand priest would repeat to the infant a long list of names of its ancestors, fixing upon that name which the child by sneezing or crying, when it was uttered, was considered to select for itself; while the Chere-miss Tartar would shake the body till it cried, and then repeat names to it till it chose itself one by leaving off crying.

The belief in the new human birth of the departed soul, which has even led West African negroes to commit suicide when in distant slavery, that they may revive in their own land, in fact amounts among several of the lower races to a distinct doctrine of an earthly resurrection. One of the most remarkable forms which this belief assumes is when dark-skinned races, wanting some reasonable theory to account for the appearance among them of human creatures of a new and strange sort, the white men, and struck with their pallid deathly hue combined with powers that seem those of superhuman spiritual beings, have determined that the manes of their dead must have come back in this wondrous shape. The aborigines of Australia have expressed this theory in the simple formula, "Blackfellow tumble down, jump up whitefellow." Thus a native who was hanged years ago at Melbourne expressed in his last moments the hopeful belief that he would jump up whitefellow, and have lots of sixpences. The doctrine has been current among them since the early days of European intercourse, and in accordance with it they habitually regarded the Englishmen as their own deceased kindred, come back to their country from an attachment to it in a former life. Real or imagined likeness completed the delusion, as when Sir George Grey was hugged and wept over by an old woman who found in him a son she had lost, or when a convict, recognized as a deceased relative, was endowed anew with the land he had possessed during his former life. A similar theory may be traced northward by the Torres Islands to New Caledonia, where the natives thought the white men to be the spirits of the dead who bring sickness, and assigned this as their reason for wishing to kill white men. In Africa, again, the belief is found among the Western negroes that they will rise again white, and the Bari of the White Nile, believing in the resurrection of the dead on earth, considered the first white people they saw as departed spirits thus come back.

Next, the lower psychology, drawing no definite line of demarcation between souls of men and of beasts, can at least admit without difficulty the transmission of human souls into the bodies of the lower animals. A series of examples from among the native tribes of America, will serve well to show the various ways in which such ideas are worked out. The Ahts of Vancouver's Island consider the living man's soul able to enter into other bodies of men and animals, going in and out like the inhabit-

ant of a h
birds, bea
bodies; ;
of the anim
In anothe
the spirits
a tribe beg
gent of th
creature to
widow who
touch walr
because he
Among
refraining f
of their chi
of their bor
the Iroquois
away the so
souls of nob
passed into
Brazil, Ican
birds feedin
Among the
at night, utt
souls of the
as inspired l
a received d
Chiriquane v
spirit of my
In Africa,
souls of bad
while admitt
the fullest w
change of s
and immorta
are harmles
sidered to be
respect and h
man who has
s one-eyed, c
"itongo" of
the "itongo"
personality of
are supposed
localities mon
psychosis, are

ant of a house. In old times, they say, men existed in the forms of birds, beasts, and fishes, or these had the spirits of the Indians in their bodies; some think that after death they will pass again into the bodies of the animals they occupied in this former state.

In another district of North-West America, we find Indians believing the spirits of their dead to enter into bears, and travellers have heard of a tribe begging the life of a wrinkled-faced old grizzly bear as the recipient of the soul of some particular grandam, whom they fancied the creature to resemble. So among the Esquimaux, a traveller noticed a widow who was living for conscience' sake upon birds, and would not touch walrus meat, which the augekok had forbidden her for a time, because her late husband had entered into a walrus.

Among other North American tribes, we hear of the Powhatans refraining from harm to certain small wood-birds which received the souls of their chiefs; of Huron souls turning into turtle doves after the burial of their bones at the Feast of the Dead; of that pathetic funeral rite of the Iroquois, the setting free a bird on the evening of burial, to carry away the soul. In Mexico, the Flascalaus thought that after death the souls of nobles would animate beautiful singing birds, while plebeians passed into weasels and beetles and such-like vile creatures. So, in Brazil, Ieanuas say that the souls of their brave will become beautiful birds feeding on pleasant fruits, but cowards will be turned into reptiles. Among the Abipones we hear of certain little ducks which fly in flocks at night, uttering a mournful hiss, and which fancy associates with the souls of the dead; while in Popayan it is said that doves were not killed, as inspired by departed souls. Lastly, transmigration into brutes is also a received doctrine in South America, as when a missionary heard a Chiriquane woman of Buenos Ayres say of a fox, "May not that be the spirit of my dead daughter?"

In Africa, again, mention is made of the Maravi thinking that the souls of bad men became jackals, and good men snakes. The Zulus, while admitting that a man may turn into a wasp or lizard, work out in the fullest way the idea of the dead becoming snakes, a creature whose change of skin has often been associated with the thought of resurrection and immortality. It is especially certain green or brown snakes, which are harmless and come gently and fearlessly into houses, that are considered to be "amatongo," or ancestors, and therefore are treated with respect and have offerings of food given to them. In two ways, the dead man who has become a snake can still be recognized: If the creature is one-eyed, or has a scar or some other mark, it is recognized as the "itongo" of a man who was thus marked in life; but if he had no mark, the "itongo" appears in human shape in dreams, thus revealing the personality of the snake. In Guinea, monkeys found near a graveyard are supposed to be animated by the spirits of the dead; and in certain localities monkeys, crocodiles, and snakes, being thought men in metempsychosis, are held sacred. It is to be borne in mind that notions of

this kind may form in barbaric psychology but a portion of the wide doctrine of the soul's future existence. For a conspicuous instance of this, let us take the system of the Gold Coast negroes. They believe that the "kla" or "kra," the vital soul, becomes at death a "sisa," or ghost, which can remain in the house with the body, plague the living, and cause sickness, till it departs or is driven by the sorcerer to the bank of the River Wolta, where the ghosts build themselves houses and dwell. But they can and do come back from this Land of Souls. They can be born again as souls in new human bodies, and a soul who was poor before will now be rich. Many will not come back as men, but will become animals. To an African mother who has lost her child, it is a consolation to say, "He will come again."

In higher levels of culture, the theory of re-embodiment of the soul appears in strong and varied development. Though seemingly not received by the early Arians, the doctrine of migration was adopted and adapted by Hindu philosophy, and forms an integral part of that great system common to Buddhism and Brahmanism, wherein successive births or existences are believed to carry on the consequences of past and prepares the antecedents of future life. To the Hindu, the body is but the temporary receptacle of the soul, which, "bound in the chains of deeds" and "eating the fruits of past actions," promotes or degrades itself along a series of embodiments in the plant, beast, man and deity. Thus all creatures differ rather in degree than in kind, all are akin to man; an elephant, an ape, or a worm may once have been human, and may become human again; a pariah or a barbarian is at once low-caste among men and high-caste among brutes. Through such bodies migrate the sinful souls which desire has drawn down from primal purity into gross and material being; the world where they do penance for the guilt incurred in past existences is a vast reformatory, and life is the long and grievous process of developing evil into good. The rules are set forth in the book of Manu, how souls endowed with the quality of goodness acquire divine nature, while souls governed by passion take up the human state, and souls sunk in darkness are degraded to brutes. Thus the range of migration stretches downward from gods and saints, through holy ascetics, Brahmans, nymphs, kings, counsellors, to actors, birds, cheats, drunkards, dancers, elephants, horses, Sudras, barbarians, wild beasts, snakes, worms, insects, and inert things. Obscure as the relation mostly is between the crime and its punishment in a new life, there may be discerned through the code of penal transmigration an attempt to appropriateness of penalty, and an intention to punish the sinner wherein he sinned. For faults committed in a previous existence men are afflicted with deformities, the stealer of food shall be dyspeptic, the scandal-monger shall have foul breath, the horse-stealer shall go lame, and in consequence of their misdeeds men shall be born idiots, blind, deaf and dumb, and mis-shapen, and thus despised of good men. After expiation of their wickedness in the hells of torment, the murderer

of a Bra
ously di
re-bern
eruel sha
turn into
herbs, or
or a musi
complish
endowed
possible r
ception of
district of
Thus we l
the trunk
longer per
that unch
and snake
these and
if not, did
A curio
plant-soul
which des
fruits, but
should dis
and the co
are in mos
better off
Brahmanis
like manne
Buddhism
recognized
the lower a
even into a
doctrine of
Gautama h
through cou
the misery
Brahma, tw
hermit, a ki
At last, whe
the ambrosi

of a Brahman may pass into a wild beast or a pariah; he who adulterously dishonors his guru, or spiritual father, shall be a hundred times re-born as grass, a bush, a creeper, a carrion bird, a beast of prey; the cruel shall become bloodthirsty beasts; stealers of grain and meat shall turn into rats and vultures; the thief who took dyed garments, kitchen-herbs, or perfumes, shall become accordingly a red partridge, a peacock, or a musk-rat. In short, "in whatever disposition of mind a man accomplishes such and such an act, he shall reap the fruit in a body endowed with such and such a quality. The recognition of plants as possible receptacles of the transmigrating spirit well illustrates the conception of souls of plants. The idea is one known to lower races in the district of the world which has been more or less under Hindu influence. Thus we hear among the Dyaks of Borneo of the human soul entering the trunks of trees, where it may be seen damp and blood-like, but no longer personal and sentient; and the Santals of Bengal are said to fancy that uncharitable men and childless women are eaten eternally by worms and snakes, while the good enter into fruit-trees. But it is a question if these and the Hindu ideas were originally independent of each other, or, if not, did the Hindu adopt the ideas of the indigenes or *vice versa*?

A curious commentary on the Hindu working out of the conception of plant-souls is to be found in a passage in a seventeenth century work, which describes certain Brahmans of the Coromandel Coast as eating fruits, but being careful not to pull the plants up by the roots, lest they should dislodge a soul; but few, it is remarked, are so scrupulous as this, and the consideration has occurred to them that souls in roots and herbs are in most vile and abject bodies, so that if dislodged they may become better off by entering into the bodies of men or beasts. Moreover, the Brahmanistic doctrine of souls transmigrating into inert things has in like manner a bearing on the savage theory of object-souls.

Buddhism, like the Brahmanism from which it seceded, habitually recognized transmigration between superhuman and human beings and the lower animals, and in an exceptional way recognized a degradation even into a plant or a thing. How the Buddhistic mind elaborated the doctrine of metempsychosis may be seen in the endless legends of Gautama himself undergoing his 550 births, suffering pain and misery through countless ages, to gain the power of freeing sentient beings from the misery inherent in all existence. Four times he became Maha Brahma, twenty times the Sekva, and many times or few he became a hermit, a king, a slave, a gambler, an ape, an elephant, a fish, a tree. At last, when he became the Supreme Buddha, his mind overflowed with the ambrosia of truth, and he proclaimed his triumph over life:

"Painful are repeated births.

O house-builder! I have seen thee.

Thou canst not build again a house for me.

Thy rafters are broken, thy roof-timbers are shattered,

My mind is detached.

I have attained to the extinction of desire."

(To be continued.)

THEOSOPHY AND ITS ETHICS.

BY CHARLES WATTS.

WHATEVER we may believe as to the truth and utility of what is termed Theosophy, there can be no reasonable doubt that many of its adherents are sincere, and that some of the objects they profess to have in view are commendable. It is said that in the teachings of Theosophy is to be found an explanation of the real nature of man, and that its ethics contains the essentials of human progress. Any theory which tends to solve the problems of existence and to exalt the character of mankind deserves our hearty support. The world, more than ever, requires correct knowledge of the laws that regulate the universe, and also solid rules whereby human actions should be so regulated that our conduct may be creditable to ourselves and have a beneficial influence upon others. In order, however, to possess these advantages, all wild and superstitious conjectures should be avoided, and the rules prescribed for the regulation of daily life should have a firm basis and moral sanctions that can be readily understood. They should accord with known facts and harmonize with cultivated reason.

Now, as we understand Theosophy, it does not furnish either of these requisites. It has been defined as "the name given to those systems of philosophy which profess to attain to a knowledge of the Divine Being by spiritual ecstasy, direct intuition, or direct individual relations." Here we have, as Hamlet said, "words, words, words," but no information that has a practical bearing upon mundane affairs. When and where has such "knowledge of the Divine Being" been attained? Besides, all "knowledge" gained by "*spiritual ecstasy*," or intuition, is worthless as a guide in life, inasmuch as it depends upon the physical and mental condition of the person in whom it is manifested, and it is both varied and conflicting.

Strictly speaking, it appears to us that Theosophy has no practical ethical code, for we are told that its highest aim is to reach the "inner circle." To do this, however, we have to pass through the portals of credulity into the halls of mystery, and there dwell in solitude and in a state of celibacy, which is often productive of conduct the opposite of moral. It is, in fact, the teaching of pure asceticism, and that no ethical system of to-day advocates as a rule of life. Even Mrs. Besant wrote, in her tract on "Secular Morality": "Asceticism, in any shape, is immoral; it decreases the amount of temporal happiness; and whether it pleases God or no, whether it give a seat in heaven or no, whether it bring happiness in a future life or no, it is equally immoral, it is equally wrong." This mode of existence might have satisfied those who lived in remote times, amid the mystic realms of spiritual delusion; but it is not suited to the requirements

of the ma
very essen
past is pr
printing p
Accord
sophists, t
says Mrs.
exactly as
fruit of go
which shal
mars his o
it save by t
nation, so
deserves."
It would
justice."
one we can
state. Mr.
sense, mea
here will b
notion rest
theory of "
which is to
to believe
ignorance, i
such cases i
we cannot a
exactly as h
and that of
and honorab
physically an
the wrong-do
themselves n
actions.
We are to
Are we to un
If so, it must
it is a part
environment.
save by the
Then it is re

of the matter-of-fact nineteenth century. We agree with Gerald Massey: "The very essence of all such mysteries as are got up from the refuse leavings of the past is pretence, imposition, and imposture. Public experimental research, the printing press, and a Freethought platform, have abolished the need of mystery."

According to the late Madame Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant, and other Theosophists, the keynote to their ethical code is in the doctrine of Karma, which, says Mrs. Besant, "is the expression of eternal justice, whereby each reaps exactly as he has sown. It is the impersonal law of retribution, distributing the fruit of good and bad actions. During one incarnation is wrought the Karma which shall mould the circumstances of the next, so that each man beautifies or mars his own future. None can escape from the operation of Karma, nor modify it save by the creation of fresh. Karma presides, so to speak, over each re-incarnation, so that the ego passes into such physical and mental environment as it deserves."

It would be interesting to learn what is here meant by the term "eternal justice." We fail to see any evidence of it in this life, and if there be a future one we can have no knowledge of its conditions while we are in our present state. Mr. Leslie Stephen, in his "Science of Ethics," says: "Justice, in a sense, means reasonableness." But is it reasonable to suppose that injustice here will be followed by justice hereafter? Upon what grounds does such a notion rest? Moreover, does not the fact that injustice obtains here destroy the theory of "eternal justice"? Further, *why* should we have to suffer wrong here which is to be compensated for in some other life? Is it not more reasonable to believe that the evils endured on earth are largely the result of man's own ignorance, indifference, and false conceptions of the duties of existence? In such cases it may be said that each person does reap what he has sown. Still, we cannot admit that it is strictly accurate to allege that always "each reaps exactly as he has sown." This theory does not accord with the law of heredity and that of cause and effect. For instance, an individual may be sober, chaste, and honorable in the morning of his life, and yet subsequently be broken down, physically and morally, and that not from his own fault, but in consequence of the wrong-doing of his parents prior to his birth. And even those very parents themselves might have died without experiencing any serious effects of their bad actions.

We are told that it is "the Karma which shall mould the circumstances." Are we to understand by this that the Karma is an entity separate from the man? If so, it must be something more than "eternal justice." If, on the other hand, it is a part of the man, it must depend for its power upon his nature and environment. If "none can escape from the operation of Karma, nor modify it save by the creation of fresh," who, or what, creates the "fresh"? Karma? Then it is responsible for the "fresh creation." If, however, Karma is not the

creative force, man and his environments are ; and the latter appears to us to be the fact. Instead of saying that each man reaps exactly as he has sown, we should urge that mankind are what they are, not merely as the result of their own conduct, but also in consequence of their general surroundings. Hence the necessity of each and all living active, useful and pure lives, so that thereby the legitimate operation of the law of cause and effect may be fully realized.

To say that Theosophy, with its theory of Karma, is a "working hypothesis," is to indulge in vague and misleading language. John Stuart Mill, in his "System of Logic," says : "An hypothesis is any supposition which we make (either without actual evidence or on evidence avowedly insufficient) in order to endeavor to deduce from it conclusions in accordance with facts which are known to be real, under the idea that, if the conclusions to which the hypothesis leads are known truths, the hypothesis itself must either be, or at least is likely to be, true. . . . An hypothesis being merely a supposition, there are no other limits to hypotheses than those of the human imagination. We may, if we please, imagine, by way of accounting for an effect, some cause of a kind utterly unknown, and acting according to a law altogether fictitious" (Book III., chap. 14).

It is, in our opinion, equally as misleading to speak of the "ego passing into such physical and mental environment as it deserves." It is here assumed that the "ego" is an entity independent of the body. But where is the evidence that it is so? Professor Ribot, in his book on "The Diseases of Personality," writes :—"The ego is not an entity acting where it chooses or as it pleases, controlling the organs in its own way, and limiting its domain according to its own wish. On the contrary, it is a resultant, even to such a degree that its domain is strictly determined by the anatomical connections with the brain" (p.45). But if the "ego" were an entity, it would be influenced in its nature by the organization which contained it. Supposing it were transmitted from one body to another it would be surrounded by "fresh" conditions, which must necessarily affect the very nature of the "ego." This appears to us to show the utter fallacy of the Theosophic notion of re-incarnation, which means that we shall continue our present "ego" in other organizations. But how can we reasonably suppose that a person who dies to-day will reappear, say, a hundred years hence, as the same individual? The conditions having changed, the result must be different. Besides, the link in the progress from a lower to a higher form of existence would be broken. For instance, a person dies in a licentious and drunken condition; will he reappear in the same wretched state? If so, where is "the expression of eternal justice"? Has a reformation taken place? If so, what has been reformed? Not the Karma, surely; for that is supposed to be the reforming agency. It cannot be the "ego," inasmuch as, apart from the brain, nerves, and the entire organization (which, after death, no longer exist), it has no functional reality.

THE

THE morni
quality; not
it was the g
in the even
showed him
and at a pla
farther off th
and the pur
were passing
alized every
recent riotin
John Lawren
ordered to
and a Euro
Order once
Meanwhile
two miles o
course of the
of the ridge
was behind
of the ridge,
over nearly n
command pla
was rough; n
of Delhi was
protection to
and on the no
Courage ar
but in the mo
roduces disc
requent assa
ever repelled
ese, on June
Quentin Batt
ere: "Dulc

THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.

XII.

THE morning that Brigadier Johnstone waited for turned up with laudable punctuality; not so the brigadier. He was not ready for the pursuit until 9 o'clock. It was the 9th of June. At 2 o'clock p.m. the pursuing force crossed the river; in the evening the force was at Loodiana. But where was the brigadier? He showed himself about midnight. Early enough on June 10th they started again, and at a place called Daylou they discovered that the evasive mutineers were farther off than ever. Officers and men alike lost heart under such a commander and the pursuit was abandoned. Not many days later, some Punjabee troops were passing, and Mr. Ricketts seized the opportunity, marched into Loodiana, seized every firearm to be found, severely punished those connected with the recent rioting who were still in the place, and heavily fined the municipality. Sir John Lawrence came to the aid of Ricketts; Nicholson's movable column was ordered to Umritsur; and Crawford Chamberlain, with two Punjabee regiments and a European battery, disarmed the native infantry and cavalry at Mooltan. Order once more reigned in the Punjab.

Meanwhile, the besieging force before Delhi had strengthened its position. Two miles or so north of Delhi is a sandstone ridge, nearly parallel to the course of the Jumna, which here flows N.N.E. And north of the flat summit of the ridge the British lines were stationed. The centre of the besieging force was behind the celebrated Flagstaff Tower; its right was towards the butt end of the ridge, where there is a deep decline, and its left was where the ridge and river nearly meet. Here was the Hindoo Rao's house, where the general in command placed a strong battery. The ground between the ridge and the city was rough; mosques, tombs, houses, ruins in every direction. The country south of Delhi was completely in the hands of the mutineers; the river formed a strong protection to the city on the east; the north seemed the only assailable point, and on the north General Barnard posted his army.

Courage among soldiers is a curious commodity. It will sometimes ooze out in the most unexpected way. Inactivity, if it does not starve it, generally produces discontent. So must have thought those who commanded in Delhi. Frequent assaults upon the besieging force were made. These assaults, though ever repelled with slaughter, kept the Sepoys in good spirits. In the first of these, on June 9th, three hours after the Guides had arrived, one of their officers, Quentin Batty, was mortally wounded; on the 13th he died; his last words were: "*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*" On June 10th and 11th more

assaults were made, but were again repulsed. The Delhi guns were worked so well that British artillerymen began to suspect that renegades were behind them.

Hitherto the assaults of the enemy had been directed against the right flank of the besieging force. On the 12th of June they tried other tactics. Handled with much skill, the Sepoys suddenly attacked the left flank. East of the Flag staff Sir Thomas Metcalfe had his mansion. It had been pillaged and shorn of its beauties, but the trees that were standing on the grounds afforded excellent cover for soldiers; and the ravine between the house and the sandstone ridge made the position a formidable one to assault. A garrison of Sepoys and a battery occupied this stronghold. From this coign of vantage marched forth the attacking force, and so cat-like were the Sepoys' movements that they were within a hundred yards of the British outposts ere they were discovered. With a savage yell the Sepoys charged upon the few British who were in position, turned their flank, and succeeded in crossing the ridge. The danger was extreme; two guns were virtually in possession of the Sepoys. But soon the 75th rallied; the 10th Fusiliers, the 60th Rifles, and the Guides came up, and the British charged. The carnage among the Sepoys was terrible; they were driven from one refuge to another; Metcalfe's house was deluged with blood, and the mutineers were chased and bayoneted right up to the very walls of Delhi. Metcalfe's house, thus captured, remained in possession of the besieging force until Delhi was taken. Whether out of bravado, or whether it was an abortive attempt to make simultaneous assaults upon both flanks of the British army, it is hard to say, but scarcely had the attack been repulsed than the enemy appeared on the right. These Sepoys were easily dealt with, and were driven back with great slaughter.

General Barnard, on June 11, directed four young officers (Hodson being one) to sit in council and concoct a plan for taking Delhi. These young officers found no difficulty in doing this; their plan was simplicity itself. All the infantry not on duty (it must be remembered that the besieging army was a very small one) were to be led at midnight as near to the Delhi walls as possible. The other troops were to be in readiness to take advantage of what would happen. Volunteers (and for dangerous work they are never wanting in the British Army) were to carry bags of powder to the two north gates; these portals were to be blown open and the city carried by a *coup de main*. The Commander-in-Chief considered the plan feasible and adopted it. The night of June 12th was fixed upon for the exploit. All in the British camp were jubilant; and none more so than Hodson and his young compeers. And when the hour so big with Delhi's fate approached, the troops were more than ever sanguine. Had they not won two victories that day? Would not the Sepoys be as much disheartened as the British were elated? But there was one cool head at least in the British Army. A body of the besiegers marched to the city wall; stealthily the move was made. The Sepoys suspected nothing. It was near midnight; impatiently they

portion of t
ere cam
brigadier G
instead of c
Chief. He
protected b
being made.
not be held
f turning th
murderous r
to say wrath
man in the
and now, loo
of judging
brigadier.
Although
residence wa
ion of the b
the ridge, an
as felt that
reinforcement
and faithfully
this monocu
ave lied !)
information.
stener) intell
trap of pape
cks of a Sik
imes the sole
the tire of a c
On June 17
as going on
nclosure, and
inflade the B
column und
the Sepoys, on
battery was ca
aptured by T
On the same
marched into

portion of the attacking force awaited their comrades. No comrades came ; but there came an order bidding the advanced body to retire to their quarters. Brigadier Graves was to have commanded the second division of the assault ; instead of obeying the order, he presented himself before the Commander-in-Chief. He represented to Sir Henry the risk of leaving their own strong position (protected by only a few native soldiers) open to the enemy while the assault was being made. Told him that, granting success attended the storming, Delhi could not be held by the few troops under Sir Henry. And then he spoke of the folly of turning the rebels out of Delhi and flooding the country with an army of murderous mutineers. Sir Henry gave in. Bitter was the disappointment, not to say wrath, of the soldiers. For a season Brigadier Graves was the best hated man in the army. But, "mortality, thy scales are just to all who pass away"; and now, looking back after so many years, the approval of all who are capable of judging wreathes itself into a garland to grace the memory of the gallant brigadier.

Although Delhi was not captured on June 12th, Sir Thomas Metcalfe's late residence was, and this, more skilfully fortified than ever, strengthened the position of the besieging army. Intrenchments were dug along the whole front of the ridge, and every precaution was taken for the safety of the British force. It was felt that a long siege had begun ; the British could not hold Delhi until large reinforcements arrived. Hodson was at the head of the Intelligence Department, and faithfully was he served by a "one-eyed moulvie," Ruj-jub Ali by name. This monocular boldly took up his quarters in Delhi. (How the fellow must have lied !) Right from the head-quarters of the mutiny did Hobson gain his information. The "one-eyed" forwarded daily (and when occasion required it, often) intelligence of what was going on in the Holy City. Sometimes the scrap of paper on which the news was written was plaited in the long-flowing turban of a Sikh spy ; sometimes a chupattie hid the precious document ; sometimes the sole of a sandal was the medium ; the hem of a garment, a cocoanut, the tire of a cart-wheel—in fact, anything and nearly everything was pressed into the service of the moulvie, and ever the missive reached Hodson.

On June 17th the cannon of the enemy thundered furiously ; and while this was going on a body of Sepoys pushed their way to a hill, crowned by a walled enclosure, and began to build a battery. From such a battery the guns could enfilade the British camp. Sir Henry quickly spoilt the plan of the mutineers. A column under Major Reid and another commanded by Major Tombs attacked the Sepoys, one falling on the right and the other on the left. The half-finished battery was carried and destroyed and the magazine blown up. One gun was captured by Tombs.

On the same day, the Sepoys who had mutinied at Nusseerabad on May 28th marched into Delhi. Two days later they sallied forth to attack the British.

The attack was to be made on an entirely new plan ; strategy was to play the chief part this time. There was no hiding or moving by stealth ; at noon they marched through the Lahore gate, bearing themselves stoutly. They were seen of course ; they wished to be seen. The British force turned out ; but ere long they turned in again : the enemy was not in sight. But when Hodson gave the information that the strategic Sepoys were in the rear, Sir Henry Barnard ordered Col. Hope Grant, with seven troops of British cavalry, the Guides, and twelve guns, to attack them. The odds were not very great—350 against 3,000, barely one against ten. Turner, Bishop, and Tombs had charge of the guns ; Yule and Daly headed the cavalry. The Sepoys fought desperately, and in spite of cannon shots and cavalry charges were near success. Two guns had they captured ; Yule was shot dead, and Daly fell wounded and was carried off by the Guides. But at this point the Rifles (60th) and the Bengal Fusiliers rushed on the scene. The two guns were recaptured, the Sepoys were driven back to Delhi and the British, victorious but heavily punished, retired to their camp. "And it was night."



OH ! BONNIE'S THE VALE.

OH ! bonnie's the vale where the auld folks bide,
 And sparkling the waters that rin to the Clyde,
 That sing to the castle, sae ancient in years,
 Where Ossian sang of sweet Mona in tears.
 And lovely the land of valor and worth,
 The grey land of Scotia, the gem o' the North,
 Where brave men are reared in a Freedom that fills
 The glens and the braes and her heather-clothed hills.
 In far-away climes, or sailing the faem,
 The Scot in his heart has a corner for hame ;
 In busiest market, at kirk, or at play,
 His wonder is still, what the auld folk will say.
 In the journey through life he is aften enrich'd
 By leaving alane what has ithers bewitch'd ;
 If few are the freens that remain if he's puir,
 The few that he has he jist loes a' the mair.
 He thinks o' the mountains, the loch in his dreams,
 The touch o' his mither, sae gentle it seems ;
 The voice o' a father, o'er a far-away sea,
 Comes soughin' in whispers like sweet melody.
 The north wind is chill an' the snaw's on the hill,
 But warm are the thochts that memory fill ;
 We lov'd not enough—still our hearts are aglow
 For the kind hearts that rear'd us, long, long ago.
 The gold light o' gloaming encircles them noo,
 And silvery hairs are shed on the broo ;
 And frail are the forms, sae winsome to me,
 As seen through the mists o' the saut, saut sea.

Scottish American.

JOHN S. MACNAB