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Anecdotes & Sayings

The Duke of Norfolk, who was the partisan friend of Fox, Burke, and Sheridan, used to say, "Next Monday, wind and within permitting, I purpose to be drunk." In the manner, O'Sullivan used to appoint his days of festive joy in the Irishman's paradise. On such occasions, it is reported that he would sometimes take 800 doses of Laudanum in a day.

Linen

Quinn says that when Silenus was taken prisoner by Medus, he obtained his ransom for making this observation, viz: "That never to have been born is by far the greatest blessing that can happen to man; and that the next best thing is to die soon."

The Irishman said just as wise a thing when he declared that he had been unhealthily poor since he was born; and that it would have been a hundred dollars in his pocket if he had never been born at all.

Sir William Hamilton asserts, in his lectures on metaphysics, that the phenomena of matter, taken by themselves, so far from warranting any inference to the existence of a God, work on the contrary, ground even an argument to his negation. Methodist Quarterly, Oct. 1843, p. 382
Natural law.

True law is indeed right reason, agreeable to nature, spread abroad among all men, unchangeable, eternal; which calls us to duty by commanding us, and detests us from crime by forbidding us; which, however, neither commands nor forbids in vain the virtuous, nor does it move the wicked by its command or prohibition. Nor does heaven permit any part of the law to be repealed; neither can any thing be taken from it, nor can it be made wholly void. From this law we can be freed neither by the Senate nor by the people, nor is another to be sought at the behest of interpreters. Nor will this law be one thing at Rome, another at Athens; one thing now, another hereafter; but one law, eternal, immutable, will bind all nations for all time; and it shall be as one common master, and as God who governs all. God himself is the author, judge, and proposer of this law. Whence will not why it will fly from himself, and having shunned the nature of man, he will, from this very circumstance, suffer the severest punishment." Cicero de Republica, B. 3. c. 12.

On the same point Socrates thus disourses with Hippias:

"Socrates: Do you know of any unwritten laws?

Hippas: Those laws, certainly which are observed in the same way (i.e. are identical) in every place.

S. Would you say that men made them?

H. How could I, for all men could never have assembled together, nor have they a common language.

S. Who then do you suppose made these laws?

H. I think that the gods have enjoined these laws upon men." Memorabilia.

Hume says, "The moral law respects a faculty of life independent of any animal nature, new, of the whole material world; at least, if it be permitted to infer an excellency from the regulation of my being, which a conformity with that law sanctifies, preparing, as it does, my moral worth for the sublime ends of my activity, conceding no compromise of its imperious to a mutilation of nature, and shunning, in its infinity, the conditions and boundaries of my present transitory life." Rameau treatise of the Practical Reason.
The Beautiful & the Good.

The Spartans, notwithstanding their Spartan austerity, prayed the gods to grant them the beautiful and the good. Humboldt.

Dr. Moreton, a divine of the time of Queen Anne, said the Jews, the children of Israel, were called Israelites because the Almighty had always hated idolaters. Bolingbroke says the Dr. wrote a Sermon on the 117th Psalm - Ed. Review Oct. 1863, p. 286.

When Bolingbroke attempted to raise the jealousy of his second wife, Madame de Villefort, 3 years older than he, by recounting to her his gallantries, she only replied, "Oh, as I look at you, I think I see the ruins of a fine old Roman aqueduct, but the water has ceased to flow."

Plato says that the whole of virtue consist in activity. On Titans, Book 6.

He says truly; for virtue is a positive, not a negative principle. Hence the difference between virtue and innocence. Innocence is negative; virtue, active. A babe is innocent, but not virtuous. Many irrational animals are innocent; not one of them, virtuous.
Harvard University.
Dr. Warren, an ancient friend of this Institution, in his Nathaniel Greene, prayed:

"May the Great and Good God grant that this College shall be so tarinued of the truth, that it will be easier to find a well in England, and a snake in Ireland than either a Socinian or Arminian in Cambridge." 2 Matthews Magnalia.

Mohammedan Dialogue.
Jobhi and Ashari, Master & Scholar, were sectarians Mohammedan. One day they conversed, thus:

Jobhi. I hold that God is, in all cases, bound to what is best and most expedient.

Ashari. There were three brothers. The first died in obedience to God; the second in rebellion against Him; and the third, an infant. What became of them after death?

Jobhi. The first was rewarded in Paradise; the second was punished in Hell; and the third is neither rewarded nor punished.

Ashari. But what if the third should say, "O Lord, if thou hadst given me longer life, I might have entered paradise with my believing brother, it would have been better for me."

Jobhi. God would answer him, "I know that if thou hadst lived longer, thou wouldst have been a wicked person, and therefore cast into hell like thy second brother."

Ashari. Then, the second will say, "O Lord why didst thou not take me away while I was an infant, as thou didst my brother, that I might not have deserved to be punished for my sin, nor be cast into hell?"

Jobhi. God prolonged his life to give him an opportunity of obtaining the highest degree of perfection, which was best for him.

Ashari. Why did he not, for the same reason, grant the youngest brother a longer life, to whom it could have been equally advantageous?

Jobhi. Does the devil possess you?

Ashari. No; but the master's ass will not pass the bridge.

And therefore Ashari left his master Jobhi, and set up a new sect for himself.

Sale's Koran, Preliminary Discourse, p. 111.
The Septuagint.

It seems certain that Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 284 years before the birth of Christ, produced a translation of ancient Jewish scriptures, and placed it in the Alexandria library. Josephus, in his Antiquities, gives us a detailed account of this translation. All the editions support his statement, and the very name of it indicates that the translation into Greek was by 70 elders.

But the doubt is as to what part of the Jewish Scripture was this translation. Josephus speaks of it as of the law, which probably includes only the Pentateuch._Webster_ thought it included so more. And the latter opinion is now so

But as the modern Septuagint includes the entire Old Testament, who translated the residue? I believe this question cannot be answered.

This translation is not very accurate, and yet it is very remarkable that every verse in the New Testament from the Old, is from the Greek Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew Scriptures. This accounts, in part— not fully—for the singular inaccuracy of the citations from the Old Testament which we find in the New. But how does this connect with the dogma of the infallibility of the entire New Testament?
Josephus (B. 12, c. 2, 51) represents Ptolemy Philadelphus as declaring to Ptolemy Philadelphus that there were in the Alexandrian Library 2,000,000 volumes; and that in a little time he should have 500,000.

It is said that there are now (1865) 12,000 volumes of English law reports. It is probable that the English have published at least 500 volumes of elementary law books.

I suppose there have been published at least 1,500 volumes of American law reports, and probably about 500 volumes of elementary law books. Then a complete American law library would probably contain about 4,000 volumes.

Sambucus says that Herren wrote two myriads of books concerning the gods. Manetho says he wrote 36,525 volumes on that subject. Sambucus, 300.

Paley, in 1785, said of the English law books, "The laws of this country, including the acts of the Legislature and the decisions of our Supreme Court of Judicature, are not included in less than 50 folio volumes. Moral and Political Phil., B. I. c. 2."

For further see Books 1, p. 114.
The Emperor Antoninus thanked the gods that, when he applied to the study of philosophy, he was taught by Simeon Passion not to believe too much study and pains on things that are obscure and difficult, and especially such as are immaterial in themselves. He says he avoided sophists, and mean authors, and the study of astrology.

Licinius says, that even though we could conceal any transaction from all God and men, yet nothing malicious should be done, nothing unjust, nothing dishonest, nothing incendiary.

Luther is reported to have written, "When I am angry, I can pray sweet and preach well." Emerson's Representative Men, p. 187.

Licius says, "As I like a young man in whom there is something of the old, so I like an old man in whom there is something of the young." Or Sempiteli. Sic. II.

Theodosius Parkin tells that a Methodist minister in a sermon had occasion to illustrate some point by a story of a youth who saved a family from starvation at the hint of his own life, and concluded by saying, "God be thanked for young men!" Whereupon several sinner in the congregation cried out, "Amen! Glory to God!" Purvis's Life, vol. 2, p. 362.

Phyllonius, who flourished in the apostolic age, and who was a famous teacher of religion and virtue, and I think, a very great man, concluded one of his prayers thus: "Give me, ye gods, what I desire." Alexander's life. Hist. 31.

"Our brains are twenty-year elders. The weight of life winds them up once for all, then closes the case, and gives the key into the hand of the angel of the resurrection." D. H. Holmes.
The following is altered from a song by Ayrton, a Scotch humorist, as given in the North British Review of Sept. 1855, p. 42. 43.

"Thairson had a son, Who married Noah's daughter, And nearly spoiled the flood, By drinking up the water.

Which he would have done In forty days or quicker, Had it not been mixed With plenty of good liquor.

_The Golden verses of Pythagoras._

Night and day to close thine eyes to rest, For thou hast quaffed well thy conscious breast, What saivest thou then heart left undone—

Whiv acts committed which thou oughtest to shun.

And a fair truth or error markst thou dead,

Yet sweet applause or sharp reproof all said:

So shall thy steps while the great rule is there,

Himself lead in virtue's path divine.

---

**Anger**

Paul advises us to be angry and sin not. Jesus is reported once to have broken on a crowd in anger. Luther is reported as saying "When I am angry, I can pray well, and preach well."

Writing about anger, Bierce says, "For my part, I think that it ought to be checked under all circumstances."

Lorenz wrote 9 books on anger. He combats the Aristotelian and St. Thomas doctrine on the necessity of anger. He holds that "anger is absolutely wrong; it is contrary to nature— it has no virtue of goodness or magnanimity in it; it destroys human society; it weakens the counterpoised power of reason; and Plato—there is no strength in anger; the very young, the old, and the sickly are those whom the malady is least incident."


1 Post, 3:18.
Is it reasonable to mourn for the dead?

Euripides, in his Lysistrata, says, "When man is born, his fit, with solemn show, We speak our sense of his approaching use; With other gestures, and a different eye, Proclaim our pleasure when he's bid to die."

Horace, mourning the death of his receiv'd the following anguished response: "Thou fool, to mourn at Euripides' death! The glowing youth to fate resigns his breath: The fate that seizes your happiness defends, Let every heart and the son of friends." The old Latin poet, Ennius, thus writes: "Let some bitter upon my passing bier The needless sigh or undivining tear?"

The wise Solon says: "Let me not unmercifully die, but o'er my bier Burst forth the tender sigh, the friendly tear."

Gray says: "In some fond breast the starting soul relish, Some pious drops the closing eye require."

Harris says: "Why do we mourn departed friends?"

Cicero, in his Tusculan Disputations, holds that Solon's idea is preferable to that of Ennius. I prefer the sentiment of Solon and pray to that of Ennion and Harris, because that of the former is founded in natural affection, but that of the latter on an affecting stoicism. Whether after we die either the joy or sorrow of our friends will be grateful to us, or will in any manner affect us, or even be known to us, none can tell. We can only judge of these things from our present feelings and knowledge. But, if, when dead, we retain our present affections, and even look into the affections of surviving friends, their love of our memory will doubtless be grateful to us.
Prayer

Plato seems to have thought that it is not wise to pray for any special, designated things; because we can not know the thing, if given, would do us good or evil. And he appears to have written his 'Euthydiades' to establish this point. So it he says that the Spartans 'just up, on every occasion, in private and in public, a similar prayer, by requesting the gods to grant them such things honorable in addition to what are good; and no one has ever heard them pray for any thing more.'

Aspasia says of Socrates, that, 'In the god he simply prayed that they would, his good things, as believing that the gods knew best what things are good.' Plato's Phaedrus closes as follows:

Phaedrus. Let us depart, since the heat has become too oppressive.

Socrates. Ought we not to go after we have prayed to these gods?

Phaedrus. Why not?

Socrates. O beloved Pan, and all ye other gods of this place, grant me to become beautiful in the inner man; and that whatever outward things I have may be at peace with those within.

May I dwell the wise man rich, and may I have such a portion of gold, as none but a prudent man can either bear or employ. — Do we need any thing else, Phaedrus? For myself I have prayed enough. 1 Bohm's Plato, 362

A prayer of the Athenians

Rain, rain, O dear Zeus, down on the ploughed fields of the Athenians, and on the plains. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, V. 7

Marcus says, 'We ought not to pray at all, or we ought to pray in this simple, noble fashion.'

A prayer by John Parker, Dec. 31, 1860

Oh, thou spirit whom no name can name, and in thought contain; then to whom years are as nothing, and who art from contending to everlasting — I thank thee that my life lasts from year to year. I thank thee that thy face is full of blessings. But I would beseech thee still, if thou didst fill my ear with grief, and turn my day into night. Vex, O God, my Father, I will bless thee that thou art still very rich me. I will
Prayer.

bless thee for whatsoever Thou dost decree. I know it is all very good. I bless Thee that Thou hast given me a kindred to my heart from years; Thou kindled my faith; Thou quickenest my love; Thou dost destroy my fear. When my father and mother forsake me, Thou wilt take me up. Oh my Soul, bless me still this coming year. Be not afar off. May I never become false to thy gift. Let my eye be open, my heart free and warm, my faith pure and heavenly. My religion dwell in the inner sanctuary of my heart. Let it be my daily life; and whatever the year shall find me, may I do my duty without fear, and so live one—lying low in thy hand, and blend by Thy goodness.


tin Life of Parker, 108.

Ambichius, a Neo-Platonist of the Alexandrian School, who flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 161 to 180, says that "No operation in sacred concerns can succeed without the intervention of prayer— it is the divine key which grants to men the presence of the gods; recreates us to the splendid rivers of supernal light; in a short time perfects our inward heart—"

Præclus tells us that the Ancients had a form of prayer called the Cathartic Prayer. "The Cathartic Prayer is that which is offered for the purpose of availing us of the assistance originating from suppleness, and other contiguons distempers, such as we have written in our temple."—Ambichius, 297.

Prayer.

and dispose them for the ineffable embrace and contact of the gods; and does not direct till it leads us to the summit of all. It also gradually and silently moves upward the manner of our souls by divesting them of every thing foreign to a divine nature, clothes us with the perfections of the gods. Besides this, it produces an indissoluble community, and friendship with the Divinity, nourishes a divine love, and inflames the divine part of the soul. Whatever is of an opposing and contrary nature in the soul, it expels and purifies; expels whatever is prone to generation and retains any thing of the drops of mortality in its ethereal and splendid spirit; perfects a good hope and faith concerning the reception of divine light; and, in a word, renders those by whom it is employed the familiar and domestics of the gods."—Taylor's Translation of Ambichius on the Mysteries, 272, 273.
Prayer.

Among divers forms of prayer, the Mohammedans, had the following:

"Forgive us, Lord! our sins; and forgive all who have the same faith with us."

3 Milman's History of the Jews, 222.

A prayer of Volon.

Bright Daughters of Messenly and Olympian Zeus! Pierian Muses! hear my prayer. Grant me wealth from the blind gods, and from all men a good name. May it be sweet to my friends and bitter to my foe; revered by the one, and dreaded by the other. Money I desire, but not ill-gotten gain: for the wealth that the gods give, lasts and flees not away; but the fruits of in-忠诚 and crime bring vengeance—sure, though slow.
Jewish Laws, Traditions, &c.

It is true that, as among all other nations, so among the Jews, a sort of common Law became gradually engrafted on their written Law. This written Law was the Pentateuch. But its imperfections and impositions—not to say its absurdities—led to many forced constructions and distorted versions of it.

The first of these were collected in a book which they called the Sifra. This was a collection of tradition and authoritative interpretation of the Law of Moses. This probably prevailed in the time of Christ.

Afterward came the Mishna. Its author was R. Schuda, a doctor of the Law who flourished in the third century. It was grounded on—1, the Law of Moses—2, oral Law said to be given to Moses, and not written by him, but handed down by tradition—3, the decisions and maxims of the wise Men—4, opinions of individuals, on which the schools were divided, and which were still open to be questioned—5, ancient usages and customs.

After the Sifra and Mishna came the Talmud. It appears that there were two Talmuds—one formed in Palestine, the other at Babylon by the Jews who returned there after the captivity. By the Prince of the Captivity, these latter Jews were governed for ages in Babylonia and Persia. And their Prince of the Captivity, as they were called, who claimed descent from David, framed the Babylon Talmud; while the Palestinian Talmud was the work of the Scribes, Pharisees, and doctors of Law. These two Talmuds were much alike. They included what was found in the Sifra and Mishna and vast accumulation of the ages of tradition and superstition which succeeded them. The Talmud is high authority with the Jews down to this day. It has in it many wise, good, and beautiful things. But there was perhaps never in the world any work on religious subjects containing so much of fallacious nonsense and incredible fable as the Talmud. See Milman’s History of the Jews.
In all time, and in all lands, every thoughtful man has felt the force of the truth contained in this language of the Roman poet.

How is it that, when both reason and conscience teach us that to perceive and pursue the good, is to secure our own substantial happiness, we frequently turn aside to what we know is evil? If we content ourselves with believing the orthodox notion of total depravity, the question is easily answered. But men of good sense and impartial minds find it as difficult to believe that dogma of the Church, as to answer the inquiry on other grounds.

Whatever name we give it, whether depravity, or something else, it is certain that in human nature is a strong tendency to evil; so that even the most virtuous must be constantly on their guard, or they will insensibly fall into some bad thought, deed, or habit.

An analogous tendency we find in irrational animals, and even in vegetation. In many instances, the vices of animals deteriorate, and the species of beings...
Human Depravity.

There things prove that there is such a thing in the world as natural evil. For can we escape this sad and sure truth by concluding with Pope, that "all partial evil is necessary good," can it be possible that insuperable, or unavailing, or any other offense against nature or moral law, can be useful to any persons to any thing?

How then comes it, we repeat, that there in all things terrestrial, this tendency to evil? In order to answer the question wisely, we ought first to consider whether it is a uniform and irresistible tendency, or whether it is only partial and controllable. The latter seems to be the true state of the case. The dogma that men are totally depraved is contrary to all experience and all observation. So more will admit that he is capable of all virtuous qualities, or that he performs no good actions. The truth is that every one is bad in some degree, and good in some degree. "Every known and joint of sin are preferable;" and best of men by far what they despise.

And though we all know this mixed character, it is very certain that in most civilized men the good far over the evil tendencies—just as in the natural world there is more sunshine than storm, more food than poison, more health than sickness.

Human Depravity.

It should also be observed that as our tendency to virtue is stronger than our tendency to vice, the race of man is constantly making progress towards perfection, and in proportion as this progress is made, the tendency of evil is weakened. In view of this indisputable truth, it was not unreasonable to suppose that by this progress the time may come when the evil tendency will entirely cease; and that consequently this evil tendency is but a temporary thing, and the virtuous tendency eternal.

In this view, it may be that, since progress appears to be the law of the universe, it was according to the eternal fitness of things that man should be created with these antagonistic tendencies, in order that he might have both the happiness and the merit of improving his own condition by his own efforts.

But however this may be, it seems clear that the Father of the universe, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, has seen fit to create all things on earth imperfect; and that our tendencies to evil are a necessary consequence of the imperfection thus inherent in our nature. Under this view, there is room for only two other hypotheses, which cannot be supported by any one.

The first is that which foresees in some parts of their, namely, that there are
two eternal principles—good and evil—which prevail everywhere in the universe; or two eternal gods—the one good, the other bad—who eternally contend with each other and who are so equally matched that neither can conquer the other. Such a notion seems absurd, and is unsupported by any sound reason.

The other hypothesis is that of the orthodox deist, namely, that by what they call the original transgression of the parents of our race, a depraved tendency was transmitted to all their descendants. This suggestion does not rationally account for the tendency in question. Indeed, the argument is suicidal. For according to it, the evil tendency must have existed in Adam and Eve before their transgression; else they could never have transgressed at all. In their primeval state, the argument supposes that they were liable to temptation; and thereby liability is identically the evil tendency in question. The argument, then, is simply this: that the evil tendency in Adam and Eve, which led them to sin, causes the evil tendency in all their race. But this is reasoning in a circle. The question still remains, how did the tendency in Adam and Eve originate? The theological solution is therefore no solution at all.

Through the whole, then, although the question of the origin of evil has never been, and perhaps never can be, satisfactorily answered, yet I think the most reasonable answer which can be given is what I have already given, namely, that the deity created us imperfect beings; that this imperfection necessarily included the liability to fall into evil; and that, though his design in so doing is unaccountable to us, yet his infinite wisdom, which is equally incommensurable by us, saw that it was all right and good. I can go no further. And if this brings me to Paphian doctrine, that "all partial evil" is "universally good," I can not keep it.

Orville Dewey D.D. in his "Towell Lectures," entitled "The Problem of Human Destiny," explains the question thus: all finite things are necessarily imperfect, and could not made infinite beings or things; therefore he could not make them perfect. He brought them as nearly to perfection as he could. All created things are of necessity finite and imperfect. Where there is imperfection there is necessarily evil. It unerringly springs from the imperfection of the creature to which it attains. God could not create them without it. He did the best he could under the circumstances.
The Ancient Philosophies.

The chief philosophies in Cicero's time were the Stoics, the Epicureans, and the Academic. Cato, Cincinnatus, and Cicero, who lived in the utmost friendship, were the principal ornaments of these schools.

The Stoics were bigots and sanguine. They held men to be truly wise and good but themselves. They placed perfect happiness in virtue, regardless of every other good. They held all sins equal by wicked. They held that a man could never forgive—never repent—never change his mind. With these principles both passed through life. He acted as if he had lived in the society of Plato, not in the days of Remus. He made no distinction of time or things. And after a peremptory sense of disappointment and repulse, unable any longer to pursue his old ways, he committed suicide.

The Epicureans placed the chief happiness in the secure enjoyment of a life of pleasure. They esteemed life only as the handmaid to pleasure, by preserving health and collecting friends. They held, therefore, that a misfortune had no other duty than to screen his own sense, decline all struggle, retire from public affairs, imitate the life of the god, and have their days in undisturbed repose. This was the Scheme Cicero followed. He had great talents, great parts, great learning, judgment, candor, and benignity. In politics and patriotism he was like Cicero. He urged Cicero to be, but would not act himself. And he managed to steer clear of the violence of the time, made all partake his friends' lives to a good old age, and died a natural death.

The Academic philosophy took a middle course. It revered virtue and honor, and it demanded virtuous action. At first it was the direct road to what was right; but if that lay not open to it, it took the next best. When it could not arrive at the certain, it it was content with the probable. It was eclectic. It always adopted the best which, under the circumstances, could be adopted. By these rules, Cicero lived. But he died by violence.

The result, therefore, was in favor of Cicero. It seems, however, that all three of these sects, highly prized virtue; and that all three of their great men, even as good as they ever lived, but Cicero for the best.
Ancient Philosophy—continue.

In Cicero's work on the Nature of the Gods, the views of these schools of philosophy concerning the Gods are very sketchy. But Cicero says that Zeno himself was "a man unsocial, illiterate, insultine, without wit, without reputation, without elegance."
Distinguished sovereigns and their era

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Name of Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Augustus Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Agrippa Balbica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Claudius Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Nero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Galba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Nerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Commodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Caracalla &amp; Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Maximiinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Hostiogabalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Alexander Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Maximiinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Maximiinus &amp; Balbinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Gordian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Philip the Arab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Orestes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Vitelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Gallus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Victorius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Name of Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Gallien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Claudian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Aurelian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Septimius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Florian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Probus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Gallien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Carinius &amp; Aurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Honorius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Constantine I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Constantine II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Julian the Aposate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Julian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empire divided into East & West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Emperors</td>
<td>Eastern Roman Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Romanus III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Emperors Zac &amp; Theodore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Michael VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Isaac Comnenus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Constantine X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Eudocia &amp; Constantine XVI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Romanus IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Michael.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Prince of the house of Leonne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Alexei I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>Alexei II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Manuel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>Andronicus I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Isaac III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>Alexei III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687</td>
<td>Isaac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Alexei IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Isaac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Baldwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Henry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Peter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Baldwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Alexei II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Baldwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Theodoros II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Romanus IX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Basil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Michael VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Leo the Philosopher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Constantine IX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Constantine &amp; Romanus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>Romanus IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>Nicephorus Phocas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>John Zimisces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Basil. &amp; Constantine X.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eastern Roman Emperors

A.D. | Emperor
---|---
1282 | Andronicus II.
1334 | Andronicus III.
1341 | John Palaeologus.
1347 | John Cantacuzenus.
1355 | John Palaeologus.
1371 | Manuel Palaeologus.
1425 | John Palaeologus III.
1448 | Constantine 13
1453 | Turkish rule began.

Frankish Sovereigns

A.D. | King
---|---
679 | Childerch, Thierry, Blotaire, Blodemir.
681 | Blotaire.
757 | Charibert, German, Sigebert, & Childeric.
762 | Blotaire 2.
594 | Thierry 2, Theodobert.
614 | Blotaire 3.
628 | Dagobert & Charibert.
638 | Sigebert & Clovis 2.
654 | Childeric 2.
679 | Thierry 4.
692 | Clovis 3.
695 | Childerch 3.
711 | Dagobert 3.
716 | Childeric.
730 | Thierry.
742 | Childeric 3.
751 | Peter the Short.
768 | Charles.
814 | Louis the Pious.
840 | Charles the Fat.
877 | Louis the Stammer.
879 | Louis 3d of Carlsbad.
884 | Charles the Fat.
887 | Arnold.
894 | Louis 4.
French Sovereigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1567</th>
<th>Henry 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Francis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Charles 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Henry 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Henry 4. - Bourbon family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Louis 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Louis 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Louis 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Louis 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Louis 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1023</th>
<th>Louis 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>Louis 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Philip 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Philip 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Louis 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Philip 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Philip 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>Philip 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Louis 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Charles 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Charles 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>Charles 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>Louis 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Charles 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Louis 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Francis 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kings of England

A.D.

1066
1087
1100
1135
1154
1189
1199
1216
1307
1327
1377
1399
1413
1422
1461
1483
1485
1509
1547
1553
1558
1603
1625
1649
1660
1685
1689
1702
1714
1727
1760
1820
1830
1837

Edward II.
Edward III.
Richard II.
Henry IV.
Henry V.
Henry VII.
Edward IV.
Edward V.
Richard III.
Henry VIII.
Henry VIII.
Edward VI.
Mary.
Elizabeth.
James I.
Charles I.
Commonwealth.
Charles II.
James II.
William & Mary.
Anne.
George II.
George II.
George III.
George IV.
William IV.
Victoria.
Kings of Scotland:

1165: William
1214: Alexander II.
1269: Alexander III.
1336: Margaret
1391: John Balliol
1306: Robert Bruce
1329: David II.
1371: Robert II.
1376: Robert III.
1406: James I.
1437: James II.
1460: James III.
1488: James IV.
1513: James V.
1542: Mary
1567: James VI.

Sovereigns of Spain:

1474: Union under Ferdinand and Isabella.
1512: Ferdinand V. the Catholic.
1516: Charles I. Emperor of Germany.
1526: Philip II.
1578: Philip III.
1621: Philip IV.
1665: Charles II.
1700: Philip V.
1726: Louis I.
1744: Philip V. again.
1748: Ferdinand VI.
1759: Charles III.
1788: Charles IV.
Peruvian Bark—Quinine

The tree which produces this bark is a native of Peru. Its name among the aboriginal Peruvians was guinaquina—hence the term quinine. It seems, however, that it was at first, and is still, known among Europeans as chilchona. This name it got by the fact that Ana, countess of Chilchona, wife of the viceroy of Peru, being attacked with fever at Lima, in 1638, a native sent to her physician some of the bark, which cured her.

It is doubtful whether this antifebrile quality was known to the native at the time of the discovery of America, though it probably was.

There are, at least, 4 distinct affections in the bark, of more or less similar quality. And there are at least 39 varieties of the tree.

The extraction of the quinine itself is due to two French chemists, Pelletier & Caventou, who first discovered it in 1820.

The British have since, (1863) succeeded in growing and multiplying this tree in India, Jamaica, Egypt, Algeria, and Western Africa. Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1860. p. 252

The Inductive and inductive Philosophy.

The deductive method draws special conclusions from general and admitted premises. The inductive method draws general conclusions from special or particular facts.

The deductive reasoning by syllogisms. It takes its major proposition for granted. Hence, if there be doubt of the major proposition, the deduction must be doubtful.

The inductive reasoning takes nothing for granted. It forms its facts, and then draws from them the necessary or probable inference. It follows, therefore, that if the facts are sufficiently numerous and well-established, the conclusion from them is often irresistible. But if these facts are few or doubtful, the truths inferred from them are often unsatisfactory.

Theologians constantly use the inductive method. Thus, they assume that the Bible says so and so. The truth of which they say can not be questioned; and from the Scripture premises thus assumed, they deduce their dogmas. But the inductive mode would require that the Bible proposition should first be proved to be true, and then the proper inference be drawn.

On the other hand, astronomers, geologists, and metaphysicians now mostly reason inductively—they first collect their special facts, and then draw their conclusions.
The rise of the Baconian philosophy of induction was the heaviest blow ever inflicted on dogmatic theology. It discarded their mode of investigation, and supplanted the very base of their system. Paley and his successors, by a skilful employment of the inductive method, attempted to confute their party for the failure of the deductive one. But their project, though ably conceived, has come to naught. And it seems now to be generally admitted, that nothing can be made of it; and that it is impossible to establish the old theological premises by a chain of inductive reasoning.

According to Buckle, the deductive method "reasons from principles and the inductive reasons to principles. Induction proceeds from the smaller to the greater; deduction from the greater to the smaller. Induction is from particular to general and from the senses to the idea; deduction is from general to particular and from the ideas to the senses. By induction, we rise from the concrete to the abstract; by deduction we are descended from the abstract to the concrete." Buckle on Civilization, Vol. 2, p. 330
Loss of Life in the War of Rebellion of 1861

Oct. 18, 1863.

In Kennedy's Compendium of the losses, he supposes that, for the last two years and a half, the number of the killed and disabled permanently in the U.S. army, and the increase of able-bodied population in the U.S., a writer in the Cincinnati gazette of this date, partly shows, that the total number of deaths, by violence and disease, and permanent disability by wounds, occasioned by the war since it began, is not half equal to the increase of able-bodied men between 1850 and 1860. The following figures are his:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Grove</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>7245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>9165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>7095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleghany</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>13700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16868</td>
<td>73407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He assumes that this includes 3/8 of all the killed and wounded on our side in the war. On this calculation he arrives at making the whole killed 25,272

Wounded 110,111

135,383

Of the killed, he holds that not over 4/9 either die or are permanently disabled. So that the whole number of the lost to the able-bodied men between 1850 and 1860 he states thus:

Killed on the field of battle 25,272
Died of disease 116,600

Aggregate of losses 241,879

The increase of able-bodied men in the meantime he holds to be 487,500

Making the net increase 235,621

Of course these calculations do not include the rebel States.
Monasticism

Christian Monasticism seems to have arisen in the 4th century, though much the same thing existed long before among the Jews of Palestine and the Therapeutae of Egypt.

Paul of Thebes was the first Christian Hermit. In the 22nd year of his age, i.e. 250, the story says he retired to a cave on the mountain Siinai, and lived there 40 years. He was so poor that he had no clothes or books, but he had a palm tree, and a palm tree furnished him drink, food, shade, and respite. In the latter part of his life, however, a man daily brought him half an ox of bread. St Anthony and two lions dug his grave, and buried him, when he died. So wrote Jerome 30 years after his death.

He is said to have been the founder of the order of St. Anthony of Egypt. He was born about A.D. 251. In 270, a large fortune devolved on him, and he gave it to the care of a younger brother. He gave away the fortune, committed his brother to the care of the poor, and devoted himself to the monastic life. He ate only once a day. His diet was bread, and salt, and water; his drink was water only. He banished all books but the name of the Lord. He slept on the ground or straw. His wardrobe was a hair shirt, a sheep skin, and a girdle.

Monasticism

Often he watched and prayed all night. Many conflicts with devils he had. He was a champion against Arianism. For years he would not wash his face. The whole Nicene age venerated him as a model saint.

The example of Anthony acted like magic on the people. Soon the deserts of Egypt, Libya, and the Thebaid swarmed with hermits. A mania for monasticism seized all Christendom. And in Egypt the number of monks was equal to the number of people in the cities.

The Stylites were an interesting class of reformers. They were so called because they stood on pillars for years doing penance and praying. The father of this order was Symeon the Stylite, originally a shepherd on the borders of Syria. At 18 he became a monk. He only ate on Sundays. For 26 years he spent 4400 lent (40 days) without food. For 36 years before his death he stood all the time on a pillar 60 feet high. Here he made more than 1200 grammatical dicta. He worked many miracles, and died at the age of 69 of an ulcer on his leg.

Symeon, the younger, was another Stylite. He spent 68 years on a pillar, and died A.D. 592.

Such is the origin of monasteries. And yet
Monasticism.

The fathers of the Church—Jerome, Athanasius, Augustine, Theodoret—formed three orders in the first of these. Athanasius, to whom we owe the establishment of the Semitic, or Semitarians, or Semitic dogma, even wrote the life of St. Anthony by 30 years after his death and testified to his miracles and piety.

The Modern Hindoos have a sort of hermitage much resembling Christian monasticism. Some of them live buried in the ground, with only the head above the soil—some wear heavy iron collars—some drag a heavy chain fastened to their foreparts—some hold their feet, but that their fingers make to the ground of their hands—some stand on their feet without support, one leg—some have their fingers with iron spikes—such are the Hindu society.

Methodist Quarterly Review, Jan. 1864, p. 22

The Gipsies.

The gipsies exist in nearly every state in Europe; and they are occasionally seen in America. They first appeared in Europe in the 15th century. They claim an Egyptian descent. And when they first came to Europe, they pretended that their god had appointed to them, in a furnace, that they should roam the world for a certain number of years.

They have kings, queens, dukes, lords, etc. Their men are thieves; their women strumpets. They are great fortune tellers. They have a language of their own, which they keep as a mystery from others. It is thought to be a dialect of the Hindustanes. They are both ferocious and vindictive. But it is said that they have, since their first advent into Europe, greatly improved in their manners and morals; and that some of them have even quit their original habits, and mingled with society, and that they are a great nation, lost their distinctive peculiarities. So says Walter Scott in a note to chap. 6 of Quintin Pilot. But a writer in the Atlantic Monthly for 1866 says they are Bohemians.
Abellard.

This celebrated Doctor of the Catholic Church was born in Brittany in 1079. He was a priest, or at least educated for the priest-
hood. In his youth, he was engaged as a private teacher of Hesiod, a
vice of a canons of Paris. Love,

arising between them, ended in

fornication, and this in offspring.

Her friends forced a private mar-
riage between them. Afterwards,

through his persecution she entered

a monastery. This so enraged her

friends that they castrated him.

He then betook himself to a cloister.

Hence Pope's "Eloge to Abellard."

He died in 1142, aged 63.

Abellard was a man of great

learning. As a lecturer and a

philosopher, he was perhaps superior
to any one of his time. Scholastic

divinity was his great theme. His

reputation at Paris as a public teacher,
says Tasso, was wonderful.

He wrote a book of speculations, which
he called "Sic et non," in which he raised
such questions as the following:

Quod sit Deus tricipitalis et contra.

Quod sit Flavius sine principio et

contra.

Quod actus generatio / nihil narrari,
vel sciri, vel intelligi posset et non.

Quod nihil fiat causa et contra.

Quod pietas sit, placat Deus et non.

Quod omnia seiant Deus et non.

Quod licet habere concubinam et

contra.

Quod nulla decentur mortem licet et

contra.

Quod licet hominem occidere, et non.
Martyrs.

Most martyrs have died for some religion. But men have become martyrs to infidelity. In the 15th century, Bruno, a pantheist, and Jan Ninja, an atheist, suffered martyrdom in Italy, under the Catholic authority, because of their infidelity. Farrar's Bampton Lectures, 103.

Ebionism.

It seems that the Ebionites, an early sect of Christians, have their name from the word ebionim, which means the poor, because they deemed poverty a virtue, and their society consisted of poor persons. After the Church grew powerful and rich, these Ebionites came to be deemed beastly. At length the Church fancied that somebody of the name of Ebion was their founder. But it appears that there never existed such a person. Tertullian perhaps first started the fable. Pagan's 'Life of Jesus,' p. 177 &c.
Is matter eternal?

If all matter is created, then there was a period when no matter existed; or ever had existed; and prior to that period, infinite eternity had always been rolling along, with being in existence, but God. And then God, through all that infinite space, was solitary and alone, dwelling in infinite space—having no universe, nothing on which to act, consequently eternally inactive, nothing on which to display his attributes of love, power, goodness, wisdom. After having an infinite time thus inactive, he then begins to create matter, and for the first time to exist his attributes. Was this not a change in the unchangeable God? How could he love when he had no object to love? Show favor or mercy without an object? Or, indeed, do any act, good or bad, if he alone thus existed? Is it not more probable that matter existed coevally with him, and that he has eternally exercised his attributes on matter as he has done of late?

It is commonly agreed that matter is indistinctible. Certainly we know no means by which any particle of it can be destroyed. Is not this some evidence of its eternity?

Herbert Spencer, however, in his tract on religion and science, p. 34, holds that if matter is eternal, it must be self-existing; and that to conceive existence through infinite past time, implies the conception of infinite past time, which is an impossibility. And he asserts, such a thing to be "absolutely un-thinkable." But might it not be assumed that all agree that matter is eternal, or that an eternal being created, and is not the idea of the eternity of matter as thinkable as the idea of the eternity of the Deity? The argument seems to be rightly strong against the eternity of any thing whatever.

Indeed, Spencer admits all this. For, as to the notion of its eternal self-existence, that of its self-creation (Pantheism) and that of its creation by a separate agency (Deity), he holds that each "when critically examined" is "literally unthinkable." p. 35.
Prophecy.

It seems that persons, not professing to be divinely inspired, have sometimes prophesied truth.

If Virgil's Pollio were a part of the Bible, the preacher could make a very pretty prophecy out of it.

Before the invention of the steam engine, Doctor Cramin prophesied thus: "Soon shall thy power, almighty steam! after dragging slow barges and urge the flying car."

Sorica has a more remarkable prophecy of the discovery of America:

Dispuls oceanus

Vincula rerum casae, et ingens
Patent tellus, lyphique novis
Dietigat orbis."
An army moving.

A correspondent, the Cincinnati Gazette, of April 17, 1865, writes concerning Sherman's army as follows:

"The wagon trains of this army can not march on less than 40 miles of road. They would, as they march, fill every street in a large city. Its batteries will cover 7 miles; its ambulances 5. It expects to live in great part on the country, and yet it carries 13,000 rations of bread, the same amount of sugar, and the same of salt. Six wagon loads of bread and 3,000 wagon loads of coffee are provided for the trip of a few days; and the trip 375,000 pounds of salt will make a fair allowance. The single item of ammunition requires 1000 wagon loads, a train itself nearly 12 miles long. The men themselves in pairs (40) could not advance, when well closed up, on less than 25 miles of road. 2500 of pack mules follow the regiments. Taking all these things into consideration, if an army like this were compelled to march its troops and trains over a single road, the column could not be moved with any degree of regularity on less than 125 miles of road."
Religion without a God.

Auguste Comte, a French Philosopher of the age, has discovered a religion, or, invented one, that altogether dispenses with a Deity. He seems to think that a religion which teaches men to serve an omnipotent personal God is unreasonable, since such a God needs no one's service. He therefore adopts a religion whose great object is to serve the human race, as forming a collective existence without assignable beginning or end.

In order rightly to serve Humanity Comte holds that a very high morality must be observed. He insists that there must be total self-abnegation, and that we must not only love our neighbor as ourselves, but more than ourselves—or rather not love ourselves at all. He even insists that no pleasure to oneself is innocent except so far as it is necessary to bodily or mental vigor. He denies that any one should eat or drink beyond the mere necessities of the body.

Along with benevolence to our race, he demands mercy toward all sentient things, especially toward the lower animals, as the horse, the dog. We can not well imagine a

Religion without an object of worship; but Mr. Comte escapes this difficulty by proposing to worship Humanity. Nor does he decline with prayer. But prayer, as understood by him, does not mean asking; it is a mere outpouring of the feelings. It is to be addressed to no one.

According to Mr. Comte, the honors to collective Humanity should be confined to public celebration. In order to this he will have priests to officiate in this sort of worship. His religion consists of three sacraments and many rity and ceremonies. But the duties of these are too ridiculous to be named.

Honor of Mons. Comte except to any proselyte?

See the thing at large in the Westminster Review for July 1838, p. 1.

Bronte quarreled with his wife and friends, and in a year or two, prayed daily for aid to his dead wife's heart, ate but a day's frugal as a monk, a piece of dry bread, and his violin, daily read the 'Imitation of Christ.' Dante, of Homer, was born 1899, died in 1887. He was irritable, fastidious, religious. The Edinburgh Review of April 1848, p. 162.
A Puzzle.

I take the substance of the following from Herbert Spencer's "First Principles." Philosopher. This thing, motion, is a curious thing. In regard to it our sight often deceives us.

I observe I see nothing strange in it. Do I think that my sight can deceive me?

P. Let us suppose, then, that you are in the prow of a ship on the equator, which is sailing westward at the rate of five miles an hour. You walk from the prow to the stern at the same rate of speed; are you, when thus walking, moving to the east or the west?

A. No this. I am remaining in the same point of space—just as a horse on the wheel of a tread mill.

P. Do it would seem. But let us consider. The surface of the earth on the equator is westward about 1000 miles an hour, carrying you and the ship, too, about that fast to the east. What say you now?

A. I believe that, for once, I have been mistaken. In such a case, I suppose I would be going rapidly to the east in whatever direction I walked on the ship, or in what direction seems the ship sailed on the sea. This is beyond all doubt.

P. So, indeed, it would seem. But let us not be too confident that we are right. It is pretty certain that in the earth's diurnal motion it rolls from West to East about 1000 miles an hour; but it is equally certain that, in its orbit round the sun, it rolls about 30,000 miles an hour to the West. What do you say now?

A. That's all right. I forgot that. Well we are entirely right at last. The result must be that if the earth's diurnal motion carries in East 1000 miles an hour, and if its annual or orbital motion carries in 36,000 miles an hour, to the West, I am travelling 66,000 miles an hour to the West.

P. Let us not be over confident. It is now a well-established fact that the earth has still another motion. Astronomers know that the whole solar system, including the sun, the earth, and all the other planets, is moving toward the constellation of Hercules with an inconceivable velocity, and rolling in a vast orbit, the circumference of which is utterly unknown, and the center of which is but vaguely conjectured. Nor can the astronomer tell us whether this motion of the Earth and whole solar system is east or west, or East, or west, or north or south. What say you now?

A. Say! What can I say? I am done guessing. Whether in a ship or out of it, I have no more idea than the man in the moon, which way I am moving, or whether I am moving at all, or where I am, or whether I am, any where.
Rambles among Words.

Minister. This word formally and properly, now mean a chief servant. But now, in its customary use, it is often means a master. The British ministry are really the British rulers. A chief magistrate is more often called a minister. Judges, Marshall, sheriffs are frequently called ministers of justice. Even clergy men are called ministers of the gospel; yet this is an opinion rule than serve their flock. So the pope calls himself summit synodum.

Pastor. This term is now always applied to preachers who have the care of churches. In this sense, it is used figuratively. Literally, it means a shepherd. I think the figurative use of it is, at this day, in some taste. For we saturate the figure a little, we shall catch a little idea. A shepherd or pastor must have a flock of sheep. There never was a pastor without such flock. The one necessarily suppose the other. If the preacher is a pastor, his church are sheep; I don't like to be called or deemed a shepherd. Moreover, a flock of sheep includes lambs, ewes, wether and ram. Not very appropriate terms to apply to decent inhabitants.

Besides, the figure is base and degrades the church member. The shepherd or pastor is a human being; but sheep are brutes. The figure supposes, therefore, a difference between the pastor and his congregation which is unjust and untrue.

Mr. This prefix usually changes totally the sense of the word to which it is prefixed as: like and unlike wise and unwise do not mean. Yet in a few instances, the meaning of the word, with or without it, is exactly the same as in the words loose and unloose, and the words tell until.

Dogs and daffs. These words seem to be mere new fashions of the phrase, "no end, no off."

The character is nothing but the Latin et, formerly written thus:

Grandeur Sublimity. Grandeur, from the Latin Grandis. French grandeur, is greatness—originally greatness in size. Sublimity, from the Latin Sublimis, also means greatness—originally great in height. Grandeur is applied to both to art and nature; but natural objects only are sublime objects. Thus, the pyramids are grand but not sublime; the Rocky Mountains are both grand and sublime. It has been said that the sublime inspires more powerful emotions, more elevated feelings than the grand. Grandeur is hardly applicable to style, though some times so applied; a sublime style is a common and accurate expression.
Rambles Among Words.

Vacation. It is strange that of late years this word is used as synonymous with occupation, though literally and formally its opposite in meaning. Vacation literally means one's calling or business. Vacation literally means the act of calling from, the business of calling aside. The one is from the Latin vocare; the other the Latin preposition a and vocatio, literally from a vocatio.

? It is certain that our interrogative point was originally. The letter q, when it was written thus: Q, and the letter was thus used as the initial of the word question. So now the point ? indicates that the sentence preceding it is interrogative. Formerly, it was put at the beginning of the sentence, not at its end, as now.

"The quotation marks were originally nothing but the letter oo, which stood for cited or citation.

Beghards. It seems that about the 13th century, there was a class of praying brethren among the Franciscan monks, who were called Beghards. Was it because they were hard beggars of alms, or because they begged hard in prayer? Sir W. Adderley's "Martyr."
Rambles among Words.

It's. The position it's is a new word. It is not found in our Bible. Its for it is, is always wrong. We should say Its or it is.

Extantransous. Souther proposed to adopt this word as meaning "out of door."" 

Starvation. This word is of American coinage. It is not in the old English dictionaries. Webster's dictionary first introduced it into England.

Garriage. Formerly this word did not mean a thing in which we are carried, but a thing which we carry, a bundle, a braid. So it is used in Acts 21, 15.

Ashew. The word, in the time of James I., meant linear defendant. So it is used in Tit. v. 1.

Brat. This was once a very dejected word. 300 years ago, Abrahama's children were called Abrahama's brats—"O Abrahama's brats! O brook of Clevedon!"

Rambles among Words.

Dan. An old English name. It is perhaps from the Spanish Don. Channer, it is I think, who says "Dan Abraham," Dan. Now. 

Supra, Soro, Sune. Bierce, in his work on the nature of the body, tells us that Soro is derived from juvena, paten, "helping father"—that Soro is from the Latin Sermon, "helping"—and that Sune is also a juvena, "helping."

Elshin, Elshunh. According to Bishop Wordsworth, these words which we translate God, Lord, mean respectively: "The Immortal, The self-existent."

Neptune. Bierce, in his work concerning the nature of the gods, says that this word is derived a hand, from swimming, the first letter being a little changed. 

Sol, the Sun, the same writer says this word is so named, either, because he is solely (alone) or, because he observed all the stars.
Rambles among Words.

Luna—the moon—is so called, from shining. Civen De Saturna Oríum.

Blanket. This word comes from the name of one Thomas Blanket, who in 1340, was the first manufacturer of blanket. He lived in Brutish

Horsted. It was first made in the town of Horsted in England. Hence its name.

Sign—signature. In the medieval age, writings were authenticated by adding the sign of the cross—signature or sign. Hence sign & signature are derived. North British Review, June 1828, p. 277.

Proverb—"To publicly retract a word." London Quarterly, July 1825, p. 103.
Books. See note 11.

Burlington, our minister in China, says "the Chinese have more books, encyclopedias, periodicals, magazines, &c. than any other people. Their prince had an encyclopedian subscribes 5000 volumes."
The celebrated cathoic maxim.


In his Tru catholici Ecclesie magnae
her curnam est, ut in teneamun,
quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab
omnibus, ceditum est, hoc est enim
ven perfrique catholicae.

I forgot where I found the above;
but Vincentius Lirimus, who wrote
about A.D. 434, in his Commentary,
express it thus: "Quod ubique, quod
semper, quod ab omnibus ceditum
est", even fides est.
The Mariner's Compass.

It is well known that on land the magnetic needle always points in different places, and at different times in the same place. But its variations on ships are far greater. Let two ships be lying still side by side with their bows in the same direction, and the same compass will not point in the same direction on one as on the other. The reason is that portions of every ship attract the needle and produce a variation. Iron wooden ships will do this, and they do it more in some localities on the sea than on others. The cause is that the iron stanchions, bolts, and bars in the wooden ship affect the magnetic needle and thus produce the variation. Soft iron produces this effect much more than hard iron or steel. In certain places on the sea, the polar attraction of the earth is much weaker than at others, and the attraction of the iron in a ship makes the variation of the compass proportionally greater.

The difficulty of these variations arising from the attraction of iron in a wooden ship has been nearly overcome by placing an equal quantity of iron all round the compass on shipboard, so that the attraction on every side is neutralised, and then the needle points truly.

But the case with iron ships, now so common, is much worse. These utterly distract the magnetic needle, so that it turns sometimes in the fourth of a circle from its true pointing. No complete remedy to this has been discovered, and great disasters have sometimes been the consequence.

It seems that, though, as a general rule, the softest iron becomes the most intense magnet, yet no two pieces of iron are exactly alike in this respect. And what is equally remarkable, the necessary hammering in felling the part of an iron ship together magnetizes instantly the whole fabric. The difficulty in iron ships has been attempted to be remedied, by ascertaining the variation of the compass before sailing, on each ship, and then making the proper allowance in navigating her. But this is a very imperfect remedy; for the extent of the variation depends much on the course the ship is sailing, and also on the calmness or roughness of the sea.

Besides, it seems that in every iron ship there are what are called a permanent and a sub-permanent magnetism. The latter is very great in new ships, but gradually wears out. As it was beaten in by hammering, it is beaten out by使用。And so its influence on the compass is constantly varying till it all disappears; the influence of the permanent magnetism always remaining. The consequence is that no ascertaining of the variation of the compass on an iron ship at one time and place is a safe guide in a future time, at another place, or in stormy seas.

It is also remarkable that iron ships which are built with their bows south, are less trouble in this way than such as are built with their bows north. See an article on this subject in the London Spectator, October 16, 1722.
In the opinion of St. Chrysostom, woman is "a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic foe, a deadly fascination, and a painter ill." Westminster Review, Oct. 1843, p. 156.

Homer, in the Odyssey, Book II, says:

"Oh woman, woman! When to ill the mind Is bent, all hell contains repose for thee: And such was mine, who barely plunged her spear Thru the fair woman when she departs abroad. Was I happy, the loud war's outcome, To meet soft quiet and repose at home? Oh, wife! the deeds of war, the fighting sea, and battles, all the races; And should portently our victory shed Home blightness, they will curse the kind."

Odyssey, Book II, 531 to 540.

Lord Bacon has somewhere written substance as follows:

"In youth, women are our ministers; in manhood, our companions; in old age, our nurses, and in all ages, our friends.

"Love your wife like yourself, honor her more than yourself. Whosoever lives unmarried, lives without joy, without comfort, without blessing. O bless a step in choosing a wife. Of thy wife is small, bend down to her, bend whispers in her ear. He who profanes the love of his youth, God's eternal wish, for him. He who sees his wife die before him, has been present at the destruction of the sanctuary itself around him, the world grows dark. It is woman whose through God's blessings are vouchsafed to a house. She teaches the children, feeds the husband to the place of worship and instruction, welcomes him when he returns, keeps the house godly and pure. And God's blessing rest upon all these things." (Salman, cited in London Quarterly Oct. 1867, p. 243)
Woman.


Free translation.

Oxet is lighter than a feather;

And the wind more light than either.

But a woman’s fickle mind

More light than feather, dust, or wind.


Plato, in his Republic, is a Woman’s Rights man. He holds the women ought to act with the man both in war and government.
Curious ecclesiastical items.

1. "Church music is supposed to have been first introduced by Gregory the Great, A.D. 601." Salazar for the soc. p. 324. But see 2. Amander, 318, 319, note 2.
2. It seems that meeting houses, or churches were not used by Christians till the 3rd century. 1. Amander's Church History, 291.
3. Image worship in churches, it seems, was first introduced about the last of the 3rd century. So they came in the train of fashionable church music. 1. Amander 293.
4. Infant baptism was not introduced into Church till about A.D. 200. Amander 311, 312.
5. As 1. above is doubtful.
7. It seems that the early Christians, like the Methodists, received number first on probation. The doctrine of divine fire. The probationary period at 2 years. 1. Amander, 305.
Sumptuary Laws

Tertullian, in his "Apology for the Christians" ch. 6, says that the ancient Romans allowed not above a noble—£1.48—to be spent on an entertainment, and but one dish, and that not a crowded one, for a supper. A senator was not allowed to have ten pounds of silver plate. And a woman was allowed to have no more gold about her than her wedding ring on her finger.
The Ancient Romans "levelled theatres to the ground, as seminaries of lewdness and immorality." Tertullian's Apology for the Christians, ch. 6.
### Remarkable facts relating to the occurrence in the Bible of the names of the Deity: God, Lord, Elohim, Jehovah.

In the first chapter of Genesis, the term God, Elohim, occurs about 25 times; and the name Lord, Jehovah, does not occur at all. Nor does it occur till the 6th verse of ch. 2.

#### Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
<th>Jehovah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Story of Balaam

God, Lord, 292 times.

#### Deuteronomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
<th>Jehovah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Joshua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ruth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Lord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The usual phrase in this book is "the Lord Thy God," "the Lord our God."*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>1 Samuel</th>
<th>2 Samuel</th>
<th>1 Kings</th>
<th>2 Kings</th>
<th>1 Chronicles</th>
<th>2 Chronicles</th>
<th>Ezra</th>
<th>Nehemiah</th>
<th>Esther</th>
<th>Psalms</th>
<th>Proverbs</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Wisdom</th>
<th>Ecclesiastes</th>
<th>Song of Solomon</th>
<th>Isaiah</th>
<th>Jeremiah</th>
<th>Lamentations</th>
<th>Habakkuk</th>
<th>Zephaniah</th>
<th>Haggar</th>
<th>Zechariah</th>
<th>Malachi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bible Names of the Deity.

Thus it appears that the name Elohim, or God, appears in the Old Testament about 2187 times; and that term Jehovah, translated Lord, appears about 3385 times.

These figures are probably not perfectly accurate; for I have gone over the Old Testament but once to get them. But I suppose they are nearly enough correct for any practical purpose.

The whole matter is rather one of curiosity than of any practical value. Yet possibly some of the following information may furnish some in regard to it.

1. It seems that however these two names of the Deity may agree or differ in literal meaning, the term Jehovah was the favorite name among the Jews, it being used in their Scriptures more than twice as often as the name Elohim.

2. When we consider that till the 56th verse of the 2nd chapter of Genesis the term Jehovah does not occur, and the term Elohim occurs 28 times; and that this portion of Genesis includes a complete account of the creation, it then not a probability that it was not written by the same person who wrote the residue of that book?

3. God is represented in Ex. 6:3, as saying: I am the Lord; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them. Yet throughout the book of Genesis, we find that these patriarchs familiarly used the name Lord Jehovah. Is this not plain some mistake here?

4. When the name of the Deity occurs in the genuine or creative sense, I think the term God is often used than in other cases.

5. It is said that Proverbs and Ecclesiastes were both written by Solomon. In Proverbs the name Lord is used 62 times and God only 7 times; and in Ecclesiastes, the name God is employed 36 times, and that of Lord does not occur once. In view of this, is it likely that the same man wrote both these books?

6. In either and both alike, no reference at all is made to the Deity either by name or otherwise. It is absurd, therefore, to claim them in any sense religious books.
Resemblances betwixt stories ancient and profane.

II.
Et post aliquant dies revultavit, ut accipiant eam, declaravit ut viserit cadaver Lemni, ut secu examen aperit in ore leonis et canum melis.

Vulgate: Judges 14:8.

Quintus exsimia hastate corporis tumens obscurum, ut intasit totidem servos januam.

Post ubi nunc super illam indutum est erat, suumque nunc vitam, vitamque suam.

Hic est, substituta diea malitie monstruosa!

Abfugit proxima loca, propriam terram.

Stirps, a qua fatum, et manus offensiva estes, invasorque tuum sui habes.

Nuliusque, quod tuus, habes, dolores et dolet.

Vulpes. Geor. i. Cap. 33:27 to 34.

II.
And behold there was a man which had his hand withered — This said he to the man, stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth, and it was restored while like as the other. Matt. 12:11-13.

When he had thus spoken, he stretched The ground, and made clay of the slime, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said to him, go wash in the pool of Siloam. He went...
Moses. And when she could no longer hide him, she took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch, and put the child therein; and she laid it in the flags by the river's brink; and his sister stood afar off, to see what would be done to him.” Ye. Ex. 2. 3-4

Romulus & Remus. The children were ordered to be thrown into the stream of the river. It happened that the Tiber, overflowing its banks, formed itself into stagnant pools. They exposed the boys in the nearest pool. The rising flood left on dry ground the trough in which they were exposed. A. the wolf, or Faustulus, a shepherdess, saved and suckled them.” Ye.

Livy. B. I. Sec. 4

The story of the priest, whose wife played the whore, given in the 19, 20, 31 chapter of Judges, is too long for insertion. She was doomed to death by the Benjaminites. For this the other tribes made war on the Benjaminites, killed 18,000 of their men, and as it seems all their women, and took an oath not to give any of their women as wives to the benjamites. The Sabine rape was similar. The story is that Romulus, the Roman, were at one time very scarce of women. In vain he sent ambassadors to other tribes to get wives for his men. He then appointed Solomon, gavie his honor of Neptune, and invited the neighboring tribes—especially the Sabines—to a feast at which.

The Sabine men and women came too. The feast

In the spirit of the celebration, each Roman youth seized a Sabine girl, and bore her off as a wife. In both these cases, the men got uniformly force and fraud at a religious festival, and all parties subsequently recognized it. Ex. 5th. Livy. B. I. Fab. 36.
Resemblance of Stories Sacred and Profane.

V.

"And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both aside, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven!" 2 Kings, 2 - 11.

Romulus. "One day while holding an assembly in the plain—a sudden storm arose accompanied with violent thunder and lightning. The king was struck down in a thick cloud, and was never more seen upon earth"—then the multitude cried, "A King! The Son of a God!"

Livy. Book 1 - Cap. 16.

VI.

"And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and got him up into the mount: and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights." Ex. 24 - 18.

There was a grove in the centre of which was a dark cave. Whether it was human's custom frequently to repair thither, or not, we cannot pretend to say.

Livy, Book 1 - Cap. 21.

Resemblance of Stories Sacred and Profane.

VII.

The story of the duel between David and Goliath—1 Sam. cap. 17—very much resembles the account of the duel between Titus Mancinus and a gigantic Band, as given in Livy, Book 12 cap. 9, 10.

VIII.

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom—it shall break into pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2 - 44.

"The multitude relies upon an ancient prophecy that at this very time—here—i.e. the region of Jerusalem—the home of the East would preside over the nations, and a race of men would go forth from Sindea to extend their dominion over the rest of the world." Tacitus, Book 5 cap. 13.
Rassemblen of Stories Sacred and Profane.

IX.

The story of Abraham offering Isaac his son as a sacrifice, and of the substitution in his place of a ram caught in a thicket—Gen. 15:8—9—is too well known to need repetition. And the same is true as to the tragedy of Jephtha's daughter.

In the tragedy of Euripides, entitled "Iphigenia in Aulis," a like story appears. Perimedes is then said to have been ordered by an oracle, while on his way to Troy, to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia to Diana. When the knife was about to be applied to her throat, the goddess snatched her away alive, and substituted in her place a stag. Bohn's Euripides, vol. 1, p. 335.

Licero gives this story a different turn. But he justly condemns every such act as a "horrible crime."

Licero De Officiis, 13, 3, Chap. 25.

On the other hand, it is more than probable that, though the law of Moses did not require human sacrifice, yet it permitted and even commanded them in cases wherever a previous vow to that effect, as in the case of Jephtha, had been made. Lev. 27-28, 29.

X.

Whoever will compare the Jewish ceremonies and ritual, found in the Pentateuch, with the Egyptian superstition and rites, as given by Herodotus, will be struck with the similarity of things so much as to perhaps to suspect that Moses may have in some cases borrowed from the Egyptians. See Eutypie $379b of Herodotus.

They both circumcised offsprings, on altars—had great regard to cleanliness—required the beasts for sacrifice to be without blemish—transferred their sins to the hands of beasts—eat part of the thing sacrificed, made libations of wine—became unclean by contact with foreigners—were removed from unclean by certain—considered the pig to be an impure beast—hate swineheads—and have many other resembling rites.

XI.

Every one is familiar with the story in Luke 16: 19 to 31, about the rich man and Lazarus, and of the ascension of hades or hell therein. That description represents the place of torment as in sight of "Abraham's bosom," or Paradise.
Resemblances of Stories Sacred and Profane.

But as being "after the manner of the way" influence Josephus, in his discourse concerning Hades, represents it very similarly. He says that at the entrance, the wicked take the left hand way and enter into torment, but the righteous take the right hand road into a place of great delight. And that this place we call Abraham's Bosom. And he says the wicked see the just at a distance, but "as choos deep and large interceded between them, in so much that a just man, that both compassion upon them. Then, can not be admitted, nor can one that is unjust, if he were bold enough to attempt it, pass over it."

Josephus could not have written many years after Luke. Virgil, who wrote about the same age, in his description of the descent of Eneas into Hades, tells the story, in many respects, similarly to Luke and Josephus.

But Homer, who wrote his Odyssey many centuries before Christ, and who in the fifth book of that immortal poem, relates the descent of Ulysses into that same Hades, describes it very much as it was after wards described in Luke, Josephus, and Plato.
And it came to pass that on the 8th day they came to circumcise the child, and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father. And his mother answered and said, “Not so!” but he shall be called John. And they went unto him and said, “There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. And they made sign to his father how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing table, and wrote saying, his name is John. And they harkened all. Luke 1:59, 60.

Abdol Metalleb, the grand father of Mohammed, “the 7th day after the birth of the child, gave a great entertainment to which he invited the principal men of the Kortish, who, after the repast was over, desired him to give the infant a name. Immediately Metalleb replied, I name this child Mohammed.” The Kortish grandee at once expressed their surprise that he did not call his grand son, according to the custom, by a name which had
belonged to some one of the family. But he persisted in the assertion he had made, saying, "May the most high glorify in
Jeann whom he has created on earth,"
alluding to the name Mohammed, which signifies preferred, or glorified.
Buth's wife of Mohammed, to family
library, &c.

XIV.

And it came to pass, as they
fled from before Israel, and tore in
the going down to Beth-heron, that the
Lord cast down great stones from heaven
upon them unto Aziah, and they died:
they were more which died with hailstones,
than they which the children
of Israel slew with the sword." Josh. 10. 11.

"The Roman army was in danger
of succumbing to thirst, but a sudden
storm drenched them with rain, while it
discharged fire and hail on their enemies,
and the Romans gained a great victory. All
the authorities which speak of the battle
speak also of the miracle." It happened un-
der M. Aurelius Antoninus, A.D. 174.
See his life in the translation of
of his works, p. 16, by Rev. Long.
In support of this story in the life of Aurelius, a letter by him is given in Reeves’ Apologetics, 132, in which Aurelius states the same fact of the prayer of his Christian soldiers bringing rain, as he expresses it, “a shower of refreshing water to us, and of fiery hail to our enemies.” The genuineness of this letter, however, has been questioned. But be this as it may, Tertullian, who was born A.D. 160, in his Apologistic for the Christian,” ch. 5, says of Aurelius, “if you will look into his letters, you will find him there testifying that his army in Germany, being just upon perishing with thirst, some Christian soldiers who happened to be in his troops did, by the power of prayer, pitch down a prodigious shower to the relief of the whole army.” But Tertullian says not a word about fire and hail, which it would have been strange for him to omit, had he known of it, and strange that he should have been ignorant of it, if the fact was so.
XV.

"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 Pet. 3:10

"Not only do men pass away, and the mountain and sea disappear under the pressure of an inescapable fate; but a day will come when the world, approaching the time of its great removal, shall be itself extinguished, when stars shall encounter stars, when every form and orderly variety of light shall blaze and consume in the fire of one universal conflagration." Speed's translation of Macrobius. Westminster Review of July 1867, p. 53.
VIII.

Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour. And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose. Mat. 27: 45, 51, 52.

The sun trod the secrets of the sky, And who durst give the source of light the lie? The stars of heaven he left declining, Hiding themselves, hidden treasures, open hands; He first the fate of Caesar did foretell, And roused Rome, when Rome in Caesar fell; In thin clouds concealed the public light,

And various mortals feared eternal night.

Plato, it is said by Cicero, was the son of Bacro by a woman, who was kept pure from all matrimonial intercourse until her accomplishment. See Strauss' Life of Jesus, Vol. 1, p. 20.

XX.

Speak not evil one of another. James 1: 11.

XXI.

All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them. Mat. 7:12.

Do not with others what you would not have others do with you! Conferences 1. 11, 32.
The infinite benevolence of the Deity.

Today I heard a sermon on this subject. The preacher undertook to prove it true by the works of creation. There is no animal organization said he which does not, in its very structure, indicate a design to promote the animal's well-being. This, I suppose, is true. But to prove the point from the works of nature, ought not the harmony of all animals in their relations with each other to be such as uniformly to promote the well-being of everyone of them? And is this the case? The preacher said it is; and he took the case of a poisonous serpent as an illustration. He inquired, why infinite benevolence gave poisonous fangs to the adder? The answer was that Divine benevolence gave them to the adder for the purpose of self-defense. This was the only explanation given. They had given it before; and the adder had borrowed it from the basilisk.

To me, it is surprising that learned divines should satisfy themselves with so faltering a reason. There are several grounds on which it is obvious such reasoning is invalid, unsatisfactory. Let us state them.

In the first place, the adder's fangs are in fact of no value to him as a means of defence. Can he defend himself by poison successfully against the attack of a strong bird with a long fife in his hand? Neither was any body (who made an attack on a serpent, being bitten by the serpent? Who, that undertakes to kill a rattlesnake, goes near enough to him to be in danger of his fangs? But will it be said that these fangs were intended as a defence of the adder, against other irrational animals? What irrational animals attack snakes? Very few I think. Does sometimes do. Perhaps some carnivorous birds do. But does not the case of the known instance of a serpent successfully defending himself, or even being any man, beast, or bird that made an attack on him, so as to render self defence necessary? Still, such an instance can be produced the argument must fail. And no one instance would make it good. To make these poisonous fangs a valuable means of defence, they would have to be frequently effective. What would we think of a pistol as a weapon of defence, if no instance could be shown in which any person had successfully withstood an attack by means of a pistol?
In this third place, the poisonous fangs of the serpent, so far from being a defense from attacks, are the very cause of attacks on the serpent race, and put them all in much greater peril than they would be without these fangs. The whole race of man hate and destroy the serpent race precisely because of these very fangs; and there is reason to think that the canine race do so too. The toad is as ugly a creature as the serpent, but it is much safer from the attacks either of dogs or man, though it possesses neither poisonous fangs nor any other defensive weapon. Its harmlessness is its security. Since the great peril to the snake is the fact that he has poisonous fangs, could the Ority have given him these weapons as a defense, while he knew they would impair the snake's life ten times more than it would be impaired without them?

In this third place, the fangs of the serpent are very seldom used in his defense, but are constantly used aggressively. We never hear of a snake biting any person or thing that attacks him. His fangs are only effective in attacking the innocent victim unawares of his presence. All the snakes flee that were perhaps ever heard of, having happened in this way. The fiery flying serpents that bit the Israelites in the wilderness were not attacked by the followers of Moses, but turned themselves the assailants. And understand well, this is generally, if not always so, in the case of what we call so-called fate. Now rational beings often prefer the right of the Ority to such laws; but the irrational creatures, never. There are rules by instinct. They follow the laws of their nature. If, therefore, serpents fangs are, in fact, seldom or never effectively used in self-defense, and constantly the aggressors on the unoffending passer by, they must be supposed to us so doing to be following the Laws of their nature impressed on them by their creator. And if so, their poisonous fangs were not benevolently given to them for self-defense.
Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

Yet the tree has no weapon of defense whatever. Sinful attack and wicked the tree; and the tree has no kind of defense against. What is the cause of that sort of favor which characterizes benevolence?

In analogous cases we must the same inequality. If infinite benevolence gave to the hog and the hornet wings to protect them from attack, how comes it that the same benevolence denied such weapons of defense to so many other fliers? Who can tell?

We have something very analogous to this in the vegetable kingdom. Some trees and shrubs are guarded and protected by thorns; others not. It is remarkable that most of the Thorny trees and shrubs bear fruit. What benevolent purpose do these thorns subservce? Are they designed to protect the fruit? To protect it against what or whom? That the object to protect it against man, or beast, or bird? Why? The fruit is of no use to the tree. Was it not made for man, and beast, and bird? Then if this was the object, why are the apple and

peach tree without thorns, and the plum and haw tree full of them? Why are the blackberry and the rosebush thorns? Why and theiram bush and the grape vine thorns? For what benevolent purpose were all these thorns, then, made? If to protect the fruit, they were made in vain; for man and beast and bird take the fruit in spite of the thorns—only they get scratched sometimes by these thorns. But what benevolence is there in so arranging these thorns that they will scratch somebody? And, according to such authors as Paley, what benevolent purpose does or can any thorn or brier subservce? I can see none.

It appears to me therefore that if we consider these things, as well as many other like them, with reference to the present state, they are utterly unaccountable on the hypothesis of the Infinite Benevolence of the Creator. For not only the poison of serpents, and the stings of hornets and ants, and the whole race of thorns and briars, but all poisonous plants useful for food and medicine, mulberries, and many other things, considered solely with reference to our present state of being, so far from fur
Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

Nothing can evidence of the infinite benevolence of the Creator, more, even to a wise and good man, rather furnish evidence against it.

Possibly, if we take into the consideration a future life and man's immortality, the conclusion might be otherwise. For a benignant creator may have designed it, but for man that, in his temporary and probationary state in this world, he should be subjected here to hardships and pains, the better to fit him for eternal happiness hereafter. And this seems so plausible that it would be satisfying with it, if the reasoning were applicable to the irrational animals. But it is not. Nobody believes that there will exist in another state of being; and yet many of them are subjected to such hardships and sufferings as apparently argue the want of infinite benevolence towards them.

The other view, then, seems to be that we should humbly admit that three things, and indeed many other things in nature, are
Norman Sayer.

Here it was, incredible, as I believe, that many ancient
nations and some modern ones have sacrificed
human beings in the way of religious worship.
And incredible as it is, there can be no
doubt that it has sometimes been done.

All the Spanish historians of the Amer-
ingas of America say the Aborigines practiced
the abomination, and Prescott sustains
them. But Catholic bigots, less the Span-
lords to exaggerate every thing against the
Indians, and Prescott only authenti-
care to the Spanish priests and historians. On
the other hand, the only native historian
of the aborigines of Central America, Jared
Logan, denies it. I would follow Sandeman.

There is but too much reason to fear
that this hideous iniquity received
some countenance from Abraham and
his descendants.

In the case of Abraham himself— in
Gen. 22—he could not have believed that
human sacrifices are wicked, or he never would
have supposed that God commanded him to
sacrifice Isaac. Paul implies says that
he was willing to sacrifice Isaac, reasoning
that God was able to raise him up even
from the dead. Rom. 11:35. According to this,
He must still have thought that a human
Human Sacrifice.

Sacrifice, in that particular instance, would not be wicked, but pleasing to the Deity. And if that was his judgment in one instance, he could not, I would seem, have thought the thing very horrible in other instances.

The case of Jephtha's daughter, if the story concerning it in Judges, be allowed to be true, appears to be a case of a Jewish human sacrifice. And it is remarkable that nowhere in the old or new testament is this story Jephtha condemned.

It is clear that the law of Moses did not command human sacrifices, except under a previous one. It is also clear that the law of Moses does not forbid them. And it is equally clear that law did command them in cases where anyone had previously vowed them. The following passage from Ex. 21: 25, 29 answers the question:

No devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, both of man and beast, and of the produce of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed. Every devoted thing is holy unto the Lord. And devoted, which shall be devoted of man shall be redeemed, but surely be kept in death.

There is no avoiding the conclusion that if a man devoted [i.e. vows to God to sacrifice] any human being, this text commands him to offer the sacrifice accordingly. One would think that Jephtha had this text in his mind on the occasion above referred to. It is remarkable that neither in the passages cited, nor any where else in the Bible, is this kind of sacrifice or devoting forbidden or even mentioned unfavorably. The facts seem to have been left free to make the vow or not as he pleased; but then if he once made it, he must perform it.

Adam black has made a public attempt to show that the passage only applies to God's devoting the Canaanite and others to destruction. But the text has no reference to this. It is not speaking of what God devotes to destruction, but it is expressly addressed to man and concerns devoted things that a man shall devote unto the Lord. Hence the whole chapter evidently treats of things made by men to God, and of these only. Such an argument as Adam black makes on this point, would, if made by a lawyer in a court, be called petitio principii.

Still, as human sacrifice certainly did not belong to the Jewish ritual, and as we have no account of any Jewish priest ever offering or proposing a human sacrifice, it is perhaps fair to conclude that the story about Bingham and Jephtha are false and
That the passage referred to in Lev. 27 is not
authentic.

Whether the Romans ever offered human
sacrifices, has been much disputed. It seems
that Dr. Prideaux and Lord Macaulay denied it. On the other hand Dr. Delbros, a very
learned German bishop, and Lord Mahan affirm it.
Lord Stadolph in his Miscellanies, agreed
with Prideaux and Macaulay. But Delbros is
supported by Sir John Aston, Plutarch, Pliny,
and Dr. Milman. The only fact that in 93 B.C.
the Roman Senate, by a decree, forbade human
sacrifices, strongly suggests their prior existence. I fear that the
weight of the evidence is in the affirmative
of this question. See North British Review for

Horsley, in his History of the Supernatural, gives a
horrid account of this crime. He says that
all the ancient nations and some modern
ones, have offered human sacrifices.

According to St. Clement, sacrifice of
human beings very common with the
ancients. The Athenians used to sacrifice 300
men on a day sombre.

The Spartans kept Clement, see
footnotes, ch. 3.

That nations of women offered them-
selves in the early ages of the world, is attested
by many ancient writers. The story is that
these women sprang from men, were independent of them, were powerful in
war, and maintained orderly government.

Homer mentions them in history, and says
they conquered the Caeanaeans, and invaded
Althea. He says that "they did sometimes
slay, but that "no virgin among them
was permitted to marry unless she first
killed an enemy." Homer, IV, 1140-1170. IX. 12.

Plato in his Laws, Bk. 11, says: "I know that there are, so to say, countless
sorts of women about Pontus, whom they call
Sororumatae [another name for Amazons] on
whom there has been enjoined an exercise in
common with, and perhaps equal to, that
of men, not only upon horses, but in bows
likewise, and in the art of arms."

Other ancient writers say that they were
a race of warriors who founded an empire on
the river Themisour in Asia Minor, on the coast
of the Euxine.

The name itself is from two words in the
Greek, literally meaning "without a breast," be-
cause they (women) cut off their right breast
so that it might not impede them in
shooting arrows and in handling the javelin.
The Irish and Latin boats, too, mention the "Awajos.

But after all, the existence of such a nation is too incredible for belief, as it is a story too unnatural for credibility. In my opinion it is entirely fabulous.

The name was given to the great river of South America, because in the Spanish invasion of the adjacent country, the native women joined their husbands in repelling the invaders.
The Golden Rule.

Vulgar Christians assert that Jesus first promulgated this rule. But to say nothing of Confucius, it seems that this rule was well known to the Jews before Christ's ministry. "That grand dictum—do unto others as thou wouldst be done by"—inscribed by Hillel, the President, at whose death Jesus was ten years of age, not as any thing new, but as an old and well-known dictum, that comprised the whole law. The Talmud and Christianity are alike as to moral duty. "The ethics in both are in their broad out line, identical." London Quarterly, Oct. 1867, p. 230. Confucius seems the first who mentioned the rule.
Fate and Predestination.

Fatalists and predestinarians agree in this, that every which happens necessarily and unavoidably happens. The only difference between them seems to be this: that fate does not necessarily suppose the existence of God; whereas, predestination, so we term it, supposes a Supreme Deity who has foreordained everything.

If in judging of these "high mysteries", we decide according to authority, it would seem that fate and predestination are victorious. The Pharisees, the Stoics, and nearly all the Ancient Philosophers, the Mohammedans, the followers of St. Augustine, in the Catholic Church, and the whole body of Calvinists including Presbyterians, Puritans, Lowarians, and Baptists, are all on the side of fate and predestination; while against it are only the Lutherans, the great body of

to

baptists, the Church of England, the Methodists, and a few inconsiderable modern Christian sects. There can be no doubt that Paul and Peter were predestinarians. breeze was almost a fatalist.

If we judge of the matter by more abstract reasoning, it is difficult to say that the argument does not hang in nearly an even balance. But, we shall hardly find it different, if we resort to the Bible for a decision of the contrary.

There are, however, two considerations which decide us against the doctrine of fate and predestination. They are these:

1. The doctrine destroys all idea of virtue and vice, of merit and demerit, of praise and blame, of rewards and punishment. If every act that I do
Hate and Predestination.

has been eternally and unalterably fate and predestination to be done, it is absolutely
unthinkable that it is rather a virtue or a vice a merit or a demerit in me, or
that I deserve any praise or blame, reward or punishment for it.

2. Every man has a consciousness
that most of his acts are voluntary; and
that when he does evil, he does it of
choice and not of necessity. And this
consciousness is the highest possible evidence—
for higher than any cold reasoning. We
are all conscious that we exist, and
no reasoning can shake this conscious-
ness. We are all equally conscious that
at least some of our acts are voluntary;
and no reasoning ought to shake this
consciousness.
Polytheism.

It is very remarkable that among all the ancient nations, except the Jews, there was a constant tendency, (as there has ever been in the Roman Catholic Church,) to multiply objects of religious worship. The sublime doctrine of only one God supremely good and great seems so simple, reasonable, and obvious, that we wonder that none of the gentile nations of antiquity ever thought of it and adopted it.

But though Polytheism had more than 100,000 gods, yet “some general characteristics pervaded them all. In all may be traced some lingering memory of one supreme or at least superior Being, to whom the other divinities were subordinate, always in function, and for the most part in origin. All maintained the practice of prayer, the natural and instinctive language, which the creature expressed the sense of his dependence on the Creator. All, without exception, possessed the rite of sacrifice, with which was inseparably united a notion of conscious moral depravity or unworthiness, in which orthodox minds will recognize some obscure traditional memory of man’s primal fall. All fancied what they called a certain ‘sanctual’ system, embodied in a series of cultic rites and purification, which, however, poorly understood, were supposed to have the power of removing a certain moral uncleanness or disqualification, or of propitiating some adverse influence. All had an organized priesthood, especially set apart for the service of religion, and although the office of the
Polytheism.

Priest was frequently combined with that of the magistrate, yet the duties were almost invariably distinct. All retained traces of a belief in a future existence, with some notion of retribution for the good or evil actions of the present life; and all the most ancient religions—the Egyptian, the Etruscan, the older Roman—coupled with the belief, the notion of a temporary purgation from the stains of earth preparatory to the final gift of immortality. All observed stated days and festivals, and leant upon the services of religion every resume of the arts which they possessed, to give dignity to the ceremonial, and to render it attractive to the worshipper. All, in fine, however they ignored, and even formally discarded, the idea in practice, bore in their very constitution

the clearest traces of the belief of a Providence umpowering and directing the affairs of men." 

How many of these points in polytheism were right or wrong, we will not stop to inquire. But it is curious to think how much these universal resemblances in pagan religions have like resemblance among Jews and Christians. The likeness holds in regard to prayer, rites and sacrifice, a sacramental system, a priesthood, a future existence, purgatory, holy days and festivals, splendid temples and an imposing ceremonial, and a Divine Providence."

The Jew and the Christian will say the polytheists borrowed these resemblances from Moses and their persecutors. Perhaps so. But the Egyptians.
might retain, and say, Moses borrowed his system of sacrifices, and literature, and his hatred of them from Egypt, where he was born and educated; and he might cite Herodotus as very plausible evidence of his assertion. For, according to "Father of History," the Egyptian worship and that of Moses are in many things much alike. And the argument gains strength, when we consider, what all admit, that the Egyptian mode of worship was older than that of Moses.

But let us give the Jew a fair chance with the Egyptian. He may well suppose them disputing as follows:

**Jew.** It is very true that there is some resemblance between your modern worship and ours; but in many things there are so many things unlike in them as to make it impossible that...

**Egyptian.** It is true that you hold there is only one supreme God; but we hold the same. We call him by one name, you by another. We have indeed many subordinate deities, and call them gods; so have you, and call them angels, devils, demons. If we worship a serpent, Moses made the image of a serpent, raised it on a pole, and the people snake bitten looked at it and were healed. He makes graven images; did not Moses make a calf and a seraph, and...
Polytheism.

As to a multitude of gods, the Christians, your bastards sons, have as many as we can had. First, they declare that "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God;" and this they say they prove out of your holy books. Then they worship divine statues; they worship many images in their churches, and crosses made of wood and metal, as our god are. They worship every where. Even relics are objects of worship with them, as with us. Do you not see, then, that as our religion is the oldest, the Jews and Christians have borrowed theirs from ours?

Jews, We Jews have only one God, and you have many. We do not worship either angels, devils, or demons— we hold them to be no gods, any more than men and horses are gods. They are God's creatures. But you hold your inferior deities to be actually objects of worship, and you sacrifice to them, as to Ephods and the simum and Thummim, no Jews our worship these. They were mere appendages of our temple. The same is true as to the cherubim and seraphim of Moses. As to Solomon's lions and brazen oxen, he violated our decalogue in making those graven images; nor did he make them till he became enamored with the daughter of your Pharaoh, who seduced him from the worship of our Jehovah to the adoration of his gods of Egypt. I may well admit that the Christians worship many gods. But the Jews are not responsible for that. Moses never taught them such a worship. The Christians are not Jews; they are not the followers of Moses; many of them indeed make their god out of wine and bread, call these flesh and blood, and then eat this god they made by them. But a great Jew abominates all such nonsense as profane and idolatry.
The Essenes

This Jewish sect appear to have existed long before the Christian era; and they existed in the time of Josephus. They numbered about 400 in his day. They believed in the immortality of the soul. They led very pure lives. Husbandry alone was their occupation. They had all things in common. Women were not admitted into their society. Marriage was an abomination with them. They kept no slaves or servants. Certain men among them were chosen as stewards to manage their affairs. Josephus says they lived like the Grecian Pythagorians. Their love for each other was very great. All pleasure they obtained from. They despised riches. Did they consider a defilement. They delighted in white garments; and always dined in them at their meals. This residence was most together; some of them found scattered in various places. They wear garments and show till they are worn out. Before sunrise, they did not talk together, but offered prayers to God. They bathed in cold water before eating. They said grace before and after eating. Dwelling they forbade. They were mortal, peaceful, and just. Three years of probation were required in order to gain admission into their society. An obligation of

Secrecy was imposed on them all. They would not eat in company, nor at all on the right side. As far as allowed to be handled on the sabbath, and on that day they would not move a vein out of its place, or go to stoop. Motion. They covered up their ordure in pits. Josephus says they were longlived, many of them living over 100 years. They were brave, and despised pain and death.

The scenes would not last long. With the Orphic Pythagorism school at Alexandria, they rejected all animal sacrifices. Many call them 'the everlasting people, among whom no one was ever born.' They preferred to be prophetic, and the revelator of dreams. When Herod was a young man, one of them is said to have foretold to him that he would be a king.

For full account of these Essenes, see
Josephus, Antiquities. Ch 10 8-13 18, ch 1 5-5.
"War of the Jews. 1:2 - ch 8, 5 2, 3 98.
North British Review. Dec. 1859, p. 181
Monotheism.

The Indo-European race, embracing the noble population of India, Persia, and all Europe, are the authors of nearly all the great military, political, and intellectual movements in the history of the world. But the Indo-European race, distracted by the variety of the Universe, never by itself arrived at Monotheism.

But the Semitic race, including the Hebrews, Phœnicians, Syrians, Arabs, and Abyssinians, guided by its firm and sure light, unwashed Divinity, and without reflection or reasoning obtained the purest form of religion that humanity has known. Roman's Religion History of Civilization, 15.

Sir Mahomet, 224.
Mahomet.

It seems, after all that has been said to the contrary, that Mahomet did not introduce Monotheism among the Arabs. They had it before his time.

Michael Servetus

Servetus was born in 1510, at Villefranche in Aragon. He was, it seems, educated in a Dominican convent. His father desired him for the law, but the inclination of his mind was to Mennonite and theology. He studied medicine, and practised it for many years; the chief employment of his life, however, was the study of divinity.

He early abandoned the Catholic and joined the Reformation, and had much correspondence with Calvin. Servetus embraced Unitarianism, and wrote a work entitled De Unitatis Erroribus. And besides works on medicine and astrology, he published a book entitled Restitutio Christianismi, in which he denied infant baptism.

Meanwhile Servetus took up his abode in Geneva, Dauphines, where for several years he held the office of municipal physician. While there he had much correspondence with Calvin about Unitarianism and other dogmas. When this became too obnoxious, Servetus proposed to go to Geneva and see Calvin. Calvin said, "If he dare come, and my authority be of any avail, I will never suffer him to depart alive."

Afterwards Servetus sent his Restitutio Christianismi to Calvin. This the more in flamed Calvin's hatred of him.

About this time, 1533, a fellow named William Sacy, a friend of Calvin, lived at Geneva. At the suggestion of Calvin, Sacy wrote to one Arnaud, a zealous papist at Lyons, reproaching the Catholic for tolerating so great a heretic as Servetus, and offering to prove his heresy. The inquisition at Lyons was informed of this charge, and apprehended Servetus. On his trial, Calvin furnished the evidence of hisesy by forwarding to the inquisition the letters and other documents received by him from Servetus. On this evidence, the inquisition sentenced him to be burnt to death by a slow fire.

But before the execution, Servetus escaped from prison, and, hardly knowing whether to flee for safety, wandered to Basle. As soon as Calvin learned that he was there, he sent the officers of the law after him. Servetus took and cast him into prison. He was soon after brought before the court. The charge against him was drawn up by Calvin to this effect: "Servetus, in eight accusations, for heresy they sentenced. One of the principal charges was that he had deformed John Calvin, a minister of God's word in the church of Geneva."
Servetus.

In France, a sort of States Attorney, conducted the prosecution. But Calvin indited him in it. Servetus prayed to be allowed to engage counsel in his defense; but Calvin objected, and the prayer was refused. Servetus prayed a reference to the counsel of two hundred. But this was refused. Before final sentence, however, the Court referred the case to the States Church, for their view of it. The Church gave a response favorable to Servetus. Many of the ministers showed themselves in favor of Mr. Servetus, as Calvin himself. Among them were Bega, Farel, Béthisy.

Afterwards, the Council of State were convened for this opinion. And Béthisy, a member of that council, he was captain general and first syndic. When he perceived that Servetus would be condemned, he said he would not be a partaker in his blood, and withdrew from the council. The sentence then was that he should be burned to the stake, and burnt alive, together with his books, till he was reduced to ashes. Remanded to prison, he sent for Calvin to try his fortune. Calvin went. But he says that when he discovered that Servetus would not recant his heresy, he left him.

At the place of execution, Servetus heard and prayed to have mercy on his accusers; when which Farel who attended him, roughly said to you, (who are so great a sinner, attempt to justify yourself?"

The last words of Servetus were: "Jesus! the son of the eternal God, have mercy on me!"

The pit on which he was burned was from wood, and he did not die till he had suffered about half an hour.

Calvin afterwards wrote a book justifying the execution of Servetus, admitting that he was the chief cause of it, and standing his memory.

See the Life of Calvin by J. H. Dyserinck.

9.15
The Test of Right and Wrong.

On the great question, it appears that there are two schools of philosophers. The one sums of Sylmarism; the other, of Propositionism. The one holds that the test is the Divine Law of God or of nature existing before any created being exist, the other, that utility or expediency is the true and only test.

The doctrine of the first of these schools is well expressed by Bossu in his treatise "De Legibus." He declares that "The principle which directs to right conduct, and acts from crime, is not only older than the ages of nations and cities, but coeval with that Divine Being who uses and rules both heaven and earth." — "The principle that impels us to right conduct, and resists us against guilt, springs out of the nature of things. It did not begin to be law when it was first written, but when it originated, and it is coeval with the Divine Mind itself."

The doctrine of the second of these schools of philosophy is thus defined by Paley: "We conclude that God will and within the happiness of his creatures, and this conclusion being once established, we are at liberty to go on with the rule built upon it, namely, that the method of coming to the will of God, concerning any action by the light of nature, is to inquire into the tendency of that action to promote or diminish the
The Test of Right and Wrong.

genuine happiness. So, then, actions are to be estimated by this standard. Whatever is expedient is right. It is the utility of any moral rule alone, which constitutes the obligation of it.

On Cicero's side of this question are Dr. Butler, Jonathan Edwards, Bishop Stewart, Dr. Thomas Brown.


Cicero's doctrine is steadily gaining ground in modern times; and I should think that at this day, a very large majority of moral philosophers agree with him.

So my mind Paley's doctrine is most dangerous. Cicero justly says of those who adopt utility as a test of right and wrong, that if they act consistently with this principle, and are not sometimes influenced with the goodness of their hearts, they can cultivate neither friendship, justice nor generosity. Cicero de officiis, III.

2.

The test of utility and expediency amounts to this proposition that we may lawfully do whatever tends to promote or increase human happiness. Now we might, for the sake of the argument, admit that to him that is infatuated, wise the expedient and the good are identical; for, in the highest sense, nothing bad can be expedient. But who shall judge whether the act supposed to be done is expedient, if expedience is to be the test of its goodness? Shall frail, ignorant, feeble men be the judges? If so, how often will they judge differently? How often will they judge erroneously? To set up such a standard of testing what is right and what is wrong, is virtually to have no standard at all. In a matter so important, it can hardly be supposed that the infinitely benevolent Being has left mortals to so encumber a rule as this. Who can judge certainly whether any particular act, proposed to be done, will, on the whole, in the long and uncertain picture, promote human happiness or not? This consideration alone shows the fallacy of such a test of moral conduct. Let us see how it would work practically. If man, we will suppose, is tempted to commit some act, which he thinks would give him pleasure. Let the act be adultery. The circumstances are such that he is certain no offering can be the consequence, and no human being except the parties to the act, will ever know it. Now, under the power of strong temptation, let him to testing the moral quality of the act on Mr. Paley's principle. He may seek to reason thus: Nature has given me this strong propensity. The pleasure of gratifying
"Test of Right and Wrong."

"The test of Right and Wrong."

"It, though brief, will be great to both parties. No one will ever know of it. It can do nobody else any harm. It will do no good. Why should we not enjoy the collapse? Life let us cherish. While yet the taper glows, and the sweet flower. P lease, ere it blows."

"Of both parties would reason thus, every one can see what would be the mistake. Yet who in his cool moments, and not under the pressure of temptation, would say that adultery, committed under any circumstances, is right? But the objector will say, this is not a fair example; for the man did not reason justly. True, he did not; but he reasoned according to your logic, and, as well as he could under the circumstances. Who can reason justly under a sudden and powerful temptation? Yet in every case of this kind, the test of expediency and utility requires us to seek about reasoning whether the proposed act will affect favorably or unfavorably the general sum of human happiness, which shows the fallacy of this whole system. Those who attempt to maintain it seem to have forgotten that the moral law was made for the masses rather than for the cool, astute philosophers; that the masses can not reason justly on nice questions of morality; that sin is exceedingly deceitful, and that every philosopher in the world does not always foresee that a given act will increase or diminish the sum of human happiness; and that when any man is strong, his only safe course is to reject the temptation without any process of rationalization at all. Practically, the truth undoubtedly is that, in nine cases out ten, every man who feels an inclination to do any act of questionable morality, and betakes himself to reasoning about its laudableness, especially in the grounds of utility and expediency, commits the act if an opportunity offer. And it is afterwards, when his passion has subsided, that he discovers his error. This is eminently true of all those violations of moral law which have their rise in inordinate appetites and lustful desires.

I think, therefore, that Locke's test is the only one to be trusted. Call it the moral sense, or instinct, or conscience, or consciousness or what you will, it is the only tolerable guide in our moral conduct. An imperfect guide, I admit it is to the mass of men whose conscience and moral sense are not much enlightened. Still, it is the best guide any man can use wisely and will to follow it."
Diligence.

It is commonly said that as to all those matters which relate to "the parts of shame," American men and women are the most delicate people in the world. As illustration of German delicacy, I give the following story.

The poet Klopstock, the great author of "The Messiah," had an accomplished wife. She maintained an epistolary correspondence with a distinguished English Dr. Richardson, I think. She had never seen him. In one of her letters to him, she wrote that:

"Have not you guessed that, in summing up all my happiness, and not speaking of children, I have none? Yes, sir, this has been my only wish ungratified these four years. I have been more than once unhappy with disappointments; but yet thanks, thanks to God, I am in full hope to be a mother in the month of November. The little preparation for my child, and child, boy (and they are so dear to me) have taken so much time that I could not answer your letter; I cannot tell you how I rejoice! A son of my dear Klopstock! O, when shall I have him? It is long since I have made the remark that geniuses do not engender geniuses. No child at all, bad son, or at most lovely daughter like you and Milton. But a daughter or a son only, with a good heart without genius, I will nevertheless welcome.

You shall think I will not be a foster but a nurse only."

In November, Mrs. Klopstock "died in a very dreadful manner, in childbirth." See Miss Milford's "Recollections of a Literary Life," p. 163, 162.
Obscene terms. Witness the stories of Lot—righteous Lot—and his daughters; of Onan; of Potiphar's wife—of Erin's drunkenness and nakedness; and many others. Witness such terms as "his bowels moved"—his bowels yearned—"uncovering nakedness." Witness that favorite expression of the Jews, "pain like a woman in travail." Every man of delicate mind, who reads the Bible daily in his family, has felt this objection; and some I know shrift over such passages, as being too obscene to be read before females. The story of the young man who went a courting, and who, on being asked to lead in family worship, happened to commence with the first chapter of Matthew, is in point. He solemnly commenced: The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.}

Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judah and his brethren; and Judah begat Phares and Zara of Shamer; and Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat Aram. Here finding he was in a bad nest, he found and said: "It is not worth while to read further; for it is clear that all these people begat one another. Let us pray:"

I find too, that the ancients of the Church were, at least some of them, not very delicate in the choice of words. Thus Festus, in his noble Apology for the Christians, written about A.D. 208, says: "When, therefore, we are at the charge of an entertainment, it is to repast the bowels of the needy, but not as you gorge those parents among you, who glory in selling their liberty for stuffing their bellies."
Dilectency.

And Marcus Minucius Felix, who flourished in the first half of the third century, and who from being a Roman lawyer turned Christian, says, in his "Octavius," 528, says, "These same Egyptians, and not a few among yourselves [the Romans] do not stand more in awe of Isis than of a sharp onion; and pray as fervently a pretext—saving your presence—to a fast, as to your God Serapis."

Contrast this language with that of the heathen classics. In his work "On the Nature of the Gods," he takes occasion to prove their existence by the evidence of design in the works of nature, especially in the organization of the human body. He does it admirably, proving by the form and use of the senses and the head, eyes, ears, and limbs, and the economy, the organs of digestion, that a wise and good Being made us; and then he

Dilectency.

adds, "It is not difficult to describe how the gross remains [of our foods] are digested by the action of the intestines, which contract and dilate; but that must be declined as too indecorous for discourse."

How would a Jew or an Ancient Father have dealt with this matter?

It is highly worthy of note that the sayings of Jesus strongly contrast with the other Jewish writings on this subject. I believe there is nothing in the gospels, spoken by Jesus, which may not with perfect propriety and delicacy be read aloud in any company.

Clement, the Illustrious head of the Catechistical School of Alexandria, who lived at the close of the second century, says: "It is a cause, and a thing to make one laugh outright, for men to bring in silver
urine-vans, and chamber pots of crystal, as they wish in their counsellors, and for silly women to get gold receptacles for sacraments made; so that, being rich, they can not even save themselves except in a superb way." The Instruc
tor by Clement, p. 124 - 69. 3. - 4 ante
Aeneid Library, 214. The same Clem
cent (p. 124) says: God "only useth xxx
not such horses as neigh after their neigh-
bors' wives that are under the yoke,
and are female-rank."
And yet St. Clement's 6th chapter of
the Instrucutor in, on filthy speaking. So it
he says that neither in the name, nor the
memories of intercourse and mutual sinners,
to which appellation not in common use
are applied, is there the designation of what
is really obscene. For neither are knees,
and legs, and such other members, nor the
names applied to them and the activity
put forth by them, obscene. And even the
secret parts of men are to be regarded without
suggestion of impiety, not shame. It is their
unlawful activity, that is shameful." 69. 3. - 4.
Vile the Existence of a Deity from the works of Nature.

Sir William Hamilton, in his lectures on Metaphysics, asserts that the phenomena of matter, taken by themselves, so far from warranting any inference to the existence of a God, would on the contrary serve to ground an argument against his existence. (Methodist Quarterly, Oct. 1833, p. 582.)

I do not believe the assertion of Sir William. Pity me, and may all men of this Modem have strenuously maintained the contrary. But I think nobody has ever put the point in a stronger light than Cicero in the second book of his treatise on the Nature of the Gods. And I entirely agree with Cicero, that "he who does not perceive the soul and mind of man, to his reason, prudence, and discernment, to be the work of a divine providence, seems himself to be destitute of those faculties."

Existence of the Deity.

Immanuel holds that "an innate knowledge of the God is essential with our very nature, and that this knowledge is superior to all judgment and deliberate choice, and subsists prior to reason and demonstration. It is also evident from the beginning with its proper cause, and is consistent with the essential tendency of the soul to the good. Immanuel on the Mysteries, ch. 3."
Vegetarians — The Buddhists.

Buddha taught his followers, not only to sacrifice no living thing, but to eat no animal food. And they follow this teaching to the present day. Howitt's History of the Supernatural, vol. 1, p. 313.

It seems, therefore, that men may live and multiply without animal food. The Buddhists outnumber every other sect of religionists in the world. There are 315,000,000 of them.

According to Dryden, the philosophy of Pythagoras forbade animal food. He first the taste of flesh from tables drove, and argued well if arguments could move.

* * * *

O impious use! to nature's laws opposed,
Their bowls are in others' bounds closed.

Dryden's Poem on the Pythagorean Philosophy.
Supersition—Bribery—Ignorance.

Philip, III. reigned Spain 43 years. Motley, in his history of Spain, says: If Philip possessed a single virtue, it was his skill in the construction and sale of the system of superstition. Of this he is, as possibly, he was from which he was exempt. It is the same, that it is not permitted to human nature to attain perfection even in evil. He was unscrupulous, implacable, false, unjust, cruel, perjurer for the cause of God, he butchered and burnt vast numbers of men. His last sickness was extremely trying. Full of running scorns, with implacable and inscrutable cruelty on him, and his blood. Many days lay on his bed a man to which he did. He never murmured. Christian resignation in him was perfect. Those informers that he was near death, his first act was to dispatch a courier for the Pope's blessing. He declared that in all his life, he had never committed a wrong to any one. He compared those acts to others. Then he took the sacrament, and left it almost alive till the last. Some solemn words were administered to him, and from him he derived infinite consolation. He had collected many relics of saints. Since he slept on a table near, and derived much ghostly benefit from them, especially a bone of St. Alburn,

We can not pronounce John Calvin an ignorant man; and his biography, Clym, declares that he was very free from superstition. But I think, the oracles of all men of his time, were John Calvin; and his superstition was as diabolical as his bigotry.

By Born a French man, he had all the bigotry of a Spaniard; versed
In all the learning of his age, he was as superstitious, his great master St. Augustine.

He was a believer in witchcraft, and persecuted it to the death. He deemed a doubt as to the existence and evil agency of the devil, as vicious as atheism. His theology made and loved equally a triumphant God and a triumphant devil.

And his bigotry was ready to visit with death all who denied his doctrine.

As Roman Catholic, in the worst times of that superstition and persecuting Church, our possessors a more hellish animosity toward heretics than he be.
Chronology.

Apollonius, the Egyptian, asserted that the world was already 153,075 years old. Theophilus to Antiochus, 13.3, ch. 16.

Plato speaks of the world as being "10,000 times 10,000" years old. Plato's Laws, 13.3.

Theophilus, who flourished about A.D. 175, says that the world was then 5,698 years old. Theophilus to Antiochus, 13.3, ch. 28— State Library.

The Egyptian priests declared to Herodotus that from the first king to the priest of Vulcan, [king Akhthes], who was the last to reign, there were 348 generations of men, and during these generations these races the same numbers of chief priests and kings. And thus, says Herodotus, they estimated at 11,340 years.

Herodotus— Enterpr. 162.
Theophrastus says of Noah’s Ark, that “the remains are, to this day, to be seen in the Arabian mountains.” Theophrastus to Autolycus. B.c. ch. 17. Acts. Vienna Library.
Sacrifices.

Clement declares that when Moses perceived that the vice of sacrificing to idols had been deeply imprinted on the Jews, from their association with the Egyptians, and that the root of this evil could not be extracted from them, he allowed them indeed to sacrifice, but permitted it to be done only to God, that, by any means he might cut off one half of the deeply imprinted evil, leaving the other half to be corrected. Recognition of Clement. B. 1. ch. 36.

The Epistle to Diognetus was probably written in the first century. The name of the eloquent author is unknown. In the 3rd chapter he writes thus of Jewish sacrifices: "While the gentiles by offering such things to those that are destitute of sense and hearing, furnish an example of madness, they..."
differ from those who studiously confer the same honor on things destitute of sense, and which therefore are unable to enjoy such honors."

Athenagoras, in his place for the Christian, ch. 13, says "The Father and Father of this universe does not need blood, nor the odor of burnt offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and incense. But the noblest sacrifice to him is to honor who stretched out and w tech the heavens, and fixed the earth in its place." Athenagoras lived about A.D. 177.
Jonathan Edwards

The good people of Northampton had
a very remarkable man for their clergyman,
a man with a brain as nicely adjusted
for certain mechanical purposes as Babbage's
calculating machine. The commentary of
the layman on the preaching and practice of
Jonathan Edwards was, that, after
23 years of endurance, they turned
him out by a vote of 20 to 1, and
passed a resolve that he should never
preach for them again. Holme—Prof.of the
Breakfast Table, 148.

Plato says "by grateful anger, a
thing most wisely, the anger proper
passion with an evil facet: and just so
much as he was restrained with by education,
to such an extent does he make his soul
a savage; and, living in meanness,
he becomes like a wild beast, and receives
from passion a bitter delight." Laws, 13, 14, 12

"The enchanter, who has never felt
anger, has reason to envy the man who
subdues it." Richter

Do myself ever get angry?
Resemblances between heaven and earth.  

XXXII.  

"It is hard for the to kick against the pricks." Paul—Acts 9:8.

I would rather sacrifice to him than dieing wrath, kick against the prints; a mortal against the God." Euripides in the Bacchae.

XXXIII.

And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered. Gen. 5:19-20.

The skies from pole to pole with head reeking,  
And showers intercepted down pouring on the ground.  
Then clad in colors of a varying dye,  
Amonian Isis found a new supply,  
To feed the clouds; the impetuous rain demands,  
The bearded corn beneath the burden bends;  
Drowned cloudborne repulse their finished grain  
And the long labors of the year are vain.  
Sor from his paternal heaven alone  
As you content to honor his vengeance down  
And from his brother of the seas he crowned  
To help him with auxiliary waves.

The victory tyrant, with his books and feet,  
Wore from mossy crown, their most alabes,  
And with perpetual nee his helms fell;  
To where in brief he thus imparts his will:  
Small school 생산 needs your powers simpy;  
And this bad world—so love regina—exulatory,  
But cause the voices of all your victory stone,  
Beau down the aim, and give sorrow down  
The floods by nature seeming to dance,  
And proudly swelling with their new command,  
Remove the living stones that stopped their way,  
And gushing from their stone against the sea.  
And with the moon their inexorable through the ground  
With annual trembling earth receive the return;  
And wing stream a weary passage found  
The demoniacal waters gather on the plains,  
And through the fields, and over the plains;  
And running onward with a strong sway,  
Bemphole, and rock, and laboring them studly,  
For safe their dwellings were, for subject to floor  
Their house fell upon their household gods.  
And shone him too strongly, built to fall,  
High for their hands, while a meeting smart,  
And sin and sathy were in one fork lost;  
A world of wetter one without a toot.  

Ovid's Orpheus of Odysseus,  
Translated by Byron.
2 Kings 19.

Every one knows the story of the invasion of the land of Israel by Sennacherib, so finely painted by Byron—

"The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold;"

or like story in some respect to the tale of an invasion of Egypt by Thutmose III, in the reign of king Seti I, the priest of Heliopolis. Herodotus says: "After this, Sennacherib, king of the Medes and Persians, invaded a large army against Egypt. The priest being reduced to a strict fast, entered the temple and bespattered before the images the calamities he was in danger of suffering. Sleep fell upon him, and it appeared to him in a vision that the god stood by and encouraged him, assuring him, etc. Sennacherib marched to Pelusium, the entrance into Egypt. There a number of field mice pouring in upon his army, devoured their quivers and their bows, and, moreover, the handles of their shields; so that, on the next day when they fell to work of their arm, many of them fell. And to this day a stone statue of the god stands in the temple of Heliopolis with a mouse in his hand, and this inscription on it: "Whoever looks on me, let him reverence the god." — Herodotus—Egypt, 140.
Hand-writings.

It seems that Sir Henry Jones has invented a method of copying and multiplying manuscripts which promises much, especially as to ancient writings. The invention is called Phonography. Its advantage over photography is, first, the far greater facility with which copies can be multiplied, and secondly, the more durable nature of the impressions. Numerous volumes of this have already been taken forming most interesting collections in the library of the British Museum. As an advantage, the different kinds of writing in different ages and different countries, and to judge of the character of the different writers by their handwriting, is hard writing not to be found in any such collection. North British Review, Jan., 1868, p. 272.

But does handwriting furnish any evidence of the character of the writer? This is a question, which, if answered at all, should be answered cautiously, certainly those who answer it affirmatively should admit that nothing like a science has yet grown out of the inquiry. It may be that a man's chirography may indicate some traits of his character; it does not seem reasonable that it indicates them all. If there be any truth in the matter, it can only be brought to light by much observation. Physiognomy may be a science, but it can be available only by close attention and long study.

Some few things may probably be determined concerning a man by his handwriting. Among these, I should be disposed to rely to some extent on the following:
1. Does the party write a large, bold hand, or a small delicate one? The former is evidence that he is a daring, dashing man; the latter that he is fearful and effeminate. Give me the former for a soldier; the latter for a counsellor.

Every one notes the difference in this respect between the handwritings of men and women. He can generally easily tell whether a man or a woman wrote any writing we see. The one indicates manliness, the other effeminacy. And yet the rule does not always hold. I know a little woman, who writes a large, bold hand; she is a most masculine woman.

2. A slovenly, careless hand bespeaks a slovenly, careless mind.

Elegant chirography depends so much on study, care, and mechanical taste, that want of it is no proof of want of a well ordered mind. But slovenly, careless writing is quite another thing. If there has evidently been no effort at neatness, if words are obliterated, or omitted, or interlined— if the lines are much blunter— be sure the writer is not decent in his dress, scrupulous in his morals, or clear and logical in his thoughts. Such a man will treat a lady's hand and spit on a gentleman's coat.
H. W. W. Sm. 5/5/67.

Wise Words.

Happy is the nation that has no history. — Ninth British Review, June, 1818, p. 124.

Any good done in the world always pays. Anthony Trollope.

What is universal may be called natural. Paley.

Wiser, never wicked man was wise. Homer.

People of much sentiment are like fountains whose overflow keeps a disagreeable jumble about them. H. W. Bescher.

Hash a dog, comb a dog, still a dog is but a dog. French proverb.

"I don't buy rhubarb at 10,000 drachma." (H. W. Bescher.)

"Homo doctus in se sensum habitet." A learned man has always help in himself. Phaedrus.

"Cantavit vacillans coronae victor." The famous troubler sings before the robin.
Miss Words

To change these favorable representations, which meet gips of their own minds, with the guilt of hypocritical falsehood, would show more sincerity than knowledge. The writer commonly believes himself. Almost every man's thought, while they are gipsed, are right, and most hearts are pure while temptation is away. It is easy to awaken generous sentiments in charity; to define duty, when there is no danger; to glow with benevolence, when there is nothing to be given. While such ideas are found, the mind feels, and self-love does not suspect the gleam of virtue to be the mother of kindness. Johnson's Life of Pope.

Music is inarticulate poetry. O'Neil.

Every art is best taught by example. Johnson.

Shrouds have no pockets.

Trust not yourself; but your disputes and fear.
Make us of every friend and sorry foe. Pope.

"The need of believing something extraordinary, is innate in man."

John Calvin

Calvin was born July 10, 1509, at
Ayon, France. He was bred a Catholic.
And the persecuting spirit which in youth
he acquired in that diabolical company,
followed him all his life; and it grew
with his growth, and strengthened with
his strength. He seems to have been
constituted of pity, mercy, and benevolence.
To make others miserable seemed to be
his darling attribute; to contribute to their
happiness, his strong work. If to ensure
his wife would have given her likewise,
surely he would have refrained from it
as a deadly sin. He was a stranger to all
these kind, sympathetic which constant
the charitie of mankind. A thorough
Jehovite; his hand was against every
man, and consequently nearly every man's
hand was against him. He quarreled
with nearly all his friends, and defied
and vitiated all his enemies. In fine,
such war, stubbornness, and stubbornness,
and bigotry, that his whole life, after he
became a preacher, was one great quarrel.

Calvin quarreled with Luther, and John
Wesley, and Melancthon, and Knox, and
almost every distinguished reformer. Brey
and Sartain were his favorite and true
toadies; but he several times fell out
with them, and abused them like he...
John Calvin.

Such was Calvin's bigotry, tyranny, and austerity, that the authorities of Geneva, though agreeing with him in his doctrine, then banished him from the city, though they afterwards recalled him.

Calvin was a genuine persecutor. Not only did he effect the death of St. Victor, but he showed himself blood thirsty towards many others. He favored the burning of witches. He pleaded for the burning of 14 women charged with spreading the plague in Geneva. He sought the life of Bolese March, because the latter denied the doctrine of predestination, and argued for freedom of will.

In fine, Calvin really believed in the doctrine of eternal election and reprobation, and in Viatorianism; and he entertained no doubt that it was the duty of good Christians to kill all who denied those dogmas. And the fanatical severity of his nature was such that he was not averse that heretics should suffer an easy death. Torture and fire, applied to heretics, were the beacon-ideal of his Christianity.

Why should he think or feel otherwise, since he firmly believed that all heretics were eternally predestined to everlasting damnation? If God eternally hated them, why should Calvin not hate them too?
John Calvin.

What between his natural cruelty and
fierceness and his doctrine of eternal rejec-
tion, he was the paragon of all Atrocity
persecutors. The annals of Papal and Chris-
tian Rome do not give that exceeded him
as a furious, fiery, fiendish persecutor.
His severity and cruelty towards Senatus
were equal to the highest achievements in
this line of Nero, Belisarius, and the Span-
ish inquisitors. Nay it went beyond that;
for he first—Judas-like—betrayed Sen-
atus to their common enemy, the inquisition,
and after the martyrdom of that great
and good man, he boasted of the part
he took in it, and calumniated the
memory of his dead victim.

Calvin, though sincere in the belief
of his absurd dogmas, was not remarka-
ble for virility. A number of times he
was caught in lies, and more than
once in bungled mendacity.

It is by no means certain that his
morals were pure; certainly they were
not above suspicion. A French gentle-
man, M. de Fallisia, fled with his
wife from Catholic persecution to Geneva.
Calvin entertained them in his house.
Soon, the lady complained that Calvin
sollicited her virtue. He, of course, denied
it. The husband believed it. Husband and
John Calvin.

wife quit the house, and became great en-
mies of Calvin's. The story is told in
Pyrès' Life of Calvin, p. 230, 237.

Calvin was a writer. He constantly
bestraveled his opponents with the vilui-
s epithets: Blasphemer—slanderer—foul-
mouthed dig—ignorance, impudence, impo-
beast—vagabond—scorpy knave, etc.

These terms he often employed. The spi-
that " Beast", he often used and decay love.

Calvin was a coward. He took good

care to keep out of danger. He was try-

ing to protect his followers in this provi-
ment. But he kept at a safe distance
himself. He gave the Pope and the

John Calvin.

Inquisition a wide birth. He evidently
believed in the proverb, "That caution is the
parent of safety."

At the age of 30, Calvin took a wife
to get married. He would not take the
trouble to hunt a wife himself. He asked
his primas to get him one. He told them he
was not "one of your mad kind of lovers"—
The only wife that satisfied me is that she be
chaste, obedient, humble, economical, patient;
and that there be hope that she shall be
solicitous about my health." They found
him a wife—the widow of an anabaptist,
with the symphonious name of Adeletta.
Adeletta lived with him about ten years.
John Calvin.

Such was the father and founder of Presbyterianism!

I blame no man for calling himself a Presbyterian or Presbyterian. But he who revives in the name calvinist in a fool or a bigot. Holmes well says, "When the Rev. Wm. B. F. Calvin [so Calvin's name originally was] and his associates burned my distinguished scientific brother, - he was burned with green fagots, which made it rather slow and painful - it appeared they were in a state of barbarism. The dogmas of such people about the Father of mankind and his creation are of no more account."

And then died. His love the loss with singular resignation - showing himself no more likely to run mad with tears than with grief love. He said, "I swallow my grief in such a manner that I have not interfered my function for a moment. Nay, the Lord hath; meantime, exercised me with other contents." Dyer says that "he must have been pursuing his usual avocation while his wife lay still unbeguied."

Such was John Calvin - one of the cruellest, most merciless, most ill-natured, most execrable bigots, that the Church has, in any age or country produced.
Calvin

in my opinion, than those of a council of Aztecs. If a man picks your pocket, do you not consider him thereby disqualified to pronounce any authoritative opinion on matters of ethics? If a man hangs my ancient female relation for disorder+++ or burns my instructor for not believing as he does, I care no more for his religious edict, than I should for those of my other faction.” Prof. of the Breakfast Table, 133, 134.
Martin Luther

This distinguished man was born in Saxon, in 1483. He was an Augustinian monk. He was bold, impetuous, and intolerant. He rejected few of the absurd doctrines of the Pope. His war was against popish practices, not Jewish doctrines.

Luther was as furious against Luther as the Pope himself, and he was equally disposed to prosecute them with fire and sword. In this respect, he made no difference between Catholic and Protestant who differed from him. He seems to have had no idea of Christian charity.

Luther looked gentlemanly; and he was destitute of good manners. He descended to low, vulgar abuse. One man he would call a devil; another he denounced as "shallow-pated." Of Zwinglius he wrote thus: "Zwinglius I regard as having drawn down upon himself the just hatred of all good men, by his daring and criminal manner of treating the Word of God. What a fellow is this Zwinglius! Ignorant as a block, of grammar, and logic and every other science." Speaking of Erasmus, he said, "If I fight against such, whether I get the better
Luther.

If it be so, I am all the same awed with nay, and so the best way is to let the wind pass on." He advised his friends to "avenge anxiety to Braemus; to be tells and unflinching toward thout support. I will write against him and kill him. It is true that to crush Brassius is like crushing a bug, but he has mocked and insulted my Christ, and he shall be punin."

Mr. Goodybody," says Luther, "should be made to damn him. himself, piously, under the influence of the law, and the sword, just as we keep wild beasts in order by chaining them."
way to do so, as she was crossing a bridge with Killaroy in a basket, something like a crown flower by, and said, "Killaroy! when are you going?" Killaroy answered, "going to see the saint". Whereupon the woman alighted, threw basket and Killaroy into the river; when, miraculously, two crowns flew away, one of which was, of course, Killaroy.

If we compare Luther and Calvin, we shall find it difficult to determine which was the more execrable. They were alike void of all benevolence and charity. They equally hated all who doubted their dogmas, and were equally spiteful, malicious, and brutal. They were both presbyterianians. Luther was the more ferociously brave; but Calvin was the more insidiously cunning. Calvin presented Stérache to death; Luther never murdered any body, only because he never got a chance to do it. Calvin was the greater knave; Luther the greater brute. Luther was a cross between the bull and the hippopotamus; Calvin, a cross between the fox and the hyena.
Pythagoras

This philosopher was born at Samos about 580 years before Christ. He was about 100 years before Socrates. The story was, that Apollo was his father. The beautiful Pythais was his mother. He was a most lovely youth; and was called "The fair-haired Samian." At 18 years of age he commenced travelling, and he travelled very extensively. He visited nearly all of Greece, and spent many years in Egypt.

It seems that Pythagoras began to teach philosophy at Crotona. His teaching was practical.

Pythagoras

So the young he taught the duties of temperance, self-culture, respect for the aged, and a generous bearing toward all men. He urged virtue, truth, family, and humanity on all classes. He was very eloquent, and made 5000 converts in one speech at Crotona.

He formed his followers into something like churches.

He insisted on the use of a vegetable diet only.

He taught that "God is One," and a "Universal Spirit."

His ethics appear to have been very wise, good, and pure. And he
Pythagoras

certainly excited a most beneficial influence on vast numbers of people.
Like Socrates and Jesus, Pythagoras never reduced his precepts to writing.
Like all other good and real reformers, he and his followers suffered much from persecution. They were banished, tortured, and slain. And Pythagoras himself, it is said, was finally obliged to become a fugitive, and flying from place to place, and finding no security any where, he at last died of starvation in the temple of the Muses at Metapontum. His followers, however, continued to associate together in society.

Pythagoras

They were numerous in Greece in the days of Socrates. They continued for many ages afterwards. And the teachings of their founder exerted a large influence on the philosophies of Greece and Rome down to the time of Christ, and soon influenced to some extent the religion of the early Christians.
Unitarians

"Ram Mohun Roy, the most illustrious representative of the Brahmanic race in our age, died a Unitarian of 
Channing's stamp."

Ronan's Rel. Hist. Brit. 310
Apparent Death

There are many well authenticated instances of persons seeming to die, and afterwards reviving; and no doubt persons, under such circumstances, have sometimes been buried alive.

Mr. Yorick, a Calvinistic clergyman, is perhaps the most noted instance of this sort in modern times. He lay apparently dead several days. Then he revived, he declared he had been in the heavenly world, and had seen and conversed with spirits and angels. The story is so firmly believed among Calvinists, that it is made one of their favorite Sunday school books.

Of such a case, I have the following account, from the life of Dr. Hendrick of Indianapolis, a truthful, good man, a preacher of the Church of the United Brethren:

Dr. Hendrick was a surgeon in the war of the Great Rebellion. He was in the army of the Potomac, and was taken sick. They removed him to Washington. There his wife met him and nursed him. Finally he apparently died. Preparations were made for his burial. Meanwhile Dr. Hendrick and Mrs. Caleb B. Smith watched his body.

In this condition he lay many hours— I forget how many. Just before they were ready to carry the body to the grave, he revived.

He says that he was perfectly conscious all the while; that immediately separated from the body, he remained in the room, sometimes looking at it as it lay lifless on the bed; that then some beautiful beings like birds escorted him to the ship, that there he was met by persons like angels who took him to heaven, where he saw the heavenly hosts praising God; that then they showed him hell, and he heard the shrieks of them, and saw persons whom he had known on earth, and that then they brought him back to his body. The doctor declared himself as certain of the reality of all this, as of any fact of his life.

For this notion a modern one. It is as old as Plato. In the 10th book of his Republic, he has a story very like that of Dr. Hendrick. Plato there tells us that one day a Pamphylian apparently died in battle. In this condition he lay on the field nine days. On the 10th, when they were proceeding, according to custom, to burn
The body, he revived, and told marvellous things of what he had seen and heard beyond the river Styx. It may be, however, that Plato means it was not merely a mere fable. Yet Smith, in his Horatian Address to the Greeks, ch. 27, seems to treat it as a reality.
The Catholic Trinity.

With the Catholics, says Beza, "Mary has entered by full title into the Trinity. She far exceeds that forgotten person, the Holy Spirit, with neither lovers nor adorers. She completes the divine family; for it would have been a marvel if the feminine element, in its triumph, had not succeeded in reaching the bosom of God, and between the Father and Son, introducing a mother." — "The representations of the incarnata, in which Mary, placed between the Father and the Son, renews the crown from the hand of the former, and the homage of the latter, above all the Trinity of Christian piety" with the Catholics.

Raman's Religious History & Criticism
Spiritualizing Scripture.

Mahan ridicules the orthodox mode of spiritualizing Solomon's Song by spiritualizing the house that Jacob built, thus:

"The house that built" ... this becomes a double meaning. The house that Jacob built, the Christian Church, is the House of David, which is the English name for John, which is the English for Johannes — God's gift. The "malt" is the doctrine of the Christian Church, containing the spirit of Christianity. The sat that ate the malt is the Catholic clergy, symbolized by the Pope. The cat that caught the rat is Master Luther, symbol of the Reformation. The dog that worried the cat is the opponents of the Reformation, especially the priests of whom Legate is the symbol. The cow with the crumpled horn that tossed the dog is the French government which drove out the priests; and the "crumpled horn" denotes the Gallican cock, and therein seems more clearly to denote the French government than any other; for the crumpled horn is much like the crest of a cock. "The maiden all forlorn" is liberty. "The man all troubled and torn" is the French people; Hammet is Lafayette; Sham, because
Theodore Parker, it seems, studied the Homeric Writings with great care. In the 2nd vol. of his life by Weir, it is said that, after a long course of Homeric study, he wrote, in 1840—Here close my present studies of Homer, and with the conclusion on the whole—1, that the greater part of the Iliad was the work of one man, whom you may call Homer; 2, that he did not write, but only sung; 3, that he sung in detached pieces, which were repeated by others; 4, that they all became mere or less corrupt; 5, that other pieces were reckoned as Homeric which are not so; 6, that the men who reduced the Iliad to writing did it gradually—now this, now that part, ballad, or story; 7, that when all were collected, the genuine and spurious were not separated sharply; 8, that interpolations were made by those men who to make the whole work fit together; 9, that the theology and morality, considering the age, are very high, though not so high as the theology and morality of the Old Testament.

Again: that the Odyssey belongs to another age, and is also the work of various hands; and that it is quite possible to separate the Odyssey into its constituent parts at this day.
Members of the Leading Religions.

Hasnel calculates that the members of the chief religions in the world are as follows:

- Christians of all denominations: 129,000,000
- Jews: 4,000,000
- Mohammedans: 250,000,000
- Brahmins: 111,000,000
- Buddhists: 315,000,000
Sacred Song

Sacred song is an essential and a most pleasing part of all religious worship. So it has been ever since the world began. At the first dawn of creation the morning stars sang together, and and all the sons of God shouted for joy." The emancipation of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage was celebrated by Moses and Miriam in hymns of triumph. The Old Testament is full of psalms, and psalms, and song. Sacred song has always been a part of Christian worship. And even the religion of paganism have shriven their religious poetry and music. Are we not to believe the Bible, is it otherwise in the heavenly world. Then the good will sing the new song, the songs of Zion, the songs of the redeemed. Our subject, therefore, is one of high concern, as it is essentially a part of faith on earth and bliss in heaven.

We know how much of the Jewish worship consisted of music and song. Besides various hymns, they had 150 psalms, which were constantly sung in temple and synagogue. These were the "songs of Zion," which gave life and joy to Jewish worship. And Jesus himself approved it for he closed the institution of the Eucharist with a hymn—"they sang a hymn and went out." How much we welcome to renew the form of that hymn, and the air to which they sang it.

We know that the early Christians worshipped in song. Paul exhorted them to speak to themselves in hymns and psalms, and spiritual songs. And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises. And the Professor Pliny, about the year A.D. 110, in his celebrated letter to Trajan, says that the Christians, at their meetings, sang hymns to Jesus as to a God. And it is indisputable that since all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, with the simple sanction of the New Laws, have made the singing of psalms and hymns an important part of religious worship.

The Catholic Church, however, does not appear to have had a great variety of religious songs. Indeed, it is remarkable that no very celebrated composer of hymns has ever arisen in that Church. But this may be partly attributed to the fact that the Catholic Church was not at the beginning, nor at the present time, so entirely conscious of the importance of religious music. But now, in the interest of the worship of God, the Catholic Church has made a great step forward. And the following are some of the most popular hymns in the Catholic Church: 16 of which are in Latin, and 25 in English.
Sacred Songs.

And of these in English it is remarkable that there are many hymns. In these, my life, my love, by Watts — Jesus, lover of my soul, by Chalmers — and Jerusalem, my happy home, by an unknown writer, the piety is complete.

But let us do the Catholic Church justice. It may well be doubted whether a great variety of hymns is of any advantage in Christian worship. Of the large collection of hymns in the several Protestant churches, only a few are favorite in any congregation, and more than half of them are rare songs. The theatrics have kept, yet some of them are very noble. The Protestants have no hymn equal to the Dies irae, Dies illa, and none superior to the Pange lingua or the Salve sancta mater.

Among the Protestants, there have been many writers of hymns; and they have produced many noble compositions. Of writers in our own language, might be named Montgomery, Lowther, Addison, Doddridge, Hall, Stichenburg, White, Priestport, Thomas, and many others. Each of these has written a few admirable hymns — some of them many. But the two great composers in this department must have been Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley. Which of these was the superior it is difficult to determine. Each of them composed many admirable, spiritual songs. Watts wrote some which were equal to Watts; but, if Watts perhaps wrote more of the very highest order than Wesley. In his soundness, Watts gave the palm to Wesley. The world, perhaps, gave it to Watts. In this department, they have both been great benefactors of the Christian world. Their sacred songs are read and sung by millions of people in Europe and America, and will be read and sung as long as the English language continues. How oft have these songs comforted the heart of grief, cheered the heart of the sorrowful, and delighted in the soul of the scion!

From these rich stores every church in our country has drawn abundant materials. Each has made a hymn-book of its own. Unfortunately, however, in their compilation, the hymns themselves have greatly suffered. I know not a single instance in which the compiler himself was a poet. And yet every one of them has attempted to improve the poetry; and the poetry has always suffered by it. The charm of a word has often destroyed its meaning with the sense and the beauty of a whole stanza. For example, a line of that magnificent hymn by Dr. Watts — "Their church, whose
Sacred Song.

WHITHER the sun? he has been spurned by compilers, by the alteration of a single proposition. The hymn is an imitation of the 72nd Psalm in which occur these words—"Prayer also shall be offered for him continually," which Hathi elegantly renders—"For him shall endless prayer be made." But the compilers in many hymn books have it thus: To him "eternally," thereby destroying the beautiful allusion to the Psalm, in order to make it favor the Lutheran view. I can easily see why the Orthodox church should object; but why a church having no creed but the Bible should do it puzzles me.

But compilers of hymn books have gone much farther. In altering some of our best hymn, they have not spared to omit whole stanzas. I believe, you can not find in any hymn book the whole of Advent's delightful hymn on gratitude, through a part of it is found in nearly every one. In some of the compilation is found the same omission of several of the very best stanzas of Muhlenburg's admirable hymn—"I would not live always.

All hymns ought to be smooth and harmonious in numbers, a conciseness an elegant in style, and pure and recurrent in sentiment. From she should be admitted into hymn-books, or tolerated in churches. But there are many hymns in our books, which are sung in our churches that violate this rule so far as to offend against all taste and all feeling.

Some hymns are destitute of all poetry, and yet are much sung. In one popular church—"Jesus my all to heaven I gone" is used more than any other; and yet there is not a line of good poetry in it; and throughout the sentiment is low.

The line "He trod I see, and I'll pursue" is shocking. To teach Jesus?

In this respect, I think even descended Becky has offended in a hymn which has been greatly praised. Beginning, with "Come, O thou traveler unknown." The hymn is addressed to the Deity who is called a traveler! And at the end of every stanza, the writer says to the traveler, the Deity,—

With thee all night I mean to stay,

And breathe till the break of day.

Without meaning the story of the content between Jacob and the angel, it appears to me blasphemous for any mortal to talk about wrestling with God.

On the contrary, truth never offend us by bold or profane expressions: but I think he...
Sacred Song

Sacred Song.

Some time ago by expressions towards the objects of his worship of too much familiarity, occasionally we find in his hymns and expressions or “Sweet Jesus,” “Dear Jesus,” “Dear Lord.” These epithets we may apply to our babies and wives, but not to the soul of the Universe.

But if such hymns as these ought to be rejected, what shall we do with the numerous doggers, which are thrown upon churches by unpoetic, illiterate writers of religious hymns? In times of great religious excitement, these basical scribbles have infected Christian congregations as the locusts infected Egypt. And it is incredible that many of their silly and insipid effusions have found a place in our hymn books. The race, I am glad to say, has nearly died out. Fifty years ago, they were very numerous. Their numbers were about equally divided on sailor hymns and soldier hymns. Some of the former were for sailing on the ocean on the good old ship “Jone;” others preferred to cross bold Jordan, stormy main, and leave this world behind.” Thus I was a boy I never could understand how the city of Zion could be a Ship, nor how John Jordan, a creek 30 yards wide, could be a stormy main. Those who went in for war songs in church

were equally extravagant. One of them could chase a bee, and two could put three to flight. Mrs. Brown, in Uncle Tom’s cabin, puts the negro to singing one three war songs commencing thus:

Hark, brethren, don’t you hear the sound? The martial trumpet and the drum.

Most of her readers would thus suppose this song a part of the fiction of her novel; but I have seen the song in a hymn book, and heard it sung by white people in church.

I know a preacher who composed and sang in congregations one of these war songs the first and second stanza of which ran thus:

Come listen while I tell the news.
A scheme of war I have in view.
When war is winter till and fright.
Prepared to fall or take to flight.

Some valiant soldiers quickly fled, While others fell and lay for dead.
And nine and female all around lay agonizing on the ground.
Sacred Song.

But if these things are offered up against just taste and true spirit, the fashion of yoking choruses to sacred songs is still worse.

There are a few choruses which have been written by the composer of the hymns to which they are attached, and of which they are a part, that are objectionable. Such is the delightful chorus to that charming hymn, "Hail, the latest Morning." Of such I do not speak. I allude those numerous anthems in which fine hymns, made by genuine poets, have been distorted and degraded by the addition of foolish choruses by foolish men. Such anthems as are, in language offensive to good taste, and shocking to genuine piety, and they are often expressed no sense at all. What sense, for example, does "glory, glory, glory, added to every line of a long metric hymn, express? In order to give some idea of the monstrous deformity of some choruses often sung at "services", we here copy a few which I have often heard sung in religious assemblies.

When Israel came to Sancha, Hallelujah.  
Began to sing and shout to home. Glory hallelujah.  
The towering walls came tumbling down, Hallelujah.  
Shuddering flats upon the ground—glory hallelujah.
Sacred Song.

Let us next consider the kind of music appropriate to Sacred Songs.

In the first place, I think that no religion song ought to be sung to an air which has been appropriated to songs not religious. In music then is constantly an association of ideas with circumstances under which we first became familiar with the air or tune. If you sing a religious song to the tune of Yankee Doodle, I cannot help thinking of the song called Yankee Doodle. Such a thing would be very inappropriate as to hold a prayer meeting in a drinking saloon. And yet the rule is often violated. We frequently hear hymns sung to Auld Lang Syne. All such things should be avoided. They are in bad taste and unfavorable to piety.

Again, the tune and the hymn ought to have a just correspondence. Thus it would be painful to hear a joyful tune sung to a funeral hymn, and equally so to hear a mournful tune to a joyful song. The true rule is that "the sound should be an echo to the sense.”

It appears to me that what is called fashionable music is not in good taste in divine worship. It smacks too much of the opera. Church music ought to be such as the larger portion of the congregation can appreciate. Some fashionable church music may charm fashionable people, but understands and can appreciate all the complication of a melody; but it is the Solomon simple airs that charm simple, common sense people. By the one you satisfy a select few; by the other you satisfy all.

Other things being equal, old tunes appear to be preferred. With new tunes there are unpleasant associations of idea; they bring to the mind no agreeable reminiscences. But if you will sing me some noble old tune which I heard in my childhood, it will touch at once the tenderest chord in my heart. You bring to my fancy the scenes of my early life. You remind me that my father and mother were in their graves, sang that same tune in their cottage many years ago when I was a boy—an innocent boy. It is said in the apocalypse that in heaven they sang a new song. But it is not said they sung it to a new tune.
Sacred Song

Repetitions of the same words in devotional singing appears to be in bad taste. It is, if I may so speak, a prevailing vice in church music. Is there any better reason for repeating parts of verses in singing than retreating the same words in reading, speaking, or praying? In singing, we know it is done to fill out the air. But it would be better judgment to choose such an air as would demand no repetition of the words. To say the least, it is but sacrificing sense to sound. If you say, "Sing the word halalalalalalalalalalala!" once, you have expressed all that can be expressed by that word. Why then repeat it? Is there anything can add any thing to the idea? Especially why sing "halal-halalalalalalalalalalala!" Are they halal any better than one? Or do they improve the understanding, or increase and intensify the emotion?

Such repetitions are sometimes very awkward—sometimes very ridiculous—and sometimes, they can border on propriety.

For the last fifty years, the old hymn, "When I can read my title clear," has been much sung to a tune regulating the one half of the 3rd line of every verse to be repeated three times. Then, "I hid my face, hid my face, hid my face to every tear," upsetting this books unknown. But when he speak repetition, you come to a word in this, it is ridiculous. Thus, In the same hymn, you sing,

"So I laid safe, so I laid safe, so I laid safe, so I laid safely reach my home."

But these repetitions sometimes become not only awkward and ridiculous, but profane and absurd. I have somewhere read that in the line

"Our great salvation comes,"

it was sung thus:

"Our great salvation comes,"

or the line

"Our poor polluted souls",

Sung thus:

"Our poor, our poor souls, our poor polluted souls."

From this specimen we may see how easy it is, by foolish and childish fancies, to turn even sacred song into awkward, ridiculous, and profane nonsense.

"Oh! yes, I think, he has said, "Music, alas, too long has been Pressed to obey the devil."
Sacred Song.

And I suppose that, not only in profane, impious, and licentious songs, music has been pressed to obey the devil, but that even in the singing of sacred songs, the music to which they have been sung was much more gratifying to the devil than agreeable to the Retail of the Deity.

The perversion of good things renders them the worst of all known things. In the heavens the best beam their elevation; so it is with the perversion of sacred song. The use of good hymns, set to appropriate tunes, and well sung, is the most interesting and delightful part of religious worship. It quiets our angry passions, corrects our evil tendencies, imparts our devotions, and purifies our hearts. But the use of badly composed hymns sung to inappropriate and inelegant airs, often invites to evil passions, hinders devotional feelings, and makes a mockery of divine worship.

Is not a pity that the divine gift of poetry and should be so perverted!
False Premises

Reasoning from false premises always ends in a false conclusion. Assuming false premises implies either recklessly or ineptly, is a species of lying. Such reasoning is often very ridiculous. In proof of which, the following anecdote is an example:

In 1868 I was travelling between Indianapolis and Chicago. The carpet sack I carried was marked J H Ray, Indianapolis. A stranger came into the car and took a seat near me, and we talked thus:

He. How are you, Mr. Ray?

J. How do you do, Sir?

He. I think I have met you at Indianapolis.

It is very probable, sir. Many people have met me there.

At that moment a moment an acquaintance passed me, and said "How do, Judge?" The stranger turned.

He. You have been on the bench several years, Judge?

J. Yes. About 15 years.

He. Who at present compose the Supreme Court of Indiana?

J. Judges Elliott, Proctor, Sengor, and Ray.

He. I believe you are the Chief Justice, are you not?

J. Yes, Sir.

He. How long have you been on the Supreme Bench, Judge, Judge?

J. About a day.

He. Ah! Then you enter on the office this very day?

J. No, Sir, I am not, and never was a Supreme Judge.

He. How strangely I am mistaken.

J. Yes. The name on this carpet sack has misled you. You forgot that I may have borrowed or stolen this carpet sack. One should never assume false premises. My name is David McDonald.

One could easily see from the first how he reasoned. He assumed that the name on the carpet sack was my name. Then pretending a former acquainstance of mine, he unnecessarily said he had met me before, and called me Ray. Then hearing some one call me Judge, he assumed that I was Judge Ray; and finally he assumed that I was Judge Ray of the Supreme Court. Thus his premises, declaration, and conclusion formed one big, ridiculous lie.
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