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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
weather permitting, I purpose to be drunk."
In like manner, Ormurry used to appoint
his days of festal joy in the Othmum
enter's paradise. On such occasions, it is
reported that he would sometimes take 3000
drops of laudanum in a day.

ibbon

Sir William Hamilton asserts, in his
lectures on metaphysics, that the phenomenon
of matter, taken by themselves, so far from warrant-
ing any inference to the existence of a God, tends
on the contrary, ground an argument to
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 deters 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 Nor does heaven permit any part of this law to be repealed; neither can any thing be taken from it, nor can it be made wholly void.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 its explication. For 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. Whoever will not obey 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, 13.3, chap. 12.

On the same point Socrates thus discourses with Hippias:

"Socrates. Do you know of any unwritten laws?

Hippia. These 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 requires a faculty of life independent of any animal nature, that of the whole material world; at least, if it be permitted to infer an intercourse from the execution of my being, which a conformity with that law sanctifies, preserving, as it does, my moral worth for the absolute end of my activity, conceding no compromise of its imperfection to a necessity of nature, and shunning, in its infinity, the conditions and boundaries of my present transitory life." - "A Treatise of the Practical Reason."
The Beautiful & the Good.

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

Dr. Manton, a divine of the time of Queen Anne, said the Jews, the children of Noah, were called Israelites because the kingship had always rested Jacobitis. Bolland, who says the Pretre's 11th Sermon on the 117th Psalm - Ed. Review Oct. 1863, p. 206.

When Bolland attempted to reuse the jealousy of his second wife (Madame de Villellet, 2 yrs. 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."

Pieko says that "the whole art of virtue consist in activity. Or, Ethics, 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.

Spanish Absurdity.

"When in the year 1700, some bold men in government proposed that the streets of Madrid should be cleaned, so daring a suggestion excited general horror. Not only the vulgar, but those who were called educated, were averse in their tenures. The academic profession, as the guardians of polite health, were incited by the government to give their opinions. This they had no difficulty in doing. They had no doubt that the dirt ought to remain. To remove it was as new experiment; and if new experiments it was impossible to foresee the issue. Their fathers had lived in the midst of it, why should not they do the same? Their fathers were wise, and must have had good reason for their conduct. Even the smell, of which some person complained, was most likely to be wholesome. For, the air being sharp and piercing, it was extremely probable that had smelly made the atmosphere heavy, and in that way deprived it of some of its injurious properties. The physicians of Madrid were therefore of opinion that matters had better remain as their ancestors had left them." - Brinckle on Civilization, p. 78.
Harvard University.
Dr. Sewall, an ancient friend of this Institution, in his Natural Religion, prays
in thus:
"May the Great and Good God grant that this College shall be so tenacious of the truth, that it will be easier to find a well in England than either a Socinian or Arminian in Cambridge." 2 Mather's Magnalia. 33

Mohammedan Dialogue.

Jobhai and Ashari, Master & Scholar, were sectariansMohammedans. One day they conversed thus:
Jobhai: 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?
Jobhai: 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, that I might have entered paradise with my believing brother, it would have been better for me"?

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

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

Jobhai: I persuaded 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 would have been equally advantageous?

Jobhai: Does the devil possess you?

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

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

Sale's Koran, Preliminary Discourse, f. 311.
Divisions of the Books of the Bible.

It seems that the divisions into chapters arose in the liturgical use of the scriptures in the synagogue and church; and long preceded the art of printing. When this began, I can not learn.

But the division of chapters into verses was made for the convenience of reference about the year 1556, and he printed the whole Bible in that form about the year 1556. This Robert Stephens was then a young Frenchman, who for conscience sake fled from Paris to Geneva, where he printed Bible and other protestant books. London Quarterly, April, 1865, p. 172.

The Septuagint.

It seems certain that Philon of Alexandria, about 281 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 Old Testament supports 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. Hebrew scholars thought it included no more. And the latter opinion is now so.

But as the modern Septuagint includes the entire old testament, who translated the rest? 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 220,000 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 1500 volumes of American law reports, and probably about 500 volumes of elementary law books. Thus a complete American law library would probably contain about 4000 volumes.

Sambucus says that Hermus wrote two myriads of books concerning the gods. Manetho says he wrote 36,525 volumes on that subject. Sambucus, 390.

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 Philosophy, etc., 4

For further see Boole's O. & K. 114
The Emperor Antonius thanked the gods that, when he applied to the study of philosophy, he was taught by Simon Batters 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.

Cicero says that even though we could conceal any transaction from all God and men, yet nothing animusious should be done, nothing unjust, nothing licentious, nothing incontinent. De Officiis, bo. II.

Luther is reported to have written, "When I am angry, I can pray well and preach well." Emerson's Representative Men, p. 297

Cicero 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." De Senectute, Sen. II.

Thaddeus Parker tells that a Methodist minister in a sermon had occasion to illustrate some point by a story of a man saved a family from drowning. At the end of his own life, and concluding by saying, "God be thanked for young men!" Whereupon several suited in the congregation cried out, "Amen! Glory to God!" Parker's Life, vol. 2, p. 362

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

"Our brains are twenty-year electives. The weight of life is in the young once for all. Then close the case, and give the key into the hand of the angel of the resurrection." D. H. Holmes

"Stagelians + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + but the pebbels of the posts though Arrival, 6th Oct.
The following is altered from a song by Ayrton, a Scotch humorist, as given in the North British Review of Sept. 1858, p. 42, 43.

Thainshow 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,
Nighly forbear to close thine eyes to rest,
For thou hast quenched with thy conscious breast,
What sacred duty then heart left undone—
What acts committed which thou oughtest to shun.

And a fair truth or error marks the deed,
Let soft applause or sharp reproofs succeed:
So shall thy steps while the great rule is there,
Illumine lead in virtuous paths divine.

Anger

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

Writing about anger, Biesso says,

"For my part, I think that it ought to be checked under all circumstances."

I agree with Biesso. In no case do I remember being angry, without feeling some compensation for it afterwards.

Leonna wrote 9 books on anger. He combats the Aristotelian and Peripatetic doctrine on the quality of anger. He holds that "anger is absolutely wrong; it is contrary to nature— it has no place of goodness or insignificance in it; it destroys human society; it was dis- countranced by Socrates and Plato—there is no strength in anger, the very young, the old, the sickly are the elements, and the malady is most intense."

Westminster Review, July 1861, p. 82.

1 Post, 314
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 friend, received the following consoling response: "Thou fool, to mourn at Euthyphrod's death! The glowing youth to fate resigns his breath: The fate withersen your happiness defended, let come the present and the son befriended."

The old Latin poet, Ennius, thus writes: "Let some balsam upon my hands lieer, The needle's sigh or unceasing tear?"

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

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

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

Cicero, in his Tusculan Disputations, holds that Solon's idea is preferable to that of Tancred. I prefer the sentiments of Solon and pray to that of Ennius and Horace, because that of the former is founded in natural affection; but that of the latter on interfamilial esteem. 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 come be known to us, none can tell. The only judge of these things from our present feelings and knowledge. But, if after death we retain our present affection, and even look into the affection of surviving friends, their hope of our memory will doubtless be greater.
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, we do no good or evil. And he appears to have written his "Iliad," to establish this point. So in it he says that the Spartans "set up, on every occasion, in private and in public, a similar prayer, by requesting the gods to grant them some things honorable in addition to what are good; and no one has ever heard them pray for any thing more."

Now Aristotle says of Socrates, that "in the gods he simply prays that they would, in good things, or believing that the gods knew best what things are good."

Phaedrus closes as follows: Phaedrus. Let us deplore the hurt that becomes less offensive.

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

Phaedrus. Why not?

Socrates. O beloved Paus, 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.

Prayer

May I draw 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, Socrates? For myself I have prayed enough.

A Prayer of the Athenians

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

Martial 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, 1840

Oh, thou spirit whom no name can name, and no thought contain; thou to whom years are as nothing, and who art from beginning to everlasting — I thank thee that my life lasts from year to year. I thank thee that my eye is still so full of blessings. But I would be more still, if thou didn't fill my ear with grief, and turn my day into night. Yea, 0 God, my Father, I will bless thee that thou art still very rich me. I will
Prayer.

Pray the for whatsoever Thou dost desire. I know it is all very good. I bless Thee that Thou hast left to my heart from year to year kindliest of my faith; Thou quickenest my love; Thou castest down my fear. When my father and mother fore-see me, Thou wilt take me up. Oh my God, bless me still this coming year, be not afar off. May I never become false to thy gift. Let my eyes be open, my heart true and warm, my faith pure and heavenly. May religion dwell in the inner sanctum of my heart. Let it be my daily life; and wheresoe'er the year shall find me, may I do my duty without fear, and so live ever—living low in my hand, and blend by Thy goodness.  

188. "Life of Parker.

Samblichus, a Neo-Platonist of the Alexandrian School, who flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 117 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 benediction of the Gods; recruits us to the splendid rivers of supernnal light; in a short time perfects our inward rest for...

Pray the for the ineffable em-brace and contact of the Gods; and dost not desist till it raise us to the summit of all. It also gradually and silently drawing upward the manliness of our souls by divinizing them of every thing foreign to a divine nature, clothes us with the perfections of the gods. Besides this, it produces an indissoluble comity, 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 sanctifies and purifies; expels whatever is prone to generation and retains any thing of the dregs 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 Samblichus on the Mysteries, 272, 273.

Proclus tells us that the Ancients had a form of prayer called the CURORTIC. PRAYER. 'The CURORTIC PRAYER is that which is offered for the purpose of availing oneself of the power of the uncreated and all the celestial beings, such as we have written in our temples."  

Samblichus, 277.
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".


A Prayer of Solomon.

Bright Daughters of Mercury and
Olympian Zeus! Pious Nuns! hear
my prayer. Grant me wealth from the
blind gods, and from all men a good
name. May I be sweet to my friend
and bitter to my foe; revered by the one,
and dreaded by the other. More is
desirable, but not ill-joined gain: for the
wealth that the gods give, last not
and fleets not away; but the fruits of insen-

cence and crime bring vengeance—sure,
though slow.
It seems that, as among all other nations so among the Jews, a sort of common law became gradually superimposed upon their written law. This written law was the Pentateuch. But its imperfections and imperfections—not to say its absurdities—led to many forced construction and distortion versions of it.

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

Afterwards came the Mishna. Its author was R. Schud, 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 Talmud and Mishna came the Talmud. It appears that there were two Talmuds—one formed in Palestine, the other at Babylon by the Jews who remained 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 the law.

These two Talmuds were much alike. They included what was found in the Tanna 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 perilous 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 men 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 races of animals deteriorate, and the species of plants decay.
Human Depravity.

These 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 Popes that "all partial evil is unnecessary"? Can it be possible that necessity, or sinfulness, or any other offense against nature or moral law, can be useful to any person to any thing?

How then comes it, we repeat, that there is in all things terrestrial, this tendency to evil?

In order to answer the question wisely, we ought first to consider whether it is in 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. No more will admit that he is devoid 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. "Even Sinners and fools be wise are far wiser, and best of men by far what they despise."

And though we all know this massa character, it is very certain that in most civilized men the good far outnumbers 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 to evil is lessening. In view of this indisputable truth, it were 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 antipathetic 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 with some imperfection; and that our tendencies to evil are a necessary consequence of the imperfection thus inherent in our nature. Unless we adopt this view, it is known of only two other hypotheses, which none can suggest by any one.

The first is that which foresees in some parts of Asia, namely, that there are
two eternal principles—good and evil—which prevail every where 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 deists, namely, that by what they call the original transmission of the passions of our race, a depraved tincture was transmitted to all their descendants. This supposition does not rationally account for the taint 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 pristine state, the argument supposes that they were liable to temptation; and therefore liability is identically the evil tendency in question. The argument, then, is simple this: that the evil tendency in Adam and Eve, which led them to sin, caused 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.

Upon 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 in what I have already given, namely, that the deity created an imperfect being; that this imperfection necessarily includes 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 in comprehensible to us, said that it was a right and good. I can go no further. And if this brings me to Locke's doctrine, that all physical evil is "universal good," I can not help it.

Cuvier Drury D.D. in his Toward Lectures on the "Problems of Human Origin," explains the question thus: all finite things are necessarily imperfect, and could not make infinite beings or things; therefore he could not make them perfect. He brought them as near to perfection as he could. All created things are of necessity finite and imperfect. Where there is imperfection, there is necessarily evil. It unavoidably springs from the imperfection of the creature to which it attaches. God could not create them without it. He did the best he could under the circumstances.
The Ancient Philosophies.

The chief philosophers in Cicero's time were the Stoics, the Epicureans, and the Academic. Both, Cato, Atticus, and Cicero, who lived in the utmost friendship, were the principal ornament of those schools.

The Stoics were bigots and yet giant. They held more to be truly wise and good but themselves. They placed perfect happiness in virtue, regardless of every other good. They held all sin equally wicked. They held that a man could never forgive, never repent, never pity—never forgive—never be deceived—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 dogs of Romulus. He made no distinction of time or things, and after a perpetual scene 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 virtue only as the handmaid to pleasure, by preserving health and conciliating friends. They held, therefore, that a virtuous life had no other duty than to secure his own ease, decline all struggle, retire from public affairs, imitate the life of the goat, and pass their days in undisturbed repose. This was the scheme Cicero followed. He had great talent, public spirit, great learning, judgment, candor, and benevolence. In politics and patriotism he was like Cicero. He urged Cicero to resign, but would not act himself. And he managed to steer clear of the violence of the time, made all things his friends, lived to a good old age, and died an honorable death.

The Academic philosophy took a middle course. It revered virtue and honesty, and it demanded virtuous action. It prescribed 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 advice, under the circumstances, could be adopted. By these rules, Cicero lived. But he died by violence.

The result, therefore, was in favor of Atticus.

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 were great, but Cicero for the best.
Ancient Philosophy—continued.

In his work on the Nature of the Gods, the views of these schools of philosophy concerning the Gods are very sketchy. But Cicero says that Dicurus himself was "a man unpolished, illiterate, insulting, without wit, without reputation, without elegance."
### Distinguished Sovereigns and Their Eras of the Roman Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Sovereign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustus Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nerva Gallicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Claudius Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Galba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Nerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Marius Aurelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Commodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Caracalla &amp; Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Maximinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Heligabalbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Alexander Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Maxamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Maximus &amp; Balbinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Gordian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Philip the Arabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Orestes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Vibius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Gallus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Valerian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Gallien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>Anacletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Florian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Probus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Gaius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Carinus &amp; Aemelian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Theodosius &amp; Maximian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Maximin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Constantine II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Constantine III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Empire Divided into East & West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East</th>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Valens</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Theodosus</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Anastasius</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Theodosus II</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Leon the Great</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Anastasius</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Theodosus II</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Emperors</td>
<td>Eastern Roman Empire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 532</td>
<td>Constantine III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Emperor Zoe &amp; Theodora.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Michael VI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Isaac Comnenus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Constantine X.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Eudokia &amp; Constantine XII.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>Romanus IV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Michael.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Prince of the house of Comnenus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Antioch II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Leo IV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>Basilius &amp; Constantin X.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Eastern Roman Emperors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>Andronicus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>Andronicus III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>John Palaeologus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>John Cantacuzenus, Nicaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>John Palaeologus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Manuel Palaeologus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>John Palaeologus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Constantine I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Turkish rule began</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frankish Sovereigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Sovereign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Childbert, Thierry, Bataine, Bledemer, Bataine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Childbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Thierry 2, Theodulf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Childert 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Childert 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Childert 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Dagobert &amp; Childert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Childert 2, Clovis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>Childert 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Thierry 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>Clovis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Childert 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Dagobert 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Childert 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Thierry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Childert 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>Peter the Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>Charlemagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Louis the Pileonaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>Charles the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>Louis the Stammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>Louis 34 Gantseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>Charles the Fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Louis 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
French Sovereigns

Henry 1.
French 2
Charles 4.
Henry 3.
Henry 1 - Bourbon family
Louis 13.
Louis 14
Louis 15
Louis 16
Louis 17

Henry 2.
Louis 8.
Louis 9.
Louis 10.
Philip 5.
Philip 6.
Philip 7.
Philip 8.
Philip 9.
Philip 10.
Philip 11.
Philip 12.
Philip 13.
Philip 14.
Philip 15.
Philip 16.
Philip 17.
Philip 18.
Philip 19.
Philip 20.
Philip 21.
Philip 22.
Philip 23.
Philip 24.
Philip 25.
Philip 26.
Philip 27.
Philip 28.
Philip 29.
Philip 30.
Philip 31.
Philip 32.
Philip 33.
Philip 34.
Philip 35.
Philip 36.
Philip 37.
Philip 38.
Philip 39.
Philip 40.
Philip 41.
Philip 42.
Philip 43.
Philip 44.
Philip 45.
Philip 46.
Philip 47.
Philip 48.
Philip 49.
Philip 50.
Philip 51.
Philip 52.
Philip 53.
Philip 54.
Philip 55.
Philip 56.
Philip 57.
Philip 58.
Philip 59.
Philip 60.
Philip 61.
Philip 62.
Philip 63.
Philip 64.
Philip 65.
Philip 66.
Philip 67.
Philip 68.
Philip 69.
Philip 70.
Philip 71.
Philip 72.
Philip 73.
Philip 74.
Philip 75.
Philip 76.
Philip 77.
Philip 78.
Philip 79.
Philip 80.
Philip 81.
Philip 82.
Philip 83.
Philip 84.
Philip 85.
Philip 86.
Philip 87.
Philip 88.
Philip 89.
Philip 90.
Philip 91.
Philip 92.
Philip 93.
Philip 94.
Philip 95.
Philip 96.
Philip 97.
Philip 98.
Philip 99.
Philip 100.
|------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------|--------------|---------|-----------|----------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-------|----------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|---------|
Emperors of Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Otto the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Henry I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Conrad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Henry IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Conrad III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 107  | Frederick 
Barbarossa |
| 108  | Henry VI        |
| 109  | Philip & Otto 
IV |
| 110  | Frederick V     |
| 111  | William of 
Holland |
| 112  | Richard of 
Holland |
| 113  | Albert II of 
Austria |
| 114  | Henry of 
Saxony |
| 115  | Louis IV of 
Barbary |
| 116  | Frederick 
III of 
Austria |
| 117  | Frederick V    |
| 118  | Joanna         |
| 119  | Charles V      |
| 120  | Francis II     |
| 121  | Charles III    |
| 122  | Francis III    |
| 123  | Charles IV     |
| 124  | Louis V        |
| 125  | Henry V        |
| 126  | Charles VI     |
| 127  | Louis VI       |
| 128  | Rudolf        |
| 129  | Albert III     |
| 130  | Henry IV       |
| 131  | Louis IV of 
Saxony |
| 132  | Frederick V  
III of 
Austria |
| 133  | Charles V     |
| 134  | Francis IV     |
| 135  | Joseph II     |
| 136  | Charles V     |
| 137  | Francis V     |
| 138  | Louis V         |
| 139  | Charles VI    |
| 140  | Louis VI       |
| 141  | Henry V        |
| 142  | Charles VII   |
| 143  | Louis V       |
| 144  | Charles V    |
| 145  | Francis V     |
| 146  | Louis VI     |
| 147  | Charles VII |
| 148  | Louis V       |
| 149  | Charles V     |
| 150  | Francis V     |
| 151  | Louis VI     |
| 152  | Charles VII |
| 153  | Louis V       |
| 154  | Charles V     |
| 155  | Francis V     |
| 156  | Louis VI     |
| 157  | Charles VII |
| 158  | Louis V       |
| 159  | Charles V     |
| 160  | Francis V     |
| 161  | Louis VI     |
| 162  | Charles VII |
| 163  | Louis V       |
| 164  | Charles V     |
| 165  | Francis V     |
| 166  | Louis VI     |
| 167  | Charles VII |
| 168  | Louis V       |
| 169  | Charles V     |
| 170  | Francis V     |
| 171  | Louis VI     |
| 172  | Charles VII |
| 173  | Louis V       |
| 174  | Charles V     |
| 175  | Francis V     |
| 176  | Louis VI     |
| 177  | Charles VII |
| 178  | Louis V       |
| 179  | Charles V     |
| 180  | Francis V     |
| 181  | Louis VI     |
| 182  | Charles VII |
| 183  | Louis V       |
| 184  | Charles V     |
| 185  | Francis V     |
| 186  | Louis VI     |
| 187  | Charles VII |
| 188  | Louis V       |
| 189  | Charles V     |
| 190  | Francis V     |
| 191  | Louis VI     |
| 192  | Charles VII |
| 193  | Louis V       |
| 194  | Charles V     |
| 195  | Francis V     |
| 196  | Louis VI     |
| 197  | Charles VII |
| 198  | Louis V       |
| 199  | Charles V     |
| 200  | Francis V     |

Note: The year numbers may be incorrect. The list is not organized chronologically and seems to include a mix of emperors and other historical figures.
### Kings of Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>Alexander II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Alexander III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>John Balliol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>Robert Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>David II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Robert II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>Robert III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>James I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>James II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>James III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>James IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>James V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>James VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sovereigns of Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Queen under Ferdinand &amp; Isabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Ferdinand V, the Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Charles I, Emperor of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Philip II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Philip III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Philip IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Charles II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Philip V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Louis I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Philip V, again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Ferdinand VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Charles III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Charles IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 first, and is still, known among Europeans as cinchona. This name it got by the fact that Ana, countess of Chinchon, 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 its antifebrile qualities were known to the native at the time of the discovery of America, though it probably was.

There are, at least, 4 distinct alkaloids in the bark, of more or less similar qualities. 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 now (1863) succeeded in growing and multiplying this tree in India, Jamaica, Ceylon, Algeria, and Western Africa. Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1860, p. 252

The Deductive and Inductive Philosophy.

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

The deductive reasoning is 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 system takes nothing for granted. It proceeds from 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 inference from them is often irrefutable. 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 propositions 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 inversely—they first collect their special facts, and then draw their conclusion.
Abstract of Inductive Philosophy.

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 able 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 reason 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 idea to the senses. By induction we rise from the concrete to the abstract; by deduction we descend from the abstract to the concrete." Buckle on Civilization, Vol. 2, p. 830
Loss of Life in the War of Rebellion of 1861

Oct. 18, 1863.

In Hennedy's 'Compendium of the Census,' he supposes that, for the last two years and a half, the number of the killed and disabled permanently in the war, exceeds the increase of able-bodied population in the U.S. A writer in 'The Cincinnati Gazette' of this date, firstly, clearly 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 1846 and 1860 years in the U.S. His figures are thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Bull Run</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilines Creek</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnage  Army</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orono</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballenst</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Springs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Donaldson</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pea Ridge</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>7721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>9617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>7701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antietam</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>9416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prairie Grove</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksbu</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>74245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>9165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>7025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>13700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>9726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 16868  73467

He assumes that this includes 3/4 of all the killed and wounded on our side in the war. On this calculation he arrives at making the whole:

- Killed: 25272
- Wounded: 130,111
- Total: 155,383

Of the wounded he holds that not over 40 either die or are permanently disabled. So that the whole number of loss to the able-bodied men between 1846 to the states then:

- Killed on the field of battle: 25,272
- Died of disabled by wounds: 27,527
- Died of disease: 166,600

Aggregate of loss by war: 217,399

The increase of the able-bodied men in the main time he holds to be making the total increase:

457,578

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 races of Palestine and the surrounding Egypt.

Paul of Thebes was the first Christian Hermite. In the 22nd year of his age, A.D. 250, the story says he retired to a cave and lived there 40 years. A spring and a palm tree furnished him drink, food, shade, and rain. In the front part of his cave, however, a man daily brought him half a loaf of bread. St. Anthony and two lions dug his grave, and buried him, when he died. So wrote Jerome 30 years after his death.

But the founder of the order was St. Anthony of Egypt. He was born about A.D. 251. In 270, a large fortune devolved on him and the care of a younger sister. He gave away the fortune, committed his sister to the care of the poor, and betook himself to the monastic life. He ate only once a day. His meal was bread, and salt, and water; his drink water only. He banished wine and beer, in the name of the Lord. He slept on the ground; or on straw. His wardrobe was a hair shirt, a sheep skin, and a girdle.

Monasticism.

Often he fasted 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 Nicaean age venerated him as a model saint.

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

The Stylites were an interesting class of hermits. They were so called, because they stood on pillars for years during penances and praying. The father of this folly was Symeon the Stylite, originally a shepherd on the borders of Syria. At 13 he became a monk. He only ate on Sundays. For 26 years he spent 40 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 conversions daily. He worked many miracles, and died at the age of 69 of wounds 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 monks. And yet
Monasticism.

The fathers of the Church—Jerome, Athanasius, Augustine, Theodoret—formed these bodies, in the first of which St. Anthony, to whom we owe the establishment of the Semi-arian 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 asceticism much resembling Christian monasticism. Some of them live buried in the ground, with only the head above the sand—some wear heavy iron collars—some drag a heavy chain fastened to their leg by a bar. Some hold their fists shut that their fingers nails may grow through the palm of their hand. Some stand perpendicularly on one leg—some go on bare feet by with iron spikes. Such are the Hindu Society...

Methodist Quarterly Review, Jan. 1866, p. 22.

The Gipsies.

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

They have kings, queens, dukes, lords, &c. Their men are thieves; their women strumpets. They are great fortune tellers. They have a language of their own, which they keep a mystery from others. It is thought to be a dialect of the Hindustanee.

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 given quit their migratory habits, and mingled with society, and thus, to a great extent, lost their distinctive peculiarities. So says Walter Scott in a note to Chap. 6 of Quentin Durward.

But a writer in The Atlantic Monthly, for July 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 priestly nome. In his youth, he was engaged as a private teacher of Heloise, a niece of a canon of Paris. Love arising between them, ended in fornication, and this in offspring. Her friends forced a private marriage 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 Farser, was wonderful.

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

- Quod sit Deus trinity, ut contra.
- Quod sit filius sine principio, ut contra.
- Quod acturus generatio filii natus, vel secur, vel intelligi passit esse non.
- Quod nihil fiat causa, ut contra.
- Quod potentia sit inter placitum Deo esse non.
- Quod omnia sciant Deus esse non.
- Quod licent habeere concubinam sit contra.
- Quod nulla decemur mantis licet sit contra.
- Quod licet hominum occideret, ut non.
Martyrs.

Most martyrs have died for some religion. But men have become martyrs to infidelity. In the 15th century, Bruno, a pantheist, and Valamir, 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 sibonim, which means the poor, because they deemed poverty a virtue, and their ability consisted of poor persons. After the Church grew powerful and rich, these Ebionites came to be despised hereafter. 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. Plinian's Life of Jesus, p. 177 iv.
Is matter eternal?

If all matter is creative, then this was a period when no matter existed, or ever had existed, and prior to that period, infinite eternity had always been rolling away, with being in existence but God. And thus 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 exert 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 had existed? Is it not more probable that matter existed co-existing 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 indissociable. 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. 31, holds that if matter is eternal, it must be self-existing, and so 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 unthinkable." But might it not be answered 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 quite 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. 33.
Prophecy.

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

If Virgils Pollio were a part of the Bible, the prediction could make a very pretty prophecy out of it.

Before the invention of the steam engine, Doctor Johnson prophesied thus:

"Soon shall my power, almighty steam! after

Drag the slow barge, and urge the flying car."

Syrac uses a more remarkable prophecy of the discovery of America:

\[\text{Dinisus Oceanus}
\text{Vincula marin lasset, ut ingen}
\text{Patrat tellus, Lythiique Novos}
\text{Detigat orbes.}\]
An army moving.

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

"The wagon trains of the army can not march on less than 40 miles of road. They would, as they move, fill every street in Lomance, the 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. 200 wagon loads of bread and 3,000,000 pounds of coffee were provided for a trip of a few days; and the trip 375,000 pounds of salt which is allowed a fair allowance. The single item of ammunition requires 1000 wagons, a train itself nearly 12 miles long. The men themselves in places (40) could not march, when well closed up on less than 25 miles of road. 2500 of pack mules follow its regiments. Taking all these things into consideration, if an army like this were compelled to march its troops and train 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 disdains with a Deity. He seems to think that a religion, which teaches us 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-sacrifice; 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 wilder animals, as the horse, the dog. We can not even imagine a

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

According to M. 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 nine sacraments and many rites and ceremonies. But the details of them are too ridiculous to be named.

Honor of Mme. Comte, except to have any prosclytes.

See the thing at large in the Westminster Review for July 1855, p. 41.

Smith married with his wife and friends, was married a year or two, prayed daily, prayed oft to his dead sweet heart, to live the day as frugal as a monk, a prince of his bread was his bread, daily read The Christian, Dante, of Homer, and left his "Ecclesiastic of Christ, Dante, of Homer," was born 1795, died in 1857. He was irritable, fastidious, religious. The Edinburgh Review of April 1828, p. 163.
A Puzzle.

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

To see, I see nothing strange in it. How 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 value of a treadmill.

P. Do it would seem. But let us consider the surface of the Earth on the equator travels westward about 1000 miles an hour. 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 if in what direction sooner 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 67800 miles an hour to the West. What do you say now?

A. That's a fact. I forgot that. Well we are certainly right at last. The instinct must build on that: if the Earth's diurnal motion carries in East 1000 miles an hour; and if its annual or orbital motion carries the 67800 miles an hour, to the West, I am travelling 66800 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 towards the constellation of Hercules with inconceivable velocity, and rolling in a vast orbit, the circumference of which is utterly unknown, and the centre of which is but vague conjectures. How can the astronomer tell us whether this motion of the Earth and whole solar system is up or down 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 formerly and properly meant a chief servant. But now, in its customary use, it means a minister. The British ministry are really the British rulers. A chief magistrate is more often called a minister. Judges, Marshals, Sheriffs are frequently called ministers of justice. Even clergymen are called ministers of the gospel; yet the former rule than serve their flock. So the Pope calls himself supreme pontiff.

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 satire the figure a little, we shall catch a bow idea. A shepherd or pastor must have a flock of sheep. There never was a pastor without such flock. The one necessarily supposes the other. If the preacher is a pastor, his church arc sheep. I don't like to be called or deemed a shepherd. Moreover, a flock of sheep includes lambs, ewes, wolves and rams. Not every appropriate term to apply to decent behavior.

Besides, the figure is lame and degrades the church member. The shepherd or pastor is a human being; but sheep are brute. 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 till and unto.

Opus and off. These words seem to be mere new formations of the phrase, "do on", "do off."

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

Grandeur Sublimity. Grandeur, from the Latin grandis, French grand, 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 sometimes so applied; a sublime style is a common and accurate expression.
Rambles Among Words.

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

? It is certain that our interrogative point was original. The letter q, where 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 just 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.

Beghardi. It seems that about the 13th century, there was a class of praying brothers among the Franciscan monks, who were called Beghards. Was it because they were hard beggars of alms, or because they begged bare in prayer? Sir E. Alexander's "Life." 1869.

Rambles Among Words.

Dissemble & Divert. These words signify in this that: the former is the act of the will; the latter, the act of the judgment. We confine to a request; we assent to a proposition.

Circumstance. This word is from circum- and stanc-, to stand around. Literally things standing around. The common phrase, "surrounding circumstances," is therefore tautological. The word is often used in the singular, but perhaps more accurately, for has there a single thing stood around any other thing? The word surrounding, as a noun, is splitting into use. Whatever usage will justify its adoption, it will be preferable to the term circumstance, as being a plainer word and Anglo-Saxon.

Surround. Properly, this word must not be confounded with inclose, incirclae, or unclasp. If city is surrounded by a wall — a garden is inclosed by a fence. a brown or head is incircled by a wreath. The earth is inviscled by the atmosphere.

Ruthie. In Milton's day, this word was the companion of Ruthie— then, nath, nether, nutheast.
Rambles among Words.

Its. The positive its is a new word. It is not found in our bible. It for it is, is always wrong. We should say this or it is.

Extant or existing. Lewis proposed to adopt this word as meaning "out of town." Starvation. This word is of American origin. It is not in the old English dictionaries. Webster's dictionary first introduced it into England.

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

Asham. This word, in the time of James I, meant linear descendent. So it is used in Titus, v. 1.

Brat. This was once a very dignified word. 300 years ago, Abraham's children were called Abraham's brats - "O Abraham's brats! O boast of Cush under!" Beshpihere.

Dan. An old English meant Mexico. It is perhaps from the Spanish Don. However, it is I think, who says "the Abraham," "Dan-non." Jupiter, Jove, Juno. Lewis, in his work on the nature of the gods, tells us that Jupiter is derived from juvenae, that is, "helping" - that Jove is from the Latin Juventas, "helping" - and that Juno is also a juvenae, "helping.

Elchan, Jehovah. According to Bishop Berkeley, these names which we translate "God, Lord, mean respectively: "The Island," "The self-existing." Neptune, Jove, in his work concerning the nature of the gods, says that this word "is derived from a word, from swimming, the first letter being a little changed." Not the sun, the same writer says this term is so named, either because he is solus alone, or because he observed all the stars."
Rambles among Words.

Luna. The moon is so called from shining. Given by Saturn Orisson.

Blanket. This word comes from the name of one Thomas Blanket, who in 1346, was the first manufacturer of blankets. He lived in Brussels.

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

Sign. Signature. In the medieval ages, writings were authenticated by adding the sign of the cross—signum crucis. Hence sign & signature are derived.

A North British Review, June 1818, p. 277.

Books  To see note 11

Burlington, our minister to China, says "The Chinese have more books, encyclopedias, periodicals, magazines, &c. than any other people. Their prince has an encyclopaedia with over 5000 volumes."
The celebrated Catholic Maxim.

In vita humana Ecclesia magnae
factae curandum est, ut in tempore,
quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab
omniae, credidit est, hoc est anima
viva propriae catholicae.

I forget where I found the above;
but Vincentius Viviani, who wrote
about 1534, in his Commentary,
expressed it thus: "Quod ubique, quod
semper, quod ab omnibus credidit
est", vero sibi satis.
The Mariner's Compass.

It is well known that on land the magnetic needle varies in different places, and at different times in the same place. But its variations on ships are far greater. Let two ships be seen lying still side by side with their prows in the same direction, and the same compass will not point in the same direction on the one as on the other. The reason is that portion of every ship attracts the needle and produces a variation. Even wooden ships will do this, and they do it more in some localities on the sea than on others. The case is that the iron fastenings, 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 renders 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 of iron ships, now so common, is much worse. These utterly distract the magnetic needle, so that it turns sometimes almost 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 softer 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 putting the parts of an iron ship together magnetizes intensely the whole fabric. The difficulties in iron ships have 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. 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 in by hammering, it is beaten out by exposure. 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, another time, or in another place, or in stormy seas.

It is also remarkable that iron ships which are built with their prows south, are less troubled in this way than such as are built with their prows north. See an article on this subject in The London Quarterly, October 18, 1792.
In the opinion of St. Chrysostom, woman is "a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic fire, a deadly fascination, and a painter ill." Westminster Review, Dec. 1825, p. 156.

Homer represents Ulisses as telling how Achilles spoke to him of woman and his wife, thus:

A woman, woman! When to ill the vine Is bent, all hell contains a softer place; And such a one was she, who once played her sphere Thro' the pure room when she became a bride. What! hope, the toil of war overcome, To meet soft quiet and repose at home! Affection hopes. Oh, wife! the dead sleep on The purgious sea, and blanch in all the face; And should posterity our virtues seek, Howe blighted! they will curse the kind.

Odyssey, Book 11, v. 531 to 540.

Sir Walter Rarm has somewhere written substantially as follows:

In youth, women are our companions; 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. Whoever lives unmarried, lives without joy,

without comfort, without blessing. O cease a step in choosing a wife. If thy wife is small, build down to her, build whisper in her ear. He who proclaims 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. If in woman whose through God's blessings are vouchsafed to a house. She teaches the children, spares 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." Stelmaic, cited in London Quarterly, Oct. 1887, p. 243.

Homer, in the Odyssey, Book 11, makes the ghost of Achilles to say:

Oh woman, woman! when to ill they mind Is but, all hell contains a softer place; And such a one was she, who leisurely played her sphere through the food home when she rejoiced abroad! What! hope, the toil of war overcome, To meet soft quiet and repose at home! Affection hopes. Oh, wife! thy deed, thy race, The proffered sex and blanch in all the face; And should posterity our virtues seek, Howe blighted! they will curse the kind.
Woman.


Free translation.

Oust is lighter than a feather;
And the wind more light than water:
But a woman's fickle mind
More light than feather, dust, or wind.

Plato, in his Republic, is a ‘woman’s rights’ man. He held the women ought to act with the men both in war and government.
Curious ecclesiastical items.

1. "Church music is supposed to have been first introduced by Gregory the Great, A.D. 602." Salabard for the deacon, p. 324. But, see 2. Macander, 318, 317, note.

2. It seems that meeting-houses, or churches were not used by Christians till the 3rd century. 1. Macander, 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. Macander, 293.

4. Infant baptism was not introduced into the Church till about A.D. 200. Macander, 311, 312.

5. As 1. above is doubtful.


7. It seems that the early Christians, like the Methodists, received members first on probation. The duration of divine favor, the probationary period at 2 year. 1. Macander, 305.
Sumptuary Laws:

Tertullian, in his "Apology for the Christian" ch. 6, says that the ancient Romans allowed not above a noble—$1.48—to be spent on an entertainment, and but one meal, and that not a crammed 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 their theatres to the ground, as seminaries only of lewdness and immorality." Tertullian's Apology for the Christians, ch. 6.

In the first chapter of Genesis, the term God—Elohim—occurs about 28 times; and the name Lord—Jehovah, does not occur at all. Nor does it occur till the 5th verse of chaps. 2.

Chap. 1 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 2 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 3 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 4 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 5 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 6 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 7 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 8 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 9 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 10 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 11 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 12 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 13 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 14 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 15 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 16 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 17 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 18 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 19 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 20 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 21 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 22 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 23 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 24 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 25 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 26 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 27 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 28 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 29 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 30 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 31 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 32 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 33 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 34 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 35 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 36 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 37 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 38 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 39 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 40 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 41 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 42 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 43 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 44 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 45 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 46 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 47 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 48 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 49 God 11 times—Lord 11

Chap. 50 God 11 times—Lord 11

The second chapter of Genesis is the only book in the Bible in which the God—Elohim—occurs more than the name Lord—Jehovah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Lord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>From 1 to 61</td>
<td>57 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 62 to 100</td>
<td>256 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 101 to 150</td>
<td>253 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 151 to the Last</td>
<td>50 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In all</td>
<td>366 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>7 times</td>
<td>48 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>5 times</td>
<td>10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>25 times</td>
<td>10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>29 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>11 times</td>
<td>104 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>7 times</td>
<td>42 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bible Names of the Deity.

Thus it appears that the name Elohim, how
often used, appears in the Old Testament about 2287
times; and that term Jehovah, translated Lord, appears about 5585 times.

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

The whole matter is rather one of curi
osity, than of any practical value. But
possibly some of the following information
may furnish some in regard to its:

1. It seems that however these two names
of the Deity may agree or differ in literal
meaning, the name 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 5th
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
include a complete account of the creation, is
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. 6:2, as saying I
am Jehovah; 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
using the name Lord. Jehovah. Is this not plainly some mistake here?

4. When the name of the Deity occurs in
the genitive or possessive case, I think the
term God is often used rather 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
but only 7 times; and in Ecclesiastes, the
name God is employed 35 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 in all the books, 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 between stories from 2nd Thessalonians

II.

At first aliquot dies renovat, ut
accipitur sabb. 12. 10. ex. dictis
rebus, et super examen apnum
in ore leonis et fatus melius.
Vulg. - Jud. 11. 3.

Resemblance of stories sacred and profane.

"...and washed, and came seeing..."

John 9. 6, 7.

A man of mean condition had lost
his sight by a suspension of his eyes. He
presented himself before Vespasian, and
falling prostrate on the ground, implored
the sufferer to administer a cure for his
blindness... the request was that the
sufferer, with his sight, could endeavors
to sustain the poor man's face, and
the balm of his eyes. Another said he
had lost the use of his hands; before
that he would think on the first
affected. [Scrip. had so ordered.] In
the presence of a prodigious multitude
he advanced with an air of serenity
and beatified the experiment. He shrank
the hand recovered, and the blind
man saw the light of the sun. By hiring
without who were not traced on the
spot, both were at once confirmed at
this hour, whose deaf and plucky
were here for no record.

II.

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

Romanus & Remus. The children were ordered to be thrown into the stream of the River. It happened that the river, overflowing its banks, forced 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 she-wolf, or Faustulus, a shepherdess, saw it and suckled them.” Ye.

Liv. 13. 1. Sec. 4

The Sabine story was similar.

The story is that Tiber 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 Solon to go among the neighboring tribes—especially the Sabines—to collect them. The Sabine women were so numerous, in the spirit of the celebration, each Roman youth seized a Sabine girl, and bore her off for a wife.

In both these cases, the men got wives by force and fraud at a religious festival, and all parties subsequently concurred in it. Sec. 34. Liv. 6. 1. Sec. 9.


**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 asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven!" 2 Kings, 2-11.

**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 unthinkingly to meet, as he pretended, the goddess, otherwise.

Livy, Book IX - cap. 21.

**VII.**

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

**VIII.**

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

"The multitude receive upon an ancient prophecy. That at this very time there is the siege of Jerusalem. The faces of the East would forsake over the nations, and a race of men would go forth from Judea to extend their dominion over the rest of the world." Tacitus, Books 5, cap. 13.
Rassemblment des traits sacrés et profanes.

IX.

The story of Abraham offering Isaac his son as a sacrifice, and of the substitution in his stead of a ram caught in a thicket—Gen. 17, 21—is too well known to need repetition, and the same is true as to the tragedy of Jephthæ's daughter.

In the tragedy of Euripides, entitled "Iphigenia in Aulis," a like story appears. Periander, it is there said to have been ordered by an oracle, while on his way to Troy, to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia to Poseidon. 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. 555.

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

Licensor Di Officiis, 13, 3, Cap. 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 where a previous vow to that effect, as in the case of Jephthæ, had been made. Lev. 27, 28, 29.

Rassemblment des traits sacrés et profanes.

X.

Whoever will compare the Jewish ceremonies and rituals, found in the Pentateuch, with the Egyptian superstitions and rites, as given by Herodotus, will be struck with the similarity of them, so much so perhaps to suspect that Moses may have in some cases borrowed from the Egyptians. See Eutych. 3, 76 of Herodotus.

They both circumcised, offered sacrifices on altars—paid great regard to cleanliness—required the priests for sacrifices to be without blemish—transported their slain to the hands of beasts—sent part of the thing sacrificed—made libations of wine—became unclean by contact with foreigners—are rendered unclean by contact—consider the pig to be an impure beast—

hate swineherds—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. There, where the 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 of the very influencing," 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 "or echoes deep and large is placed 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 also wrote about the same age, in his description of the descent of Aeneas 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 11th book of that immortal poem, relates the descent of Odysseus into that same Hades, describes it very much as it was afterwards described in Luke, Josephus, and Virgil.

It is true that Homer and Virgil adorn their descriptions of the "darken region of the dead." with fancies very much more poetic than those of Luke and Josephus. But whoever reads and compares them all, can not fail to see that they are describing the one identical Hades; and will find it difficult to deny that all these stories have a common origin, though he may be unable to see what that origin is.

XII.

Mary is represented as commanding, "If one sex get a man or a woman that they die, then the ox shall be duly burned, and his flesh shall not be eaten," Ex. 21:28.

Plato says, "if a beast of burden or any other animal shall kill any person," let them destroy the condemned animal, and cut it beyond the border," The Laws, 127.e.12.
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 said unto her, there is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. And they made sign to his father to what he would have him called. And he asked for a writing table, and wrote saying his name is John. And they called him that called all. Luke 1:59-60.

Abdel Molalib, 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 Korish, who, after the feast was over, desired him to give the infant a name. Immediately Molalib replied, ‘I name this child Mohammed.’ The Korish grandees 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 election he had made, saying, "May the most high glorify in
him whom he has created on earth,"
alluding to the name Mohammed, which signifies preserved, or glorified.
But his wife of Mohammed, in family Library, „.

XIV.

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

"The Roman army was in danger
of perishing by thirst, but a sudden
storm drenched them with rain, while it
discharged fire and hail on their enemies,
and the Roman gained a great victory. All
the authorities which speak of the battle
speak also of the miracle." It happened un-
der M. Aurelian Antoninus, A.D. 174.
See his life in the translation of
of his works, p. 16, by Geo. Long.
In support of this story in the life of Aurelius, a letter by him is given in Reeves' Apologia, 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. 165, in his *Apologetic* 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 the 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 burnt up." 2 Pet. 3:10.

"Not only do men pass away, and the mountain and sea disappear under the pressure of an irresistible 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 combine in the fire of one universal conflagration." Schoener’s translation to Movers. Westminster Review of July, 1867, p. 33.

XVI.

"He that sinneth against one wrongeth his own soul." Prov. 8:36.

"He who does wrong, does wrong against himself. He who acts unjustly, acts unjustly to himself—because he makes himself bad." Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, 9–4

XVII.

How often tithes, or tenths, are mentioned in the laws of Moses, it will be seen. It is curious that the thing should always be a tenth—why not sometimes a ninth or a twentieth?

But it is more curious to find the same thing in many other religions. Pliny, in his natural history, 13:12, ch. 14, mentions a law in Arabia which obliged every merchant to offer the 10th of his produce in sacrifice to the god Jaks. Justin says that the barbarians exacted the 10th of their spoils, taken in the Sicilian war, to Hiero II of Syracuse. The Ethiopians paid...
The Roman general Sylla dedicated a temple to Hercules, and so did Augustus. See their Livia in Plutarch. Selden, in his history of titles, especially mentions numerous other statues in many nations of the same kind. To this day, in many parts of Europe—especially in England—titles are extant. The English law books are full of laws regulating titles.

XVIII.

Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto 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 trodeth the secrets of the sky, And why dare give the source of light the lie? The charms of empire he oft declares, Hince tempest, hidden terrors, open woes; He first the fate of Caesar did foretell, And pitied Rome, when Rome in Caesar fell; In iron clouds concealed the public light.

XIX.

And various mortals feared eternal night; Dix earthshakers rent the solid walls below, And from their summits shook the eternal stone; Pale spectrels in the close of night were seen, And voices heard of more than mortal men.

Dryden's Virgil.

XIX.

“And he knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son.” Mat. 1: 25.

Plato, it is said by Oiosneas, born the son of Archid by a woman, who was kept pure from all matrimonial intercourse until her announcement. See Strauss' Life of Jesus, Vol. 1, 524.

XX.

“Speak not evil of another.” James 1:11.

Yet no one speaks evil of another? Plato— Laws,

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!” Common saying.
The infinite benevolence of the Orang.

To-day 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 seen as uniformity 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 serpent had borrowed it from baby.

To me, it is surprising that learned clergymen should satisfy themselves with such an answer. There are several grounds on which it is obvious such reasoning is invalid, unsatisfactory. Let us state them.

Infinite Benevolence of the Orang.

In the first place, the adder's fangs are of no value to him as a means of defence. Can he defend himself by means successfully against the attack of a strong boy with a long pole in his hand? Moreover, were 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 he said that these fangs were intended as a defence of the serpents against other irrational animals? What irrational animal attacks a snake? Very few I think. Dogs sometimes do. Perhaps some carnivorous birds do. But what if there be any known instance of a serpent successfully defending himself, or of 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 matter of defence, they would have to be frequently utilized. What would we think of a pistol as a weapon of defence, if no instance could be shown in which any person had successfully repelled an attack by means of a pistol?
In this case, 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 at much greater peril than they would be without these fangs. The whole race of man hate and destroy the Serpent race primarily because of these very fangs; and this is reason to think that the canine race do so too. The Troad is as ugly a creature as the Serpent, but he is much safer from the attack of dogs or men, though he possesses neither poisonous fangs nor any other defensive weapon. His harmlessness is his security. Since then the great peril to the Snake is the fact that he has poisonous fangs, could the Ority have given him these weapon as a defense, while he knew they would inspire the Canine race ten times more than it would be impressed with out them?

In the third place, the fangs of the Serpent are very seldom used in his defense, but are constantly used aggressively. We have heard of a snake biting any person or thing that attacks him. His fangs are only effective in attacking the innocent victim unaware of his presence. All the snakes I have that were perhaps ever heard of, have 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 in like way, this is generally, if not always so, in the case of what we call a Snake bite. Now rational beings often pervert the rights of the Ority to evil ends, but the irrational creatures, never. They are ruled 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 are aggressions on the unwarring party 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.

In the fourth place, benevolence is equity, and equity is equality. If God gave the Serpent his poisonous fangs for his protection, why then he must give some such protection to the Troad? The Serpent can protect himself from danger by escape much better than the Troad.
Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

Yet the toad has no weapon of defense whatever. Septum attack and wound the toad; and the toad has no kind of defense against it. Does this look like that sort of fairness which characterizes benevolence?

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

Nor have we anything analogous to this in the vegetable kingdom. Some trees and shrubs are guarded and protected by thorns; others not so. 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? Was 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 them, and the plum and hazel tree full of them? Why are the blackberry and the raspberry shrubs thorny, and the currant bush and the grape vine thorny? 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 the thorns. But what benevolence is there in so arranging these thorns that they will scratch somebody? And, according to such reasons as these, what benevolent purposes do 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 briers, but all poisonous plants, roots for food and medicine, malarias, 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 eradicate the infinite benevolence of the Creator, wisdom, 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 benevolent 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 pain, 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 those 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.

No wiser view, then, seems to be that we should humbly admit that these things, and indeed many other things in nature, are

Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

to be wholly inscrutable to our vision and unaccountable by our reason. The presumptions divine may attempt to explain all the mysteries of nature; for he has nobody to contradict him. But a wise man will rather suspend his judgment, and humbly admit his ignorance.

All things agree that the Deity is infinite. If, then, he is benevolent at all, his benevolence must be infinite. For an infinite Being can not have finite attributes.
Human sacrifices

Sure it not incredible, history would lead us to 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 American savages of America say the Mexicans practiced the abomination, and Prescott sustains them. But Catholic bigotry, love the Spaniards to exaggerate every thing against the Indians; and Prescott only authorizes are the Spanish priests and historians. On the other hand, the only native historian of the aborigines of North America, Bancroft, states it. I would follow Bancroft.

There is but too much reason to fear that this frightful 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 wanted, or he never would have supposed that God commanded him to sacrifice Isaac. Paul indeed says that he was willing to sacrifice Isaac, supposing that God was able to raise him up even from the dead. 44th Rom. 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, it 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 the word Jephtha condemned.

It is clear that the Law of Moses did not command human sacrifices, except under a previous vow. It is also clear that the Law of Moses does not forbid them. And it is equally clear that Aaron did command them in cases where anyone had previously vowed them. The following passage from Jer. 27:20, 21 answers this 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 fruit of the 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 sold it shall not be redeemed."

There is no escaping the conclusion that if a man slaughters [is used to herd 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. It is remarkable that neither in the passages cited, nor any where else in the Bible, is this kind of sacrifice or devotion forbidden or even mentioned unfavorably. The party seems 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 this passage only applied 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 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 earlier rejected.

Still, as human sacrifice certainly did not belong to the Jewish religion, 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 Abraham and Jephtha are fabulous and
Human Sacrifice

That the passage referred to in Rev. 2:9 is not authentic.

Whether the Romans ever offered human sacrifice, has been much disputed. It seems that Dr. Peck and Lord Macaulay denied it. On the other hand Dr. Dollis, a very learned German Catholic, Lord Mahon affirms it. Lord Stanhope in his Miscellaneous, agrees with Peck and Macaulay. But Dollis is supported by Sir John Aston, Lartaux, Pliny, and Dean Milman. The very fact that in 96 b.c. the Roman Senate, by a decree, forbade human sacrifice, 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 Dec. 1867, p. 116, 117.

Horace, in the first vol. (p. 267, 268, 269) of 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 the sort was very common with the ancients. The Messenians, on holy sacrifices, 300 men, of whom was the open-post, the Spartan king. Clement, St. Justin, A.D. 114.

Amazons

That nations of women called Amazons, in the early ages of the world, is attested by many ancient writers. The story is that these women separated from war, lived independently of them, were powerful in war, and maintained orderly government. Herodotus mentions them in history, and says they conquered the Scythian, and invaded Armenia. He says that they did sometimes marry, but that no virgin among them was permitted to marry until she had killed an enemy. Herodotus IV, (1107, IX. 22).

Plato in his Laws (B. C. 399) says that I know that there are, so to say, countless numbers of women about Pontus, whom they call Amazons. Another name for Amazons was Atalanta, or Atalantidae. In the Thessalian Tales, they were the women of the Thessalian people.

The name itself is from two words in the Greek, literally meaning "without a breast". Because these women cut off their right breast, that it might not inconvenience them in shooting arrows and in hunting the wild game.
The Irish and Latin hosts, too, mention the Amazon.

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 invader.
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 you would have done by," is quoted by Hillel, the President, at whose death Jesus was ten years of age, not as anything new, but as an old and well-known doctrine, that comprised the whole law." The Talmud and Christianity are alike as to moral duty. "The ethics in both are in their broad out lines identical." London Quarterly, Oct. 1867, p. 230. Confucius seems the first who mentioned the rule.
Fate and Predestination.

Fateful 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, as 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 victors. 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, benevolents, and Baptists, are all on the side of fate and predetermination; while against it are only the Lutherans, the great body of

baptists, the Church of England, and 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. And, 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 me 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 punishments. If every act that I do
Fate and Predestination.

has been eternally and unconditionally fate and predestination to be done; it is absolutely unthinkable that it is either 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—far higher than any cold reasoning. We are all conscious that we exist, and no reasoning can shake this consciousness. 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 instructive 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 unrighteousness, in which "orthodox" minds will recognize some obscure traditional memory of man's primal fall. All fancied what they called a certain "ceremonial" system, embodied in a series of lustreous rites and purifications, which, however broadly understood, were supposed to have the power of removing a certain moral uncleanness or disqualification, or of profiting some adverse influence. All had an organized priesthood, specially set apart for the defense of religion; and although the office of the
Polytheism.

The 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 Sumerian, the older Roman—coupled with this belief, the notion of a temporary purification from the stains of earth preparatory to the final gift of immortality. All observed stated days and festivals, and levied 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 imported, and even formally discarded the idea in practice, bore in their very constitution the clearest traces of the belief of a Providence unlooked and directing the affairs of men.”

North British Review of 1847, p. 138, 139.

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 religious have like resemblance among Jews and Christians. The likeness holds in regard to prayer, rites and sacrifices, a sacramental system, a priesthood, a future existence, purgatory, holy days and festivals, splendid temples and an imposing ceremonial, and a Divine Providence."

The Jews and the Christians will say the polytheists borrowed these resemblances from Moses and their successors. Perhaps so. But the Egyptians. See page 208.
might riot, and say, 'Now borrow his system of sacrifices, and cults, and his hatred of some from Egypt, where he was born and educated; and he might cite Herodotus as very plausible evidence of his assertion. For, according to the "History 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 disjunct as follows:

Israel. 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

we should have borrowed ours from you. You had many gods; we had but one. You worshipped a bull; we sacrificed bulls to our God. He both, indeed, consider a pig to be an impure beast, and if we touch him only with our garments we jump into the water; but you, as Herodotus tells us, sacrifice hogs to the Moon and Baal-chus, while we also offer any sacrifice of some. He will not eat pork at all; but when you sacrifice it to the moon and Baal-chus, you eat a part of the hog sacrificed. You worship images and vine spirits, and serpents; we are forbidden either to make or worship any image, or to worship any object in nature. Our religion is pure Theism; yours pure Polytheism. How, then, can you say that we borrowed our religion from you?

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. We make graven images; did not Moses make a calf and a serpent, and
Polytheism.

Place them with outstretched wings over the
many seats? And did not your Solomon make
images of lions? And was not the Ephod, the
Arim, and the Shammim of Moses objects of wor-
ship? What were the 400 porcupines of So-
mon but graven images? And did not that
monumental deity require his revenue for
our gods Belus, when he made his brazen
sea, and 12 graven oxen supporting it?
As to a multitude of gods, the Christian,
your bastards sons, have as many as we com-
bad. 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 divin
saints; they worship many images in their
churches, and crosses made of wood and
metal, as our gods 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?

And, the Jews have only one God,
and you have many. He do not worship
other angels, devils, or demons— we hold
them to be no gods, any more than men
and horses are gods. They are gods created.
But you hold your inferior deities to be
actually objects of worship, and you sacrifice
to them. As to Ephod and the Arim and
Shammim, we saw our worship there. They
were mere appendages of our temple. The
same is true as to the Cherubim and Seraphin
of Moses. As to Solomon's lions and brazen
oxen, he violated our decalogue in making
these graven images; nor did he make them
until 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.
Jesus 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 good
Jew abominates all such nonsense, perfidy
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 retained sin. They despised riches. Oil they considered a defilement. They delighted in white garments; and always drank in them at their meals. Their residence was incohesive; some of them found scattered in various places. They wear garments and should till they are worn out. Before sunrising, they did not talk together, but offered prayer to God. They bathed in cold water before eating. They said grace before and after eating. Dwelling they forbade. They were simple, peaceable, 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 sit in company, nor at all on the right side. So far they abased to be handled on the sabbath; and on that day they would not move a vessel out of its place, or go to store. They covered up their ordeals in pitch. Josephus says they were longlived, many of them living over 100 years. They were brave, and despised pain and death.

The sects would not eat flesh. With the Orphic Pythagorean School at Alexandria, they rejected all animal sacrifice.

Many call them "the Everlasting people, among whom no one was ever born."

They professed to be prophets, and the revelers 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 accounts of these Essenes, see Josephus Antiquities, ch. 10. 15. 16, 17, ch. 16. 15. 16, War of the Jews, b. 2., ch. 5, 6, 2, 3, 98.

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, Phcenicians, Syrians, Arabs, and Assyrians, guided by its firm and sure light, unmasked Divinity, and without reflection or reasoning obtained the purest form of religion that humanity has known. Bernard's Religion History 4 & 5:219. Sir Mahomet, 224.
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.

Servetus was born in 1511, at Valence 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 medicine and theology. He studied medicine, and practised it for many years as the chief employment of his life; however, he laboured in the study of divinity.

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

Meanwhile Servetus took up his abode in Vienna, Daphneph, where for several years he held the office of municipal physician. While there he had much correspondence with Calvin about Unitarianism and other dogmas. Upon this Calvin took offence. In this correspondence, Servetus proposed to go to Vienna and see Calvin. Calvin said, 'If he saw me, and my authority be of any avail, I will never suffer him to depart alive.'

Afterwards Servetus sent his Restitutio Christianiæ to Calvin. Oh, the more in 

flamed Calvin's hatred of him.

About this time—1535—a fellow named William Sarie—a friend of Calvin—lived at Geneva. At the suggestion of Calvin, he wrote to the Arragon, a zealous pietist at Geneva, requesting him to write and publish a treatise against Servetus, and offering to prove his heresies. The inquisition at Rome 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 secured from prison, and, hardly knowing whether to flee for safety, wandered to Geneva. 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 were drawn up by Calvin. The inquisition of him. The inquisition of him. One of the principal charges was that he had defamed 'John Calvin, a minister of God's Word in the church of Geneva.'
Servitus.

In Fontaine, a sort of State Attorney, conducted the prosecution. But Calvin aided him in it. Servitus prayed to be allowed to engage counsel in his defense, but Calvin objected, and the prayer was refused. Servitus prayed a sentence of the crown to the counsel of two hundred. But this was refused. Before final sentence, however, the Court referred the case to the Civil Church, for their view of it. The Church gave a response favorable to Servitus. Many of the ministers showed themselves in favor thereof, as Calvin himself. Among those were Bega, Tarel, Billaing.

Afterwards, the Council of State were convinced for their opinion. And Calvin, a member of that council, he was captain-general and first syndic. When he perceived that Servitus would be condemned, he said he would not be a partaker in his blood, and withdrew from the Council. The sentence finally was that he should be bound the stake, and burnt alive, together with his book, till he was reduced to ashes. Remembered to prison he sent for Calvin to beg his intercession. Calvin went. But he says that when he discovered that Servitus would not renounce his heresy, he left him.

At the place of execution, Servitus knelt

and prayed to have mercy on his accusers; when which Servit who attended him, roughly said to you, 'who are so great a sinner, attempt to justify yourself?'

The last words of Servitus were: Jesus! thy son of the eternal God, have mercy on me!'

The fire 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 Servitus, admitting that he was the chief cause of it, and standing his memory.

The Test of Right and Wrong.

On this great question, it appears that there are two schools of philosophers. The one adheres to Statism; the other, to Eclaircissement. The one holds that the test is the divine law of harm or of nature existing before any created being existed; the other, that utility or expediency is the true and only test.

The doctrine of the first of these schools is well expressed by Locke, in his treatise, "De Legibus." He declares that "the impulse which directs to right conduct, and represses from crime, is not only older than the ages of nations and cities, but coeval with that Divine Being who makes and rules both heaven and earth." — "The principle that impels us to right conduct, and warns 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 Puftey: "We conclude that God will, and within the capacities 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
2.0.2

Test of Right and Wrong.

Nothing bad can be expedient. But who shall judge whether the act proposed to be done is expedient, if expedience is to be the test of its goodness? Shall frail, ignorant, passionate 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 us to so unwise a rule as this. He can judge certainly whether any particular act, proposed to be done, will, on the whole, in the long and uncertain future, 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. A 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, set him to testing the moral quality of the act on Mr. Paley's principles. He must seek to reason thus: Nature has given me this strong propensity. The pleasure of gratifying...
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 us good. Why should we not enjoy the ecstasy?

Life let us cherish
While yet the taper glows,
And the sweet flower
Pluck ere it blows.

Of both parties would reason thus, every one can see what would be the result. 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 the kind, the test of expediency and utility requires us to ask about reasoning whether the proposed act will affect favorably or unfavorably the general sum of human happiness, which shows the fallacy of the 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 temptation of vices the intellect and muddle the judgment; that the wise philosophers in the world are not always found 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 reformation 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 lawfulness, especially in the grounds of utility and expediency, commits the act if an opportunity offers. 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 affections and lustful desire.

I think, therefore, that becker'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 condition and moral sense are not much enlightened. Still, it is the best guide any, and we are wisely and will to follow it.
Delicacy.

It is commonly said that as to all those matters which relate to "the parts of shame," inoculation, &c., 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 Englishman, Dr. Richardson, I think. She had never seen him. In one of her letters to him, she writes thus:

"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 thus 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-bed (and they are so dear to me) have taken so much time that I could not answer your letter— I can not 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. So children at all, bad sons, or at most lovely daughters like you and Milton. But a daughter or a son only, with a good heart without genius, I will nevertheless honoured."

"You shall think I will not be a nanny, but a nurse only." 42. 56.

In November, Mrs. Klopstock "died in a very dreadful manner, in childbirth." See Miss Milford's "Recollections of a Literary Life," p. 121, 122.
Delicacy.

Abraham begat Isaac: and Isaac begat
Jacob; and Jacob begat Judah and his
brethren; and Judah begat Phares and
Zara of Thamar; and Phares begat Es-
ron; and Esron begat Aam—Abraham
begat Isaac; and they lived while they
lived; and Isaac begat Jacob; and
Jacob begat all these sons: and
Jacob lived while he lived.

I find, too, that the ancient fathers
of the Church were, at least some of them,
not very delicate in the choice of words.
Thus Justinian, in his noble Apology
for the Christians, written about A.D. 200,
says “When, therefore, we are at the charge
of an entertainment, it is to refresh the
bowels of the needy, but not as you
serve those parents among you, who glory
in selling their liberty for stuffing their
mouths."
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Delicacy.

And Marcus Minicius Felix, who flourished in the first half of the third century, and who from being a Roman lawyer turned Christian, says, in his "Octavius," p. 28, "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 if you were a priest—saying your prayers to a god, 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 of the organs of digestion, that a wise and good Being made us; and then he adds, "It is not difficult to describe how the gross remains of our food are digested by the motion of the intestines, which contract and dilate; but that must be declined as too indelicate 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 fame, and a thing to make one take it right, for men to bring in silver
mine-pans, and plundered parts of cisterns, and, they value in their estaters, and for silly purposes to get paid recklessly, and, for every thing indeed, so that, being


The Acts of the Apostles xxi. 37. says, "And not a few hired houses were made ready for us, and we will be ready with all haste, that we may be able to set out in a safe ship way." The place,

"and not a few hired houses were made ready," and the next verse, "that we may be able to set out in a safe ship way."
Sir William Hamilton, in his lectures on Metaphysics, asserts that the phenomenon of matter, taken by themselves, so far from warranting any inference to the existence of a God, would on the contrary serve ground an argument to his negation. Methodist Quarterly, Oct. 1863, p. 387.

I do not believe the assertion of Sir William. Pity not many and many other Moderns 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 discretion, to be the work of a divine Providence, shows himself to be destitute of those faculties."
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 religiousists 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 table drove, and argued well if arguments could move

O impious use! To nature's laws opposed, where bowls are in others' bowls closed.

Dryden's Poem on the Pythagorean Philosophy.

Philip III. ruled Spain 43 years. 

Motley, in his United Netherlands, says that Philip possessed a single virtue, it was the construction of the barriers of fame. If there are views, he possibly have an from which he was exempt, it is the exam if not permitted to human nature to attain perfection even in evil. He was immovable, implacable, false, unjust, cruel, persecuting. For the cause of God, he butchered and burnt vast number of men. His last sickness was extremely trying. Full of running sera, berend immovable and untenable wall on his flesh and bones. Many days he lay on his bed a man in strict Wun. He never wavered. Christian resignation in him was perfect. Those inform that he was near death, his last act was to dispatch a courier for the Pope's blessing. He declared that, in all, he had never committed done wrong to any one. He implored the abbot to future Diego. Then he took the sacrament, and took it almost whole till he died. Some extreme warning was administered, and from him he derived infinite consolation. He had collected many relics of Saints. There he kept on a table near and derived much ghostly benefit from them. Especially a bone of St. Alban.
In all the learning of his age, he was as superstitious as his great master St. Augustine. He was a believer in witchcraft, and sentenced it to the death. He denied a doubt as to the existence and evil agency of the devil, as wicked as atheism. His theology made and loved equally a trinite 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 superstitions and persecuting Church, our possession a more holdish animosity towards hunters than him.
Chronology.

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

Plato speaks of the world as being "10,000 times 10,000" years old. Plato, L. iv. v. m. 13.3.

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

The Egyptian priests declared to Herodotus "that from the first king to the priest of Luxeum [king Aha], who last reigned, there were 341 generations of men, and during these generations there were the same numbers of chief priests and kings." And thus, say Herodotus, they estimated at 11,340 years. Herodotus—Euterpe, 142.
Fables and fabulous stories.

Theophrastus says of Noah's Ark, that "the remains are, to this day, to be seen in the Arabian mountains." Theophrastus to Autolycus. B. 3. ch. 17. Anti-Attic 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

[the Jews] on the other hand, by thinking up to offer these things to God as if he needed them, might judgedly render it an act of folly rather than of divine worship. For he that made heaven and earth, and all that is therein, and gives us all the things of which we stand in need, certainly require none of these things which he himself testifies on such as think of furnishing them to him. But those who imagine that, by means of blood, and the smoke of sacrifices and burnt offerings, they offer sacrifice acceptable to him, and that by such honors they show him respect. Thus, by supposing that they can to him who stands in need of nothing, appear to me in no respect to
differ from those who stupidly 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 wavered 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 processes as Babbage's calculating machine. The commentary of the laymen on the preaching and practicing 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. Holmes. Prof. of the

Breakfast Table, 148.

Anger. Kant, p. 15

Plato says, "By gratitude, anger, a thing most wickedly, the Socratic prostration passion with an evil fruit; and, just as 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, 13.4.21

"The angrier, the more fierce he is and the more he exerts his powers on himself. Bernoulli.

Do myself ever get angry?
Rumour's between content and facts.

XXXII.

"It is hard for the to hide against
the princes." Paul - Acts 9:5.

I would rather sacrifice to him
than bring wrath, high against the
princes; a mortal against God." Aeschylus in "The Bacchae.

XXXIII.

And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon
the earth: and all the high hills that were
within the whole heaven were covered. Gen.
Gen. 5:19 ye.

The sky from pole to pole with clouds resounds;
And showers increased down pouring on the ground.
Then glad in colors of a varying sky,
Ammonian Isis breed a new supply
To feed the clouds: the impetuous rain downpours;
The brained horn beneath the burden bends:
Orphanthed down repulse their finished game.
And the long labor: of the year are vain.
For from his patriarchal heaven, alone
As you content to bear his vengeance down:
Aid from his brother of the sea he sends,
To help him with auxiliary waves.

The vengeful tyrant calls his broods and feels;
Throttling from many arms, their moist albes,
And with perpetual war his palace fills.
So where in brief he thus impacts his will:
Small sorrows bitter needs your power supply.
And this bad work—so love regime—obliterate.
Let loose the reins of all your vengeful store.
Beat down the arms, and open sally dawn.
The hands by nature sooner to claud,
And proudly swelling with their new commerce.
Lumps in the living stones that stopped their way.
And groaning from their source against the sea.
Stood with his mare their inconvenient through the ground.
With mutual trembling earth received the runners;
And many patterns from its source exulted.
The sacrificed waters gather on the plains;
And feast the flocks, and over the plains.
Vore running around with a strong sway.
Bumptious and wild, and laboring hence long.
For safe their dwellings were, for sake of floods.
Their house fell upon their household gods.
She saw him too strongly, built to fall.
High on their hand—while a meeting small.
Two six and satis more in one buckle lost;
A world of waters and without account.

Ovid's "Epistola of Augustus,"
Translated by Frydel.
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;"

of like story in some respects to one of an invasion of Egypt by Thutmose III, in the reign of king Joshua, the priest of Lachish.

Herodotus says: "After this, Sennacherib, king of the Arabians and Assyrians, invaded a large army against Egypt. The priests being reduced to a state, entered the temple and beseeched before the image 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 encamped at Pelusium, the entrance into Egypt. There a number of field mice housing 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 fled before of their army, many of them fell.

And to this day a stone statue of the king stands in the temple of Lachish with a mouse in his hand, and this inscription on it: "Whoever looks on me, let him reverence the gods!". Herodotus—Europe, 481.
Hand-writings.

It seems that Sir Henry Jenner has invented a method of transcribing and multiplying manuscripts which promises much, especially as to ancient writings. The invention is called Photographography. Its advantage over photography is, first, the greater facility with which copies can be multiplied, and secondly, the more durable nature of the impressions. Volumes of this have already been formed most interesting collections in the annals of ancient handwriting. By these we are able to see the different hands of writing in different ages and different countries, and to judge of the characters of the different writers by their chirography, if hand writing indicates a character. North British Review, June 1866, 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. Certain thew factors 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, pains, 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 of words, or obliteration, or omission, or interline—of the spots in which blotter—be sure the writer is not deceit in his dress, scrupulous in his morals, or clear and logical in his thoughts. Such a man will tread on a lady's toe and spit on a gentleman's coat.
Wise Words.

Happy is the nation that has no history. — 18th British Review, June, 1815, p. 124.

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

What is universal may be called natural. — Paley.

A liar, never wicked man was wise. — Homer.

People of much sentiment are like fountains whose overflow keeps a disagreeable muddle about them. — H.W. Beecher.

Man a dog, vomit a dog, still a dog is but a dog. — French proverb.

"I don't buy revenge at 10,000 dollars" (H13, 23) Dramaions.

"Homo est totus in suo simplicissimo habitu." A learned man has always help in himself. — Phaedrus.

"Cantabit quidam omnium uterque" The funeral oration was sung before the rabbit.

Wise Words.

He who has nothing, has nothing to fear. — Spanish Proverb.

"Transfert et altera dea mala facta, arbitrati." — Misplaced good deeds are ill placed. — Seneca.

Let the grapes grow for the season of the branches; without branches there would be no grapes. — Justinian.

The world is like the ebb and flow of the well with its two buckets: the full one is ever emptied; and the empty one is ever filled.

You can not touch the sensibility of a fool; a dead man's body does not feel the knife.

For a man who has been ruined by a woman, there is no legal one no judge.

Throw no stones in the well whence you have drunk.

Where Satan can't enter himself, he said, none as his messenger. — Justinian.
Miss Words

To change those favorable representations, which most give 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
original, are right; and most hearts are
pure while temptation is away. It is easy
to awaken generous sentiments in privity;
to define death, when there is no danger;
to glow with benevolence, when there is
nothing to be given. While such ideas are
powerful, the one fact; and self-love does
not suspect the glories of virtue to be the mother

Music is inarticulate poetry. O'Neill.

Every art is best taught by example. Johnson.

Shrouds have no pockets.

Trust not yourself; but your deities to know
Mak' in of every friend and every foe. Pope.

"The seed of believing something extra-
ordinary, is innate in man."

Herbert's Path of Life 325

Miss Words

Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
The eternal days of God are now;
But error waddles with us in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers. Bryant.

Truth gets well if she is run over by
a locomotive, while error dies of looking
if she scratches her fingers. Holmes.
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 communion,
followed him all his life; and it “ grew
with his growth, and strengthened with
his strength.” He seems to have been
institute of pity, mercy, and benevolence.
So make others miserable seemed to be
his darling attribute; to contribute to their
happiness, his strange work. If to assess
his wife would have given her pleasure,
surely he would have repriamed from it
as a deadly sin. He was a stranger to all
those kind, sympathy which constant

John Calvin

the chariots of mankind. A through
Jesuit, his hand was against every
man, and consequently every man’s
hand was against him. He quarreled
with nearly all his friends, and defied
and vilified all his enemies. In fine,
such war, stubbornness, and obstinacy,
and bigotry, that his whole life, after he
became a preacher, was one great quarrel.

Calvin quarreled with Luther, and with
mer, and Melancthon, and Knox, and
almost every distinguished reformer. Berg
and Hard were his favorite and his
toadies; but he several times fell out
with them, and abused them like all
others.
John Calvin.

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

Calvin was a genuine persecutor. Not only did he upset the death of St.-Vincent, 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 Bolza, despite the latter's denial of 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 fanaticalism; and he entertained no doubt, that it was the duty of good Christians to kill all who denied these dogmas. And the typical cruelty of his nature was such that he was not content that heretics should suffer an easy death. Torment and fire applied to heretics were the beam-ideas 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 hates them, why should Calvin not hate them too?
John Calvin.

What between his natural cruelty and
fierceness and his doctrine of eternal repula-
bation, he was the paragon of all atrocious
persecutors. The annals of Pagan and Chris-
tian Rome do not bear that exceeded him
as a furious, fiery, fiendish persecutor.
His fury and cruelty towards Saracens
were equal to the highest achievements in
this line of Nero, Caligula, and the Span-
ish inquisitors. Nay it went beyond them;
for he first—Judas-like—betrayed Sal-
vitus to their common enemy, the empire,
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 sincerity. A number of times he
was caught in lie, and more than
once in contemptuous mendacity.

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

Wife, quit the house, and became great en-
emies of Calvin's. The story is told in
Pyr's Life of Calvin, pp. 230, 237.

Calvin was a sailor. He constantly
insulted his opponents with the viloi-
spites... Blasphemous, slanderer, foul-
mouthed, def. ignorance, impiety, impo-
 beast, vagabond, seamy, knave, etc.

Then turn him he often employed. The spi-
that "Beast", he often used and called him.
Calvin was a coward. He took good
care to keep out of danger. He was way
pre to put his followers in this predic-
ment. But he kept at a safe distance
himself. He gave the Pope and the

John Calvin.

Inquisition a cause birt. 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 princes to get him one. He told them he
was not "one of your mad kind of lovers"—
"the only thing that satisfies me is that she be
chaste, obedient, humble, economical, patient;
and that there be hopes that she shall be
solicitous about my health." They found
him a wife—the widow of an anabaptist,
with the sympathetic name of Sisletto.
Sisletto lived with him about ten years.
And then died. He bore the loss with singular resignation—shewing himself no more likely to run mad with grief than with joy. He said "I swallow my grief in such a manner that I have not interrupted my functions for a moment. Nay, the Lord hath; meanwhile, exercised me with other content." Just says that "he must have been pursing his usual avocation while his wife lay still unburied!"

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

John Calvin

Such was the father and founder of Presbyterianism!

I blame no man for calling himself a Presbyter or Presbyterian. But he who replies in the name Calvinist is a fool or a bigot. Helmore well says, "When the Reverend Mr. Calvin (so Calvin's name originally was) and his associates burned my distinguished scientific brother, — he was burned with green pagots, which made it rather slow and painful— it appears they were in a state of barbarism. The decrees of such people about the Father of mankind and his creatures are of no more account..."
Galvin

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 relative for

wrongly++, or burns my instructor for

not believing as he does, I care no more

for his religious edicts, than I should

for those of any other nation.” Pfr. of

the Breakfast Table, 133, 134.
Martin Luther.

This distinguished man was born in Saxony, 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 popish doctrines.

Luther was as furious against heretics as the Pope himself, and he was equally disposed to persecute them with fire and sword. In this respect, he made no difference between Catholics and Protestants 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 base, 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 criminating manner of treating the word of God. Want as 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
of it or not, I am all the same covered with mud, and so the best way is to let the mud pass on." He advised his friends to "avenge severity to.Brammus; to be terrible and unflinching towards that servant. I will write against him and kill him. It is true that to crush Brammus is like crushing a bug; but he has mocked and insulted my Christ, and he shall be punished."

"Mr. Every body," says Luther, "should be made to demean himself freely under the influence of the law and the sword, just as we keep wild beasts in order by chaining them."

Luther was very superstitious. Everybody has read of his fight with the devil, in which he accused Satan by proclaiming him without iniquity. He believed in "changelings"—i.e. that the devil sometimes carried off human bodies, and left in their emacies his own imps. Such a changeling a woman once presented to Luther. Its name was Killcrup. It was a great glutin. It cried when others laughed, and laughed when others cried. Luther advised the woman to carry it to the shrine of some saint. He says that as she was on her
Luther

way to do so, as she was crossing a bridge with Killcroph in a basket, something like a crown flowing on, and said, "Killcroph! where are you going?" Killcroph answered, "going to see the saint.

Whereupon the woman, a frighted thing, threw basket and Killcroph into the river; when, mirabile dictu, two crocuses flew away, one of which was, of course, Killcroph.

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 predestinationists. Luther was the more ferociously brave; but Calvin was the more insidiously cunning. Calvin persecuted Susanna 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 Nile; 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 Pythisa 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 because

Pythagoras

So the young he taught the duties of temperance, self-control, respect for the aged, and a generous bearing toward all men. He urged virtue, truth, family, and humility on all classes. He was very eloquent, and made 300 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 benificent influence on vast numbers of people. Like Socrates and Plato, 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.
Unitarians

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

Bunyan's Rel. Hist. of Brit. 317
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. Yorant, 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 striking, because 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, godly man, a preacher of the Church of the United Brethren:

Doctor 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 Mrs. Hendrick and Mrs. Caleb B. Smith watched his body.

In that condition he lay many hours— I forget how many. But before they were ready to carry the body to the grave, he revivized.

He says that he was perfectly conscious all the while; that when separated from the body, he remained in the room, sometimes looking at it as it lay lifless on the bed; and that some beautiful beings like birds assisted him to the ships; 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 Jesus, and how heard the shriek of them, and saw persons whom he had known on earth; and that those 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.

Is 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 Doctor Hendrick. Plato there tells us that one night, 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 bury
The body, he revived, and told marvel-
ous things of what he had seen and
heard beyond the river Styx. It may
be, however, that Plato means it was
more fable. Yet Spinoza, in his Intro-
duction Address to the Tractat, ch. 27, seems
to treat it as a reality.
The Catholic Trinity.

With the Catholics, says Remon, "Mary has entered by full title into the Trinity. She far exceeds that forgotten person, the Holy Spirit, with neither lovers nor admirers. 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, receives the crown from the hand of the former, and the homage of the latter, disclose the True Trinity of Christian unity" with The Catholics. Remon's Religious History of Criticism, p. 335.
Spiritualizing Scripture.

Mr. H. ridicules the orthodox mode of spiritualizing Solomon's Song by spiritualizing the phrase that Jacob built, thus:

"The house that built, this is a double meaning. The house that Jacob built it is the Christian Church, which in the New Testament is the Name for Jesus, which is the English for Johannes, the Greek name for God's Gift. The "mael" is the doctrine of the Christian Church, as containing the Spirit of Christianity. The rat that ate the mael is the Christian Eucharist, 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 Lange in the symbol, the cock with the crumbling horn that tossed the dog is the French government which drove out the priests, and the "crumbling horn" denotes the Battle of the cock, and thereby seems more clearly to denote the French government than any other, for the crumbling horn is much like the end of a cock. "The maiden all forlorn" is Liberty. "The man all stubbed and torn" is the French people mourned of Liberty, and counting itself a most jilting Jacob in the Revolution. The priest all shorn and shorn is Lafayette; shorn, because..."
Theodore Parker, it seems, studied the Homeric Writings with great care. In the 2nd vol., is, of his life by Mrs. H., it is said that, after long course of Homeric study, he wrote, in 1860—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 sang; 3. that he sang in detached pieces, which were repeated by others; 4. that these all became more or less corrupt; 5. that other pieces were reckoned as Homeric which are not so; 6. that the man 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 these men also 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.

Hassell calculates that the numbers of the adherents to the different 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 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 psalm, and psalm, and song. Sacred song has always been a part of Christian worship. And with the religion of paganism have sprung their religious poetry and music. And, if we may credit the Bible, is it otherwise in the heavenly world. There the good angels sit in the throne rejoicing, forever hymning the praise of the Father of the Universe. Our subject is, therefore, 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. Thus were the 'songs of Zion,' which gave life and joy to Jewish worship. And Jesus himself approved its form, for he closed the institution of the Eucharist with a hymn, "thy song a hymn and went out." How much we like to know 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 praised and sang praises. And the prisoner Philemon about the year 60 A.D., in his celebrated letter to Philemon, says that the Christians at their meetings sang hymns to Jesus as to God. And it is indubitable that since all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, with the single exception of the Dunkers, 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 elaborate composition of hymns has ever arisen in that church. At this day the book entitled 'Catholic Piety,' and commonly used by the Catholics in this country by the public, does not contain even more than 161 psalms and hymns. 16 of which are in Latin, and 25 in English.
Sacred Song.

Of those in English, it is remarkable that there are few hymns—'Hosanna, my life, my love' by Watts; 'Jesus, lover of my soul,' by Chaldecott; and 'Jerusalem, my happy home,' by an unknown writer—the former is in the Psalms of David, and the latter is in the Psalms of Solomon. But let us see the Catholic Church justify itself. It may well be doubted whether a great variety of hymns is of any advantage to any congregation, and more than half of them are heard twice. In the Reformed Church, however, they have but few, yet some of them are very noble. The Protestants have the Psalms equal to them, but not as superior to the Psalms. The Catholic Church has the Psalms. 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, Gow, Aspinall, Ravensbridge, Heber, Stukenberg, White, Pierpot, Harris, and many others. Each of these has written a few admirable hymns—none of them many. But the two great composers in this department 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, but Watts perhaps wrote more of the very highest order than Watts. In his writing Watts gave the palm to Watts; the world perhaps gives it to Watts. In this department they have both been great benefactors of the church and world. Their sacred songs are read and sung by millions of people in England and America, and will be read and sung as long as the English language continues. When have their songs smoothed the brain of grief, cheered the hearts of the sorrowful, and delighted the soul of the saint?

From these rich store, 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 imitate the poetry, and the poetry has always suffered by it. The change of a word has often destroyed the sense and the beauty of a whole stanza. For example, a line of Watts' magnificent hymn: 'by Dr. Watts—Their shadow 
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Sacred Song.
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Where'er the Sun he has been spoilt by compilers, by the alteration of a single propriety. The hymn is an imitation of the 72nd Psalm in which occur these words, "Prayer also shall be offered for him continually," which Hath elegantly renders, "He shall stand in prayer be made." But the compilers in many hymns have changed it thus: To him "he"—thereby destroying the beautiful allusion to the Psalm, in order to make it favor the Lutheranian creed. I can easily see why the Orthodox church should do this; but why a church having no creed but the Bible should do it puzzles me.

But compilers of hymn books have gone much further. In copying some of our best hymns, they have not spared to omit whole stanzas. I believe you can not find in any hymn book the whole of Havercamp's delightful hymn on gratitude, though 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 Mullenburg's admirable hymn—"I would not live always." All hymns ought to be smooth and harmonious in numbers, accurate in is elegant in style, and pure and reverent 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 feel.

Some hymns are adaptations of old poetry, and yet are much sin. In one popular church, "Jesus my all to heaven I give" 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 traced I see, and I'll pursue" is shocking. —To teach Jesus!

In this respect, I think even such a church 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 this traveler, "The Deity—"

With thee all night I mean to stay,
And tarry till the break of day.
Without ceasing the story of the contest
Between Jacob and the angel, it appears to me blasphemous for any mortal to talk
about wrestling with God!

On the contrary, Hath has observed, by tone or phrase expansions, but I think he
Sacred Song.

Some times, dear Brothers and Sisters, when we were in the midst of our worship of too much familiar-ity, occasionally we find in his hymns, and expressions of "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 doggerel, which are thrown upon churches by unlettered, illiterate writers of religious rhymes? In times of great religious excitement, these finery scribblers have infected Christian congregations as thelocates infected Egypt. But 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. 50 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 or the good old ship Zion; others preferred to "flee bold Jordan stream my man 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 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 would chase a bee, and two could put horses to flight. Miss Jane in Uncle Tom's Cabin has the negroes singing one of these war songs commencing thus:

"Hark, brethren, don't you hear the sound? The martial trumpet now is sounding.

Most of her readers doubtless 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 folk in church.

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

Come listen while I tell the news,
A scheme of war I have in view,
When men, a-simmer, cold and fright,
Are forced to fall or take to flight.

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

But if these things are offensive against just taste and true feeling, the fashion of writing choruses to sacred songs is still worse.

There are a few choruses, which have been written by the compiler of the hymn, to which they are attached, and of which they are a part, that are unobjectionable. Such is the delightful chorus to that charming hymn by Bishop Hذرم... Hail the blest monarch. Of such I do not speak. I allude to those numerous instances in which fine hymns, made by genuine poets, have been distorted and defaced by the addition of foolish choruses by foolish men. Such interludes are, in language offensive to good taste, and shocking to genuine piety; and they often express 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 monstrousness 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 Sion, Hallelujah;
Began to sing and shout to Zion, Hallelujah;
The towering walls came trembling down, Hallelujah;
Thunder flat upon the ground—glory Hallelujah.

Short, short, we are gaining ground;
We'll shout old Satin's kingdom down;

Die in the field of battle,
Die in the field of battle,
With glory in my soul.

Babylon is fallen, it fallen, it fallen;
Babylon is fallen to rise no more;

O, I'm in search for the kingdom;
Will you go to glory with me?
Hallelujah, Praise ye the Lord.

O that I'll be joyful, joyful, joyful,
O that I'll be joyful to meet to part no more;

And I'll sing Hallelujah,
And you'll sing Hallelujah,
When we arrive at home.
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 there is constantly an association of ideas with circumstance under which we first become familiar with the air or tune. If you sing a religious song to the tune of Yankee Doodle, I can not help thinking of the song called Yankee Doodle. Such a thing would be an in-appropriate as to hold a prayer meeting in a drinking saloon. And yet this rule is often violated. We frequently hear hymn sung to a barn dance tune. 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 sorrowful tune sung to a joyful hymn, and equally so, to hear a mournful 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 think music may charm fashionable people, I understand and can appreciate all the complication of a melody; but it is the solemn, 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 ought to be preferred. With new tunes there are unpleasant associations of idea; they bring to the mind no agreeable reminiscence. But if you will sing me some old, old tune which I heard in my childhood, and you touch at once the tenderest chord in my heart. You bring to my fancy the scenes of my early life. You remind me of my father and mother now in their grave, singing the 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 sang it to a new tune.
Repetition 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 repeating 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 or sing the word “hallelujah” once, you have expressed all that can be expressed by that word. Why then repeat it? Is so doing done any thing to the idea? Especially why sing “hallelujah”? Are our halls any better than one or do they improve the understanding or increase and intensify the emotion? Such repetitions, they are sometimes very awkward—sometimes very ridiculous—and sometimes, they even border on profanity.

For the last fifty years, the old hymn—“When I can read my title clear”—has been much sung to a tune requiring the one half of the 3rd line of every stanza to be repeated three times. Then “I bid farewell, I bid farewell, I bid farewell to every tear”, brevitating the words unknown. But when we speak, repetition you come to do a word in two: it is ridiculous. Thus, in the same hymn, you sing, “So I let safe, so I let safe, so I let safely reach my home.”

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

“Our great salvation comes,
It was sung thus:
“Our great sal—our great sal—our great salvation comes”
by the line

“Our poor polluted souls.”

Sung thus:
“Our poor soul—our poor soul—our poor polluted souls.”

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

It is likely, I think, who has said “Music, alas, too long has been pressed to obey the devil.”
And I suppose that, not only in profane, impassioned, 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 dise of the Ority.

The perversion of good things renders them 'the worst of all things', "as Heaven's best beam turns dingy in smoke." 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, makes our devotions, and purifies our hearts. But the use of badly composed hymns, sung to inappropriate and unsuitable airs, often invites to evil passions, with 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 inadvertently, 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 sash I carried was marked "W. Ray, Indianapolis." A stranger came into the car and took a seat near me, and we talked thus:

Mr. How are you, Mr. Ray?

Mr. How do you do, sir?

Mr. I think I have met you at Indianapolis.

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

At that moment a man entered, an acquaintance passed me, and said "How do you do, Judge?" The stranger resumed.

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

Mr. Yes, about 15 years.

Mr. Who are present compose the supreme court of Indiana?

Mr. Judges Elliott, Frazer, Snegoff, and Ray.

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

J. No, sir.

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

J. Not a day.

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

J. As, sir, I am not, and never was a Supreme Judge.

He. How strangely I am mistaken.

J. Yes. The name on this carpet sash has misled you. You forget that I may have borrowed or stolen this carpet sash. 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 sash was my name. Then pretending a former acquaintance of mine, he amusingly 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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