Religion without a God

Auguste Comte, a French Philosopher of the age, has discovered a religion, or invented one, that altogether dispenses with a Deity. He seems to think that a religion which teaches 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-abnegation, and that we must not only love our neighbor as ourselves, but more than ourselves—or rather not love ourselves at all. He even insists that no pleasure to oneself is innocent except so far as it is necessary to bodily or mental vigor. He argues that any one should eat or drink beyond the mere necessities of the body.

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

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

According to 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 expects the any proselytes.

See the thing at large in the Westminster Review for July 1855, p. 3.

Grande quarrel with his wife and friends. Wood illness a year or two. Passed away by his death, strict diet, to live a day as frugal as a monk, a piece of dry bread was his usual daily bread, and he made the Fraternal of Christ, Dante, of Homer, born 1825, died in 1857. He was irritable, pious, religious. The Edinburgh Review of April 1855, p. 162.
A Puzzle.

I take the substance of the following from
Herbert Spencer's "First Principles."

Philosopher. This thing, motion, is a curious
thing. In regard to it our sight can de-
eive us.

I wish, I see nothing strange in it. Nor
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 six miles
an hour. You walk from the prow to the
stem at the same rate of speed; are you,
when thus walking, moving to the East or the West?

A. North. I am remaining in the same
point of space—just as a horse on the wheel
of a tread-mill.

P. So it would seem. But let us consid-
er the surface of the earth on the equator to
westward about 1000 miles an hour, carrying
you and the ship, too, about that fast to the West.

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 di-
rection I walked on the ship, or in what
direction season 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 travels 40000
miles an hour to the West. What do you say
now?

A. That's a fact. I forgot that. Well we
are entirely right at last. The result must be an
clearly that if the earth's diurnal motion carries
us fast 1000 miles an hour; and if its annual
or orbital motion carries us 40000 miles an hour,
to the West, I am travelling 6000 miles an
hour to the West.

P. Let us not be too confident. It is
now a well established fact that the earth has
still another motion. Astronomers know that
that the whole solar system, including the
sun, the Earth, and all the other planets, is moving
now toward the constellation of Hercules with inconceiv-
able velocity, and rolling in a vast orbit, the
eccentricity of which is utterly unknown.

and the centre of which is but vague conjecture.

Nor 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, did mean a chief servant. But now, in its customary use, it as often means a master. 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 clergy men are called ministers of the gospel, yet this oftener rule than serve their flock. So the pop is he himself serious sermon.

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 if we situate the figure a little, we shall catch a new 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 are sheep. I don't like to be called or dream a shepherd. Moreover, a flock of sheep includes lambs, ewes, wethers and rams. Not very appropriate terms to apply to decent beholders.

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

Un. This prefix usually changes totally the sense of the word to which it is prefixed as: like and unlike—wise and nonsense—do and undo. 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 untill.

Dona and daff. These words seem to be more new formations of the phrase, "do one" and "do off."

Sublunary. Sublunary, from the Latin sublunas, French, grandeur; is originally greatness in size. Sublunary, from the Latin sublunas, also means greatness, originally greater, not in height. Grandeur is applied 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 implies more powerful sensations, more elevated feelings than the grand. Grand is hardly applicable to style, though sometimes so applied; a sublime style is a common and accurate exposition.
Rambles Among Words.

Education. It is strange that of late years this word is used as synonymous with instruction, though literally and formally it is opposite in meaning. Instruction literally means one's calling or business—education literally means the act of calling from the business of calling aside. The one is from the Latin vocatio, the other the Latin proposition a and vocatio, literally from a vocatio.

? It is certain that our interrogation point was originally the letter 9, where it was written thus: 9. And the letter was thus used as the initial of the word question. So now the point : indicates that the sentence preceding it is interrogative. Formerly, it was put at the beginning of the sentence, not at its end as now.

""" The quotation marks were originally nothing but the letter 9, which stood for cited or citation.

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

Rambles Among Words.

Instruct & Instruct. These words signify in this that the former is the act of the will; the latter, the act of the judgment. He accords to a request; we accord to a proposition.

Circumstances. This word is from circum and stances, stances standing around the common phrase "surrounding circumstances." is therefore theological. This word is often used in the singular, but perhaps more accurately, for how can a single thing stand around any other thing? The term "surroundings," as a noun, is growing into use. However, 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 inclusive, considered, or enveloped. A city is surrounded by a wall—a garden is enclosed by a fence, a bird or beast is inclosed by a cage. The earth is surrounded by the atmosphere.

Rather. In Milton's day, this word was the contraction of Rather—their, rather, rather, rather.
Rambles among Words.

Sts. The positive it is a new word. It is not found in our Bible. So for it is, is always wrong. We should say This or it is.

Extraneous. Professor proposed to adopt this word as meaning "out of door".

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

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

Ashew. This word, in the time of James I., meant Linen, deuco-dye. So it is used in John, 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 from of Chelmsford!"

Rambles among Words.

Dan. An old English word, Nite, is perhaps from the Spanish Deo, Heaven, it is I think, that says "God, Abraham," "Dan, now." Jupiter, Jove, Sun. Lippers, in his work on the nature of the body, tells us that Jupiter is derived from jumana, a "helping" father—that Jove is from the Sister, jumana, "helping," and that Sun is also a jumana, "helping."

Elchim, Schorah. According to Bishop Bede, these names which we translate God, Lord, mean respectively: "The Immortal, The self-existent."

Neptune. Lippers in his work concerning the nature of the God, says that this word "is derived a hand, from swimming, the first letter being a little changed." And the Sun, the same writer says this term is so named, either because he is soles [alone] or because he observes all the stars.
Rambles among Words.

Luna. - The moon is so called, from Shinig. Civen De Saturni Orisum.

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

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 signature. Hence sign & signature are derived.

North British Review, June 1828, p. 217.

Burlington, our minister to China, says the Chinese have more books, encyclopedias, pamphlets, magazines, etc., than any other people. "Our princes had encyclopedias enough for volumes."
The celebrated Catholic Maxim.

In fine, *Maxim. Eccl. magno
huc erundum est, ut in timorium,
quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab
omnibus, credendum est, hoc est enim
vitae propriae catholicum.

I forget where I found the above, but Vincentius Siringius, who wrote
about A.D. 434, in his commentary,
expresses it thus: "Dom ubique, quod
semper, quod ab omnibus credendum
est," *vita fides est.
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 portions of every ship attract the needle and produce a variation. Iron wooden ships will do this, and they do it more in some localities on the sea than on others. The cause is that the iron stanchions, bolts and bars in the wooden ship affect the magnetic needle and thus produce the variation. Soft iron produces this effect much more than hard iron or steel. In certain places on the sea, the polar attraction of the earth is much weaker than at others, and the attraction of the iron in a ship 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 equivalent 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 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 softest iron becomes the most intense magnet, yet no two pieces of iron are exactly alike in this respect. And what is equally remarkable, the necessary hammering in fitting the parts of an iron ship together magnetises instantly the whole fabric. The difficulty in iron ships has been attempted to be remedied, by ascertaining the variation of the compass before sailing, on each ship, and then making the proper allowance for navigating her. But this is a very imperfect remedy; for the extent of the variation depends much on the course the ship is sailing, and also on the calmness or roughness of the sea. Besides, it seems that in every iron ship there are what are called a permanent and a sub-permanent magnetism. The latter is very great in new ships, but gradually wears out. As it was beaten in by hammering, it is beaten out by waves. 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 in a safe guide, for a future time, at 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 Advertiser, October 10, 1722.
**Woman.**

In the opinion of St. Chrysostom, woman is "a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic fruit, a deadly fascination, and a painter ill." Westminster Review, Oct. 1845, p. 158.

Homer, in his "Iliad," tells how Achilles spoke to him of woman and his wife. Thus:

"A woman, woman! When to ill the wine Is best, all hell contain pulmonary fire: And such was mine, who laid on my shore Thru the long hours when she deemed herself dead. Was I hoped, the toil of war overcome, To meet soft quiet and repose at home? Delusive hope! Oh, wife! the dead slipper Than Ajax! death, and blacken all the soul. And should posterity one worthless lead. Some blemishment, they will worse the kind."

Odyssey, Book 11, v. 531 to 540.

Lord Bacon has somewhere written substantially as follows:

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

"Love your wife, like yourself, hour by hour, then yourself. Whosoever lives unmarried, lives without joy;
Woman.


Free translation.

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


Plato, in his Republic, is a "Woman's Rights" man. He 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 social, p. 324. But see 2. Arndt, 318, 319, note 2.

2. It seems that meeting houses, or churches were not used by Christians till the 3rd century.
   1. Arndt's Church History, 291.

3. Image worship in churches, it seems, was first introduced about the last of the 3rd century. So they came in the train of fashionable church music. 1. Arndt 293.

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

5. As 1. above is doubtful.


7. It seems that the early Christians, like the Methodists, received numbers first on probation. The likewise of Divine fire in the probationary period at 2 years. 1. Arndt, 305.
Sumptuary Laws

Tertullian, in his "Apology for the Christians" ch. 6, says that the ancient Romans allowed not above a noble-£1.48- to be spent on an entertainment, and but one horse, and that not a crummed 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 theaters to the ground, as seminaries only of lewdness and immorality." Tertullian's Apology for the Christians, ch. 6
Remarkable facts relating to the occurrence of the names of the Deity—God & Lord—Elohim & Jehovah

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 6th verse of chaps. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaps.</th>
<th>God 11 times—Lord 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>Exodus</th>
<th>Leviticus</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Deuteronomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The several sheets in this book are the Lord Thy God and the Lord our God.
Bible Names of the Deity.

Thus it appears that the name Elohim, now Latin God, appears in the Old Testament about 2687 times; and that term Jehovah, translated Lord, appears about 5375 times.

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

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

1. It seems that however those 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 the portion of Genesis include a complete account of the creation, is there 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. 6:23 as saying I am the Lord; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of Lord Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them. Yet throughout the book of Genesis, we find that these patriarchs familiarly used the name Lord Jehovah. Is there not plainly some mistake here?

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

5. It is said that Proverbs and Ecclesiastes were both written by Solomon. In Proverbs the name Lord is used 62 times: and God only 3 times; and in Ecclesiastes, the name God is employed 36 times, and that of Lord does not occur once. In view of this, is it likely that the same man wrote both those books?

6. In Esther and Ecclesiastes, 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.
II.

Et post aliquid die resurrexit, ut accipendam eam, declinavit ut vidisset cadaverem. Eius, ut ore examinaret in ore leonis, gratia panis mellis.

Vulg. - Judg. 16: 8.

Quin ter eximias subductas corporis trahit, ut intellea totidem et vicem judicandos. Post tibi una sedes illius subductam ostendit, inferioris Officium mittit, Luciferum subicit. Hic vice, subitum omni ratio visibilis monstrum! Adjicient liquidaque longus viros totos

Suspendunt hanc, ut rectius effregunt rota, suspensumque trahi subicit, damnum actores simulac possum, ut huius omnium dimittat annus.

Vulg. - Josua 4: - Linea 530 to 540.

III.

And behold there was a man which had his hand withered - Thus said he to the man, stretch forth thy hand. And he stretcheth it forth; and it was restored whole like as the other. Matt. 12: 11-13.

When he had thus spoken, he stretch the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said to him, go wash in the pool of Siloam. He went
The story of the priest, whose wife played the whore, given in the 19, 20, 31 chapter of Judges, is too long for imitation. She was punished to death by the Benjaminites. For this the other tribes made war on the Benjaminites, killed 18,000 of their men, and as it seems all their women, and took an oath not to give any of their women as wives to the ben sherging Benjaminites who were not slain. But those men, by collusion with the other tribes, stole wives from them at a feast at Shiloh.

The Sabine rape was similar. The story is that Seneca Romulus, the Roman were at one time very scarce of women. In vain he sent ambassadors to other tribes to get wives for his men. He then appointed Solomon, king of Jerusalem, and invited the neighboring tribes—especially the Sabines—to send. The Sabines, more women, came as mass. In the spirit of the celebration, each Roman youth seized a Sabine girl, and brought her off as a wife. In both these cases, the men got unity force and pride and felt at a religious festival, and all parties subsequently reconcile in it, 39. Livy, B. l. p. 20, 31.
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 accurately, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven!" 2 Kings, 2. 11.

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

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. Neither it was Shem's custom frequently to refer thereto, or to enter, as he pretended, the godless, impartial." Livy. Book 1. Cap. 21.

Resemblance of Stories Sacred and Profane.

VII.

The story of the duel between David and Goliath—1 Sam. chap. 17—very much resembles the account of the duel between Titus Manlius and a gigantic band, as given in Livy, Book 12. Cap. 7. 10.

VIII.

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

"The multitude revered upon an ancient prophecy—that at this very time thereof is the siege of Jerusalem—the fall of the East would prevail over the nations, and a race of men would go forth from Judaea to extend their dominion over the rest of the world." Taciturn. Book 5. Cap. 13.
The story of Abraham offering
Isaac his son as a sacrifice, and
of the substitution in his place of a
ram caught in a thicket—Gen. 22:13
is too well known to need repetition—
and the same is true as to the trag-4
dy of Jepthah's daughter.

In the tragedy of Euripides, en-
titled "Iphigenia in Aulis", a like
story appears. Agamemnon is there
said to have been ordered by an
oracle, while on his way to Troy,
to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia,
to Diana. When the knife was
about to be applied to her throat,
the goddess snatched her away alive,
and substituted in her place a stag.

Licensor gives this story a differ-
ent turn. But he justly considers
very such act as a "horrible crime."

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

On the other hand, it is more than probable that,
though the law of Moses did not require human sacrifice,
yet it permitted and even commanded them in cases
where a previous vow to that effect, as in the case
of Jepthah, had been made. Lev. 27—28, 22.

Whoever will compare the Jewish
ceremonies and ritual, found in the
Pentateuch, with the Egyptian superstitions
and rites, as given by Herodotus, will
be struck with the similarity of thing-
so much as perhaps to suspect that
Moses may have in some cases borrowed
from the Egyptians. See Eutype 3790 of
Herodotus.

They both circumcised offspringsacrificed
on altars—paid great regard to clean-
liness—required the beasts for sacrifice
to be without blemish—transferred their
sins to the hands of beasts—eat part of
the thing sacrificed—made libations of
wine—became unclean by contact with
foreigners—are honored likewise by certain
consider the pig to be an impure beast—
hate swine's head—and have many other
resembling rites.

Every one is familiar with the
story in Luke 16—17 to 31. About the rich
man and Lazarus, and of the ascension
of hades or hell therein. That descrip-
tion represents the place of torment
as in sight of "Abraham's bosom," or that
Resemblances of Stories Sacred and Profane.

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

The same is true in general of the description of Hades by Socrates as given by Plato in his "Phaedo."

XII.

Jesus is represented as commanding, "If one sin a man or a woman that they die, then the ox shall be surely stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten." Ex. 21:29.

Plato says, "If a beast of burden or any other animal shall kill any person", let them destroy the condemned animal, and eat it beyond the border." The Laws 137 c. 12.

But as being "after the way inferior. 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 "of eloses deep and large infraed between them, into so much that a just man that hath compassion upon them, then can not be admitted, nor can one that is unjust, if he were bold enough to attempt it, pass over it."

Josephus could not have written many years after Luke. Virgil who wrote about the same age, in his description of the descent of 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, &c.
And it came to pass that on the 8th day they came to circumcise the child, and they called him Simeon, after the name of his father. And his mother answered and said, "Not so," but he shall be called John. And they say unto her, "There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. And they made sign to his father how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing-table, and wrote saying his name is John. And they that called nullified all. Luke 1:59-60.

Abdiel Motalib, the grandfather of Muhammad, "The 7th day after the birth of the child, gave a great entertainment to which he invited the principal men of the Koreish, who, after the feast was over, desired him to give the infant a name. Immediately Motalib replied, "I name this child Muhammad." The Koreish 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 his election, as it had been made, saying, "May the most high glorify in
known whom he has created on earth,"
alluding to the name Mohammed, which signifies praised, or glorified.

With his wife of Mohammed, to family
library, 36.

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, until Azash, and they died:
they with more which died with
hailstones, than they who the children
of Israel slue with the sword." Josh. 10. 11.

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

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 burned up." 2 Pet. 3:10.

"Not only do men perish, and the mountain and sea disappear under the pressure of an inconceivable fate; but a day will come when the world, approaching the time of its great removal, shall be itself extinguished, when stars shall encounter stars, when every form and orderly variety of light shall blaze and consume in the fire of one universal conflagration." -- Isaiah 24, 1867, p. 33.

XVI.

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

"He, who does wrong, does wrong against himself. He who acts unjustly, does injure to himself because he makes himself sad." -- Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. 9:4

XVII.

How often tithes, or tenth, are mentioned in the law of Moses, it will be seen. It is curious that the things should always be a tenth. Why not sometimes a ninth or a twelfth?

But it is more curious to find the same thing in many other religions. Pliny, in his natural history, 13:12, ch. 11, mentions a law in Arabia which obliged every merchant to offer the 10th of his frankincense to the god Jaka. Justin says that the barbarians, and the 10th of their spoils, taken in the Sicilian war, to Hercules of Tyre. The Ethiopians paid...
tithes to this god Assouline. The Roman-
general Sylla dedicated a temple of all his
relics to Hercules, and so did Trajan. See
their lives in Plutarch. Selden, in his history
of tithes, enumera mentions numerous other instances
in many nations, of the same kind. To this
day, in many parts of Europe — especially
in England — tithe is exact. The English
laws books are full of laws regulating
if the.

**XVIII.**

Now from the sixth hour, there was
 darkness over all the land unto the ninth
hour. And behold, the veil of the tem-
ple 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.” Matt. 27: 45, 51, 52.

The sun travels the secrets of the sky,
And why should give the source of light the lie?
The claim of empire he oft declaring,
Hence timbrell, hidden treasures, open tear;
He first the fate of Caesar did foretell,
And parsed Rome, when Rome in Caesar fell;
In thin clouds concealed the public light.
The infinite benevolence of the Deity.

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 animals 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 shown as uniform-ly 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 serpents had borrowed it from God.

To me, it is surprising that learned theologians should satisfy themselves with so falshon a reason. There are sound grounds on which it is obvious such reasoning is invalid, unsatisfactory. Let us State them.

Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

In the first place, the adders fangs are of no value to him as a means of defence. Can he defend himself by injecting successfully against the attack of a strong boy with a long pole in his hand? Whose ureau is any body who made an attack on a serpent, being bitten by the serpent? Who, that undertakes to kill a rattlesnake, goes near enough to him to be in danger of his fangs? But will it be said that these fangs were intended as a defence of the adder against other irrational animals? What irrational animals attack snakes? Very few, I think. Does sometimes do. Perhaps some carnivorous birds do. But here is there any known instance of a serpent successfully defending himself, or even being any man, beast, or bird, that made an attack on him, so as to render self-defense necessary? Still, such an instance can be produced. The argument must fail, and no one instance would make it good. To make these poisonous fangs a valuable means of defence, they would have to be frequently injected. 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 their own place, the poisonous fangs of the serpent, so far from being a defense from attacks, are the very cause of attacks on the serpent race, and put them all in much greater peril than they would be without their fangs. The whole race of man hate and destroy the serpent race purely because of these very fangs; and this is reason to think that the venomous race do so too. The toad is as ugly a creature as the serpent, but he is much safer from the attacks either of dogs or men, though he possesses neither poisonous fangs nor any other defensive weapon. His harmlessness is his security. Since the great peril to the snake is the fact that he has poisonous fangs, could the Deity have given him these weapons as a defense, while he knew they would inspire the un hakile to ten times more than it would be impoverished without them?

In the third place, the fangs of the serpent are very seldom used in his defense, but are constantly used aggressively. We never hear of a snake biting any person or thing that attacks him. His fangs are only effective in

attacking the innocent victim unaware of his presence. All the animals less 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 undeniably well, this is generally, if not always so, in the case of what we call a snakebite. Some rational beings often prevent the sight of the Deity to evil lives; but the irrational creatures, never. There are rules by instinct. They follow the laws of their nature. If, therefore, serpents fangs are, in fact, seldom or never effectively used in self-defense, and constantly injurious to the unoffending passer by, they must be supposed to us so doing to be following the laws of their nature imposed on them by their creator. And if so, their poisonous fangs were not benevolently given to them for self-defense.
Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

Yet the toad has no weapon of defense whatever. Sufin attacks and devours the toad; and the toad has no kind of defense against him. Does this look like that sort of fairness which characterizes benevolence?

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

We have something very analogous to this in the vegetable kingdom. Some trees and shrubs are guarded and protected by thorns; others not. It is remarkable that most of the thorny trees and shrubs bear fruit. What benevolent purpose do these thorns subservce? Are they designed to protect the fruit? To protect it against what or whom? 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

Infinite Benevolence of the Deity.

Fees, tree without thorn, and the plum and haw tree full of thorn? Why are the blackberry and the ragberry shrubs thorny, and the currant bush and the grape vine thornless? For what benevolent purpose were all these thorns there made? To protect the fruit, they were made! 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 views as these, what benevolent purpose docs 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 wasps, and the thorns of thorns and brambles, but all poisonous plants alike for man and beast, 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 evince of the infinite benevolence of the Creator, more, even to a wise and good man, rather furnish evidence against it. Possibly, if we take into the consideration a future life and man's immortality, the conclusion might be otherwise. For a benevolent creator may have devised 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 satisfy with it, if the reasoning were applicable to the irrational animal. But it is not. Nobody believes that these will exist in another state of being; and yet many of them are subjected to such hardships and sufferings as apparently argue the want of infinite benevolence towards them.

The writer, 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 inapplicable 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

Here 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 aborigines of America say the Mexicans practiced the abomination. And Prescott sustains them. But Catholic bigotry, like the Spanish, has gone to exaggerate every thing against the Indians; and Prescott, only authenticated by the Spanish priests and historians. On the other hand, the only native historian of the aborigines of Spanish America, Bernal Diaz, denies it. I would follow him.

There is but too much reason to fear that this profuse luxury received some counterbalance from Abraham and his descendants.

In the case of Abraham himself—In Gen. 22— he could not have believed that human sacrifices are winked, or he never would have supposed that God commanded him to sacrifice Isaac. Paul indeed says that he was willing to sacrifice Isaac—reckoning that God was able to raise him up even from the dead—Rom. 11:33. 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 Jezebel's daughter, if the story concerning it in Judges be allowed to be true, appears to be case of a Jewish human sacrifice. And it is remarkable that nowhere in the old or new testament is this act of Jezebel condemned.

It is clear that the Law of Moses did not command human sacrifices, except under a previous curse. It is also clear that the Law of Moses does not forbid them. And it is equally clear that laws did command them in cases where anyone had previously vowed them. The following passages from Lev. 27: 28, 29 proves this assertion.

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. Any devoted thing is holy unto the Lord. And devoted, which shall be devoted of man, shall be redeemed, but surely be lost to death.

There is no escaping the conclusion that if a man devote 2 cents to God, to sacrifice any human being, this text commands his to offer the sacrifice accordingly. One would think that Jezebel 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 offering or devoting forbidden or even mentioned unfavorably. The parties seem to have been left free to make the vow or not as he pleased; but then if he once made it, he must perform it.

Adam black has made a public attempt to show that the passage only 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 man's devoted things. If this be so, then it is not a fair argument as Adam black makes on this point: would, if made by a lawyer in a court, be called petitio principii.

Still, as human sacrifice certainly did not belong to the Jewish sacrifice, 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 Jezebel are both fictitious.
Human Sacrifice

Of the passage referred to in Lev. 27, it is not
authentic.

Whether the Romans ever offered human sacrifices, has been much disputed. It seems that the Picts and Lord Macaulay denied it. On the other hand Dr. Ellis, a very learned German Catholic, Lord Mahon affirmed it. Lord Stanhope in his Miscellaneous, agreed with Pict and Macaulay. But Ellis is supported by Sir John Aston, Staremburg, Pliny, and Dean Milman. The very fact that in 95 B.C. the Roman Senate by a decree forbade human sacrifices, strongly suspends their prior existence. I fear that the weight of the evidence is in the affirmative of this question. See North British Review for Dec. 1854, p. 140, 141.

Herodotus, in the first vol. (p. 267, 268, 809) of his History of the Superstitious, 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 dry sacrifices 300 men of whom were the promissory, the Spartan king, Clement, six initiations, ch. 8.

Amazons

Of the 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, live independent of them, were powerful in war, and maintained orderly government. Herodotus mentions them in history, and says they conquered the Lydians, and invaded Greece. 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. 100, 109, 109, 109.

Plato in his law, 37 c. 11, says "he that was first to know that there were six, so to say, countless huge bands of women about Pontus, whom they call Sarmatians [another name for Amazons] on whose land has been enjoined an exercise in common with, and perhaps equal to, that of men not only upon horses, but in bows likewise, and in the uses of arms."

Other ancient writers say that they were a race of warriors who fought on an empan on the river Tsimabstract in Asia Minor, on the coast of the Tynicis.

The name itself is from two words in the Greek, literally meaning "without a breast"; because their women cut off their right breast, so that it might not interfere with their shooting arrows and in hurling the javelin.
The Irish and Latin poets, too, mention the Awajun.

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

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

Vulgar Christians assert that Jesus first promulgated this rule. But, to say nothing of Confucius, it seems that this rule was well known to the Jews before Christ's ministry.

That grand dictum—do unto others as thou wouldst be done by—inspired by Hillel, the President, at whose death Jesus was ten years of age, not as any thing new, but as an old and well-known dictum, that comprised the whole law. The Talmud and Christianity are alike as to moral duty. "The ethics in both are in their broadest lines, identical." London Quarterly, Oct. 1867, p. 230.

Confucius seems the first who mentioned the rule.