Fate and Predestination.

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

If in judging of these "high mysteries", we decide according to authority, it would seem that fate and predestination are univocals. 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, Low Churchmen, 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, the Methodists, and a few inconsiderable modern Christian sects. There can be no doubt that Paul and Peter were predestinarians. I knew 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 controversy.

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. I see not that I do
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has been eternally and invincibly fate
and predestined to be done, it is absolutely
unthinkably 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 their
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 conscious-
ness. We are all equally conscious that
at least some of our acts are voluntary,
and no reasoning ought to shake this
consciousness.
Polytheism.

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

But though Polytheism had more than 100,000 gods, yet some general characteristics pervaded them all. In all may be traced some lingering memory of one supreme or at least superior Being, to whom the other divinities were subordinate, always in function, and for the most part in origin. All maintained the practice of prayer, the natural and instinctive language, which the creature expressed the sense of his dependence on the Creator. All, without exception, possessed the rite of sacrifice, with which was inseparably united a notion of conscious moral depravity or unworthiness, in which orthodox minds will recognize some obscure traditional memory of man's primal fall. All pursued what they called a certain 'ceremonial' system, embodied in a series of illustrious rites and purifications, which, however greatly understood, were supposed to have the power of removing a certain moral uncleanness or qualification, or of propitiating some adverse influence. All had an organized priesthood, especially set apart for the service of religion; and although the office of the
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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 Etruscan, 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 remnant 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 imagined, and even formally discarded the idea in practice, bore in their very constitution the clearest traces of the belief of a Providence, guiding and directing the affairs of men.”—North British Review of 1847, p. 138, 157.

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 those universal resemblances in pagan religions have like resemblance run through among Jews and Christians. The likeness holds in regard to prayer, rites, and sacrifice, a sacramental system, a priesthood, a future existence, purgatory, holy days and festivals, splendid temples and an imposing ceremonial, and a Divine Providence.

The Jew and the Christian will say the polytheists borrowed these resemblances from Moses and their predecessors. Perhaps so. But the Egyptians...
might ritot, and say, Moses borrowed his system of sacrifices, and liturgies, and his hatred of sults from Egypt, where he was born and educated; and he might cite Herodotus as very plausible evidence of his assertion. For according to "Father of history", the Egyptian worship and that of Moses are in many things much alike. And the argument gains strength, when we consider, what all admit, that the Egyptian mode of worship was older than that of Moses. But let us give the Jew a fair chance with the Egyptian. He may well suppose them distinguishing 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. We, indeed, consider a pig to be an unclean 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, while we abhor any sacrifice of swine. We will not eat pork at all; but when you sacrifice it to the Moon and Baal, you eat a part of the hog sacrificed. You worship images and even reptiles 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 cumb and a snake, and
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Place them with outstretched wings over the 'many seats'? And did not your Solomon make images of lions? And was not the Ephod, the Ark and the Shemumim of Moses objects of worship? What were the 400 porpoises of Solomon but graven images? And did not that magnificent diptop describe his reverence for our god Nebu, when he made his brazen sea, and 12 graven oxen supporting it? As to a multitude of gods, the Christians, your bastards, have as many as we can had. First, they declare that: 'The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God'; and this they say They prove out of your holy books. Then they worship divin saints; they worship many images in their churches, and crosses made of wood and metal, as our god are. They worship every where. Even relics are objects of worship with them, as with us. Do you not see, then, that as our religion is the oldest, the Jews and Christians have borrowed theirs from ours?

Sure, the Jews have one God; and you have many. We do not worship either angels, devils, or demons—we hold them to be no gods, any more than men and horses are gods. They are Gods creations. But you hold your inferior deities to be actually objects of worship, and you sacrifice to them. As to Ephod and the Ark and Shemumin, no Jews our worship these. They were mere appendages of our temple. The same is true as to the Cherubim and Seraphim of Moses. As to Solomon's lions and brazen oxen, he violated our decrees in making those graven images; nor did he make them till he became enamored with the daughter of your Pharaoh, who seduced him from the worship of our Jehovah to the adoration of his god of Egypt. I may well admit that the Christians worship many gods. But the Jews are not responsible for that. Moses never taught them such a worship. The Christian are not Jews; they are not the followers of Moses; many of them indeed make their gods 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 as porter 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. Husbands alone were their location. 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 Pythagoreans. Their love for each other was very great. All pleasure they obtained from. They despised riches. Oil they considered a defilement. They delighted in white garments; and always dressed in them at their meals. Their residence was most together; some of them found scattered in various places. They wear garments and show till they are worn out. Before sunrise, they did not talk together, but offer prayer to God. They bathed in cold water before eating. They said grace before and after eating. Dwelling they forbade. They were merry, 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. As far they allowed to be bidden on the sabbath; and on that day they would not move a vessel out of its place, or go to study. They covered up their ordure in pots. 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 Orphico Pythagorean School at Alexandria, they rejected all animal sacrificial.

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

They prepared to be prophetic, and the revelator of dreams. When Herod was a young man, one of them is said to have foretold to him that he would be a king.

For full accounts of these Essenes, see Josephus Antiquities, ch 10, 115-13: 18, ch 18, 1-5; 55-85; 1405-6, 13: 2-6, ch 8, 9, 1-2, 3, 98.

North British Review, Oct. 1898, p. 151
Monotheism.

The Indo-European races, 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, Phoenicians, 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. Rennan's Political History of the Jews, 15.

Sir Makomet, 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.

Michael Servetus

Servetus was born in 1511, at Villefranche in Aragon. He was, it seems, educated in a Dominican convent. His father desired him for the law, but the inclination of his mind was to medicine and theology. He studied medicine, and practised it for many years; the chief employment of his life, however, was the study of divinity. 

He early abandoned the Catholic, and joined the Reformation, and 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 Christianismi, in which he denied infant baptism.

Meanwhile Servetus took up his abode in Rome, Sarphina, 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 Geneva and see Calvin. Calvin said “He knew come, and my authority be of any avail, I will never suffer him to depart alive.”

Servetus

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

About this time—1553—a fellow named William Sare—a friend of Calvin—lived at Geneva. At the suggestion of Calvin, he wrote to one Amreus, a zealous priest at Lyons, refurnishing the Catholic for tolerating so great a heretic as 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 sought from priest, and, hardly knowing whether to flee for safety, wandered to Basle. As soon as Calvin learned that he was there, he sent the officers of the law after him. Servetus took and cast him into prison. He was soon after brought before the court. The charge against him was drawn up by Calvin. There were no accusations for heresy; they Stalin. One of the principal charges was that he had defamed John Calvin, a minister of God's Word in the church of Geneva.
Servetus.

In Fontaine, a sort of States attorney, conducted the prosecution. But Calvin aides him in it. Servetus prayed to be allowed to engage counsel in his defense, but Calvin objected, and the prayer was refused. Servetus prayed a short time to the council of two hundred. But this was refused. Before final sentence, however, the court refers the case to the civil church, for their view of it. The church gave a response favorable to Servetus. Many of the ministers showed themselves as weak thinking, as Calvin himself. Among these were Beza, Farel, Bèdines.

Servetus. Servetus was condemned, he said he would not be a heretic in his blood, and withdrew from the council. The sentence finally was that he should be buried up, and burnt alive, together with his books, till he was reduced to ashes. Remembering he prayed he sent for Calvin to beg his mercy. Calvin went. But he says that when he discovered that Servetus would not renounce his heresies, he left him. At the place of execution, Servetus knelt and prayed to have mercy on his accusers, when which Farel, who attended him, roughly said to you, who are so great a sinner, attempt to justify yourself?

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

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

See the Life of Calvin by J. H. Dyck, ch.

9, 10.
On the great question, it appears that there are two schools of philosophers. The one views of Sthenius; the other, of Platonism. The one holds that the test is the Divine law 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巡工 in his treatise "De Legibus." He declares that the impulse which directs to right conduct, and acts from virtue, is not only older than the ages of nations and cities, but coeval with that Divine Being who rules and rules both heaven and earth." — "The principle that impels us to right conduct, and winces us against guilt, springs out of the nature of things. It did not begin to be law when it was first written, but when it originated, and it is coeval with the Divine Mind itself."

The doctrine of the second of these schools of philosophy is thus defined by Paley: "We conclude that God wills and establishes the happiness of his creatures, and this conclusion being once established, we are at liberty to go on with the rule built upon it, namely, that the method of coming to the will of God, concerning any action by the light of nature, is to inquire into the tendency of that action to promote or diminish the
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Summarizing happiness. So, thus, actions are to be estimated by their tendency. Whatever is expedient, if expedient is right. It is the utility of any moral rule alone, which constitutes the obligation of it.

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

On Paley's side are Hobbes, Condorcet, Dr. Clarke, Lord Shaftesbury, Stirling, More, James, Jeremy Bentham.

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

So my mind Paley's doctrine is most dangerous. Lezzer justifies some of those who adopt utility, a test of right and wrong, that if the act consistently with these principles, and are not sometimes influenced with the goodness of their hearts, they can cultivate neither friendship, justice or generosity. Lezzer de officii. 82.

The test of utility and expediency amounts to this proposition, that we may lawfully do what tends to promote or increase human happiness. Now we ought, for the sake of the argument, admit that to him that is infinitely wise the expedient and the good are identical; for, in the highest case, nothing bad can be expedient. But who shall judge whether the act proposed to be done is expedient, if expedient is to be the test of its goodness? Shall frail, ignorant, feeble men be the judges? If so, how often will they judge differently than often will the 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 bountiful Being has left mortals so unchangeable a rule as this. How 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 ask how it would work practically. If man, as 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. After, under the power of strong temptation, act him to testing the moral quality of the act on Mr. Paley's principles. He may seek to reason thus: Nature has given me this strong propensity. The pleasure of gratifying
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it, though brief, will be great to both parties. As one will ever know of it. It can do nobody else any harm. It will do us good. Why should we not enjoy the getaway?

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

Of both parties would reason thus, every one can see what would be the mistake. Yet who in his cool moments, and not under the pressure of temptation, would say that adultery, committed under any circumstances, is right? But the objector will say, this is not a fair example; for the man did not reason justly. True, he did not; but he reasoned according to your logic, and as well as he could under the circumstances. Who can reason justly under a sudden and powerful temptation? Not in every ease of this kind, the test of expediency and utility requires us to act 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;
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that sin is exceedingly difficult, and temptation oft clouds the intellect and mingles the judgment; that the wise and philosophic in the world are not always forewarned 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 reflection 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 on 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 Cicero's test is the only one to be trusted. Call it the moral sense, or instinct, or conscience, or consciousness or what you will, it is the only tolerable guide in our moral conduct. An imperfect guide, I admit it is to the mass of men whose conscience and moral sense are not much enlightened. Still, it is the best guide we have and we do wisely and will to follow it.
Delicacy.

It is commonly said that as to all those matters which relate to "the matter of shame," intercourse, &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 wrote 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 these four years. I have been more than once unhappy with disappointments: but yet thanks, thanks to God, I am in full hope to be a mother in the month of November. The little preparation for my child and child-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! A, 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 son, or at most lovely daughter like you and Milton. But a daughter or a son only, with a good heart without genius, I will nevertheless welcome."

"You should think I will not be a little, but a nurse only." Y. S.

Diligence.

Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat
Jacob; and Jacob begat Judas and his
brothers; and Judas begat Pharz and
Saar of Shamir; and Pharz begat Es-
rom; and Esrom begat Abram. From be-
ing it a ram, here finding he was in a
bad nest, he prayed and said, "It is
not worth while to read further; for
it clear that all these people begot one
another. Let us pray:"

I find, too, that the ancients, of the
Church were, at least some of them,
not very delicate in the choice of word.
Thus Tituillian, 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
gorge those parents among you, who glory
in selling their liberty for stuffing their
..."
Diligence.

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 "Octavia," p. 28, says, "These same Egyptians, and not a few among yourselves [the Romans] do not stand more in awe of Isis than of a sharp onion; and pray as fervently a respect-saving your presence-to a fruit, as to your God Serapis."

Contrast this language with that of the heathen Bible. 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 indecent for discussion."

How would a Jew or an Ancient Pharisee 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 laugh outright, for men to bring in silver
Wine-vats, and chamber pots of crystal, as they wish in their counsellors, and for silly women to get gold receptacles for sacraments made; so that, being rich, they can not even raise themselves except in a superb way. "The Instruc-
tor by Clement. 13. 2. on 3. 4 ante
Nicoene Library, 214. The same Clem-
ent (p. 124) says: God "only usurpts xxx
not such horses as neigh after their neigh-
bors," vims that are under the yoke,
and are female-kind."
And yet St. Clement's 6th chapter of
the Instructor is, on filthy speaking. In it
he says that neither in the name nor the
necessity of intercourse and unlawful unions,
to which appellation not in common use
are applied, is there the designation of what
is really obscene. For neither are knees
and legs, and such other members, nor the
names applied to them and the activity
not forth by them, obscene. And even the
secret parts of man are to be regarded as
suspicious of impiety, not shame. It is their
unlawful activity that is shameful."p. 229.
As the existence of a Deity provable by the works of nature.

Sir William Hamilton, in his lectures on 

Metaphysics, asserts that, the phenomena of 

matters, taken by themselves, so far from 

warranting any inference to the existence 

of a God, would on the contrary serve 

to ground an argument to his negation. 


I do not believe the assertion of Sir 

William. Palsy and 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 disorder, 

to be the work of a divine providence, 

seems himself to be destitute of more 

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 man 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 tables drove, and argued well if arguments could move 0 impious use! To nature's laws opposed, these bowls are in others bowls closed.

Dryden's Poem on the Pythagorean Philosophy.
Superstition—Bigotry—Ignorance.

Philip III, ruled Spain 43 years. Motley, in his United Netherlands, says "If Philip possessed a single virtue, it was that he did the conscientious research of the sources of that pride. If there are views, as possibly there are, from which he was exempt, it is because it was not permitted to human nature to attain perfection even in evil. He was unworshipful, implacable, false, unjust, cruel, persecuting. For the praise of God, he butchered and burnt vast numbers of men. His last sickness was extremely painful. Full of running sons, remorse unmerciful and insufferable weighed on his flesh and bones. Many days he lay on his back in a many-pitted gown. He never unmerciful. Christian resignation in him was perfect. Whoso informed that he was near death, his first act was to dispatch a courier for the Pope's blessing. He declared that, in all his life, he had never convincingly done wrong to any one. He complained that many wrongs to future heirs. Then he took the sacrament, and took it almost daily till he died. Some extreme emotion was administered to him, and from this he derived infinite consolation. He had collected many relics of saints. Seated he kept on a table near, and derived much ghostly benefit from them. Especially a bone of St. Alban, which Clement III. had given him, was of great service. With this relic, and with the form of St. Vincent and the bone bone of St. Jerome, he daily rubbed his son, and the priest assured him that in this there was great efficacy. And so, with prayer composure, he died, not doubting his instant entrance into paradise. What a combination of bigotry, superstition, ignorance, wickedness, and undoubting faith!"—Motley's United Netherlands, 555, 594, 556, 558, 554.

We can not pronounce John Calvin an ignorant man; and his biography, Owen, declares that he was very free from superstition. But he was I think, the oriel of all men of his time, was John Calvin; and his superintendence was a delusion in his sight.

By. Born a French man, he had all the bigotry of a Spaniard, versus...
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 brutish as atheism. His theology made him love equally a triumphant God and a triumphant devil. And his bigotry was ready to visit with death all who denied his doctrine.

As Roman Catholic, in the worst times of that superstitions and persecuting church, our possessors a more hateful animosity toward heretics than he bore.
Chronology.

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

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

Theophilus, who flourished about A.D. 175, says that the world was then 5,688 years old. Theophilus to Atheljens, 13.3, ch. 28. —Bible Fiction Library.

The Egyptian priests declared to Herodotus that from the first king to the priest of Vulcan, [king Athamas], who last reigned, there were 341 generations of men, and during these generations there were the same number of chief priests and kings. And they say Herodotus, they estimated at 11,310 years. Herodotus: Encheris, 102.
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. 19. Ante-Nicene Library.
Sacrifices.

Clement declares that when Moses surmised that the vice of sacrificing to idols had been deeply ingrained in 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 ingrained 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 justly receive it an act of folly rather than of divine worship. For he that made heaven and earth, and all that is therein, and gave us all the things of which we stand in need, certainly require none of those things which he himself delights 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, then, by supposing that they can to him who stands in need of nothing, appear to me in no respect to
Athenagoras, in his place for the Chris-
tian, ch. 13, says: "The Father and Father
of this universe does not need blood, nor
the odor of burnt offerings, nor the fre-
grance of flowers and incense. But
the noblest sacrifice to him is to honor
who stretched out and waddled the
heaven, 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 Bible, 143.

Anger. Kant, p. 15

Plato says "by gratifying anger, a thing most violently, the speaker procures passion with an evil fruit; and just so much as he was refined with by education to such an extent does he make his soul a savage; and, living in no restraint, he becomes like a wild beast, and receives from passion a bitter delight." Laws, 9, 146 a 13

"The anger of the one who has never felt anger, has reason to envy the man who subsides it." Richter

Do myself ever get angry?
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Reembellish between notes and footnotes.

XXXII.

"It is hard for the to hide against the priests." Paul - Act 9:5.

I would rather sacrifice to him than being wrath; hide against the priests; a mortal against the Lord God." Socrates in the Barchus.

XXXIII.

And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered. B.C. 1,946.

The skin from pole to pole with head upwards And showers increased down pouring on the ground. Then glad in colors of a varying type, Levantine Ibo bred a new supply. To feed the clouds; the impetuous rain divided; The thunder torn beneath the burden bends. Orfrayed clowns replore their finished gone: And the long labor of the year are vain. We from his Patricked heaven alone As you contend to nurse his vengeance bow And from his brother the seed he planted, To help him with auxiliary waters.

The contrary tyrant with his books and plow, Manuel from moody war, their want abides, And with perpetual war his hollow fill'd Is where in brief he then impacts his will: Small scorchedutton needs your power supreme; And this bad world - so love regimen - destroy. Yet raise the Voice of all your various store; Bear down the storm, and open sorry mock The floods by nature stream to Union, And proudly swelling with their own command, Round the live ring stone that stops their way, And gushing from their source against the sea. Nest with his man their inexorable through the ground With violent trembling earth receive the volume; And every other's friend. The expansive waters gather on the plain, And from the field, and overt the grain; Were rushing onward with a steady sway. Bismuth, and field, and laboring them along. For safe their dwellings warm; for subject by floor, their house fell upon their household gods. She shoke him too strongly, burst to fall, High on his hand; while a meeting small. Cross over and sate move in one fathom lost, A world of water and without amount. Ovid's Bishops of Orvieto, Translated by Snyder.
Every one knows the story of the invasion of the land of Judah by Sennacherib, so finely painted by Byron—

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

A like story in some respect is told of an invasion of Egypt by Thutmose III, in the reign of king Solon, the priest of Luxor. Herodotus says: "After this, Sennacherib, king of the Babylonians and Assyrians, invaded a large army against Egypt. The priests being reduced to a state, entered the temple and besought before the images the calamities he was in danger of suffering. Sleep fell upon him, and it appeared to him in a vision that the god stood by and encouraged him, assuring him that. Sennacherib marched to Pelusium, the entrance into Egypt. There a number of field mice appeared in upon his army, devoured their quivers and their coats, and, moreover, the handles of their shields; so that, on the next day when they fled before they army, many of them fell and to this day a stone statue of the him stands in the temple of Luxor with a mouse in his hand, and this inscription on it: "Whoever looks on me, let him save the gods!". Herodotus—Europe, 141
Hand writings.

It seems that Sir Henry Jenner has invented a method or method of facsimile and multiplying manuscripts which promises much especially as to ancient writings. The invention is called Photograms, as advantage our photographs is, first, the far greater facility with which copies can be multiplied, and secondly, the more durable nature of the impressions. Volumes of these have already been taken forming most interesting collections in the mimicry of ancient manuscripts. By these we are able to see the different kinds of writing in different ages and different countries, and to judge of the characteristics of the different writers by their chirography, if hand writing indicates character. North British Review, June 1868 p 272.

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

[Handwritten text continues on the opposite page]
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 steady nerves and mechanical taste, that want of it is no proof of want of a well ordered mind. But slovenly, careless writing is quite another thing. If there has evidently been no effort at neatness - if words are obliterated, or omitted, or interlined - if the lapses are much blotters - be sure the writer is not decent in his dress, scrupulous in his morals, or clear and logical in his thought. Such a man will treat on a lady's arm, and spit on a gentleman's coat.
Hive Words.

Happy is the nation that has no history. [A.C. British Review, June, 1813, p. 124.]

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

What is universal may be called natural. Paley.

Wiser, never wicked man was wise. Homer.

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

“Kill a dog, cob a dog, still a dog is but a dog.” French proverb.

“I don’t buy resistance at 10,000 ducat.”[174] Dr. Johnson.

“The same tree in one ramus in another habit.” A learned man has always help in himself. Phaedrus.

“Lamantit voci motu comitato ventre.” She familiar toaster songs before the rooster.

Hive Words.

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

“Persephone male locuta mala facta arbitrari.” Misprised good deeds are ill placed. Sannio.

Sect the grapes pray for the welfare of the branches: without branches there would be no grapes. Job.

“The world is like the wolf: he with his two buckets: the first one is ever emptied, and the empty one is ever filled.”

You can not touch the semblance of a font: a dead man’s body does not feel the knife.

For a man who has been ruined by a woman, there is no laws nor no judge.

Throw no stones in the well whence you have drunk.

When Satan can’t enter himself, he studies as his messenger. Job.
Miss Words

To change those favorable representations, which might give of their own mind, with the guilt of hypocritical fakery, 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 near while temptation is away. It is easy to awaken generous sentiments in privacy; to define duty when there is no danger; to glow with benevolence when there is nothing to be given. While such ideas are formed, they are felt; and self-love does not suspect the glories of virtue to be the mother of fame.

Johnson. Life. 1748.

Music is inarticulate poetry. O'Niel.

Every art is best taught by example. Johnson.

Shrouds have no pockets.

Trust not yourself; but your defects to know. Make us of every friend and sorry foe. Pope.

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

Burbage's Del. Plut. with 520.
John Calvin

Calvin was born July 10, 1509, at
Noyon, 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
destitute of pity, mercy, and benevolence.
So that others miserable seemed to be
his darling attribute; to contribute to his
happiness, his strength work. If to assess
his wife would have given him pleasure,
surely he would have refrained from it
as a deadly sin. He was a stranger to all
these kind, sympathies which constitute
the charities of mankind. A thorough
Jehovite, his hand was against every
man, and consequently nearly every man's
hand was against him. He quarreled
with nearly all his friends, and defied
and vitiated all his enemies. In fine,
his war, stubbornness, and enmity,
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. Bzer
and Han were his favorite and Miss
Toadies; but he several times fell out
with them, and abused them like dogs.
John Calvin.

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

Calvin was a genuine persecutor. Not only did he offset 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 Bolse, merely because the latter denied the doctrine of predestination, and argued for freedom of will.

In fine, Calvin really believed in the doctrine of eternal election and reprobation, and in Vindictism; and he entertained no doubt that it was the duty of good Christians to kill all who denied these dogmas. And the tyrannical spirit of his nature was such that he was not afraid that heretics should suffer an easy death. Torture and fire, applied to heretics, were the beaus-ideals of his Christianity.

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

What between his natural cruelty and fierceness and his doctrine of eternal reprobation, he was the paragon of all Atrocity persecutors. The annals of Papal and Christian Rome do not, one that excelled him as a furious, fiery, fiendish persecutor. His cruelty and cruelty towards Socrates were equal to the highest achievements in this line of Nero, Caligula, and the Spanish inquisitors. Nay, it went beyond them; for he first—Judas like—betrayed hisvirtue to this common enemy, the inquisition, and after the martyrdom of that great and good man, he boasted of the part he took in it, and calumniated the memory of his dead victim.

Calvin, though sincere in the belief of his absurd dogmas, was not remarkable for veracity. A number of times he was caught in lies, and more than once in baseless mendacity.

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

wife quit the house, and became great en-
smie of Calvin’s. The story is told in
Purr’s life of Calvin pp. 230, 237.

Calvin was a leader. He constantly
beatticed his opponents with the violent
spirits...Blasphemer—slanderer— foul-
mouthed slayer—ignorance, impudence— Mapa-
beast—vagabond—screevy knave, &c. &c.
these terms he often employed. The spi-
that “beast”, he often used and dwelt upon.

Calvin was a coward. He took good
care to keep out of danger. He was my
friend to put his followers in the predic-
mint. But he kept at a safe distance
himself. He gave the Pope and the

John Calvin.

Infinitive a civic birth”. He evidently
believed in the proverb “That caution is the
parent of safety.”

At the age of 30, Calvin took it upon
himself to get married. He would not take the
trouble to hunt a wife himself. He asked
his friends to get him one. He told them he
was not “one of your mad kind of lovers”-
“the only beauty that excites me is that she be
chaste, obedient, humble, economical, patient;
and that there be hope that she be
solicitor about my health”. They found
him a wife—the widow of an anabaptist,
with the symmetrical name of Asletta.
Asletta lived with him about ten years,
Such was the father and founder of Presbyterianism!

I blame no man for calling himself a Presbyterian or Presbyterian. But he who rejoices in the name Calvinist is a fool or a bigot. Collins well says, "When the Reverend Mr. Calvin [so Calvin's name originally was] and his associate burned my distinguished scientific brother, he was burned with green pagots, which made it rather slow and painful; it appeared they were in a state of barbarism. The dogmas of such people about the Father of mankind and his creation are of no more account.
Calvin

In my opinion, than those of a council of Aztecs. If a man picks your pocket, do you not consider him thereby disqualified to pronounce any authoritative opinion on matters of ethics? If a man hangs my ancient female relation for heresy +++ or burns my instructor for not believing as he does, I care no more for his religious edicts, than I should for those of my other brother."

P. 37, 37.

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

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

of it or me, 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 "abhor every to brassius; to be terrible and unflinching towards that serpent. I will write against him and kill him. It is true that to crush brassius is like crushing a bug; but he has mocked and insulted my Christ, and he shall be punished."

"Mr. Every body," says Luther, "should be made to demean himself piously 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 promising him woman instead.

He believed in "changelings"—i.e. that the devil sometime carried off human babies, and left in their empy, his own imps. Such a changeling a woman once presented to Luther. Its name was Killbrand. It was a great glutton. 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 she was on her
way to do so, as she was crossing a bridge with killcroop in a basket, something like a crow flown by, and said, "killcroop, where are you going?" Killcroop answered, "going to see the saint." Whereupon the woman off-righted, threw basket and killcroop into the river; when, miraculously, two crows flew away, one of which was, of course, killcroop.

If we compare Luther and calvin, we shall find it difficult to determine which was the more execrable. They were alike void of all benevolence and charity. They equally hated all who doubted their dogmas, and were equally spiteful, malicious, and brutal. They were both presbyterianians. Luther was the more ferociously brave; but calvin was the more insidiously cunning. Calvin persecuted st. jerome 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 cyprian potamus; calvin, a cross between the fox and the hyena.
Pythagoras

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

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

Pythagoras

So the young he taught the duties of
temperance, self-culture, respect for the
agia, and a generous bearing toward
all men. He urged virtue, truth, family,
and humility on all classes. He was
very eloquent, and made 2000 con-
verts in one speech at Crotona.

He formed his followers into some-
thing like churches.
He insisted on the use of a veget-
able 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