

# HUMAN NATURE:

A Monthly Journal of Hoistic Science.

---

JANUARY, 1875.

---

## VALUE OF *A PRIORI* REASONING IN THEOLOGY.

*By* ST. GEORGE STOCK, *Pembroke College, Oxon.*

IF it be possible to demonstrate the existence of a Deity, it is right that we should apply ourselves diligently to the comprehension of the successive steps of reasoning which lead up to so important a conclusion. Doubters, and deniers, however intelligent and honest they may be esteemed, are, on this supposition, chargeable with downright dishonesty, inexcusable negligence, or invincible dulness. For a demonstrative argument enchains the assent of the understanding. It is impossible to conceive the conclusion not to be true, if the premises from which it is deduced be admitted. And we may remark here that, though much valid reasoning may be founded on a false or doubtful assumption, we cannot pronounce a truth to be demonstrated unless the argument start from self-evident principles. When the premises are self-evident, the ultimate conclusion, however remote, however, in itself, obscure, borrows all their strength, provided no violation of the laws of reasoning has been permitted to creep in between. If any one, therefore, were to demonstrate the existence of a Deity, he would for ever shut the mouths of opponents, at least, of all on whom it would be worth while to expend argument. Whoever attempted to gainsay him, would have to take his choice between the epithets of "knave" and "fool." Such being the case, I was surprised at an assertion thrown out by Dr. Sexton, (a gentleman for whom I entertain a sincere respect,) to the effect that this feat had actually been accomplished by Mr. Gillespie of Torbanehill. But it seems that Dr. Sexton is not without good company in this opinion. Sir William Hamilton and Lord Brougham, with a host of other luminaries, appear to have been of the same way of thinking. At least, they bestow high praise on Mr. Gillespie's demonstra-

tion of the existence of a God. Now, a demonstration is worthless, if it do not prove its point. We are entitled, therefore, to infer that these persons shared Dr. Sexton's opinion, that the fact of the existence of a Deity had been established by Mr. Gillespie "with the certainty of a mathematical demonstration."

If this achievement has really been performed, our first thought naturally is, "What a pity it was not accomplished sooner!" It is perfectly appalling to look over an old book-shop, and observe the amount of paper, and, no doubt, thought, that has been wasted on both sides of the question—wasted, I say, because, what admits of demonstration, is no fit subject for controversy! But, it is when we turn to our own times, which touch us more quickly, that the regret becomes most poignant. How many a true and tender soul has there been of late, in this period of the decay of old methods of thought, who has found head and heart hopelessly at war—to whom the sun seemed blotted from the heavens if he were deprived of his faith in a God such as he had been wont to believe in, and who yet could find no reason for his faith! And what anguish might have been spared to these, if only Mr. Gillespie had been at hand to heal!

It also cannot fail to strike us as a little remarkable that a conclusion all the data of which have been in possession of mankind so far back as the constitution of their minds has been the same as at present, should have been left to a gentleman of this late period to arrive at—not so left, because unattempted, but after having been tried again, and again, and all to no purpose, even by such intellects as those of Clarke and Locke. The inadequacy of the reasoning employed by these two great thinkers, has been ably pointed out by Mr. Gillespie, who thereby reminds us of the custom of the priesthood at Aricia, where it was incumbent upon him who aspired to serve at the shrine to slay his predecessors in single combat, before handling the holy things himself.

Such thoughts as these rush into the mind on hearing that the controversy of ages has been laid at rest for ever. But it would not be the first time a great truth has been missed, for want of some one able to put two and two together; nor the first time men have perished, when aid was within their reach. Moreover, Mr. Gillespie has had the advantage of learning from the failures of his predecessors. But were the matter ever so improbable, it would be poor reasoning, indeed, to pronounce it impossible on no other grounds than that.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the chain of reasoning advanced by Mr. Gillespie in his "Argument, *à priori*, for the Being and the Attributes of the Lord God, the Absolute One, and First Cause."

By way of preamble I will venture to make a suggestion. It is much to be wished that in some future edition of the "Argument, *à priori*" (say in a "Sceptic's own"), when certain deficiencies, which I hope to point out, shall have been corrected, Mr. Gillespie would complete the scientific appearance of his work by prefixing, after the manner of Euclid, such definitions, axioms, and postulates as he has made use of. No doubt the axioms are hardly, if at all, more than what are common to all reasoning whatsoever. Still, in dealing with so capital an argument, it seems desirable that even these should be set down. Every reader would in that case know exactly what ground he was treading upon.

Now for the task before us.

#### DIVISION I.—PART I.

Mr. Gillespie's first proposition lays down that "Infinity of Extension is necessarily existing." Under the head of this proposition I have simply to invite the reader's attention to the extreme modesty, and consequent safety, of Mr. Gillespie's initial assumption. We are merely asked to admit that we have in our minds an idea of space, and that we cannot, by any means, get that idea out of our minds. The following axiom, or postulate, "We cannot conceive the external Infinity of Extension non-existent," joined to the definition, "Everything the existence of which we cannot but believe, is necessarily existing," results in the proposition stated above. Whether space is to be considered a substance or a mode, whether it exists in the mind only, or out of it as well, whether it be God or matter, or an attribute of either, or a form of human thought, we are, happily, not called upon to decide before starting. Otherwise, some little time might elapse before we got fairly on our way. For with regard to the nature of space, every possible opinion is maintained by some one with pertinacity. But Mr. Gillespie's demonstration is intended for all, and he very properly takes up his position on common ground. He has his own opinion, as we know from other sources, which he holds with a plenary assurance, namely, that space is a mere attribute of a substance—God; but he does not seek to cram it down our throats at starting. In fact, we set out from the position that "space is—space," a doctrine which Mr. Gillespie himself holds in no high esteem, but which is a good comfortable one, nevertheless.

Proposition 2 lays down that "Infinity of Extension is necessarily indivisible." We shall see that this is as unexceptionable as the preceding, when once we understand the meaning of the term "divisible." And this ought not to be a matter of extraordinary difficulty, since we have a clear definition given us—

"Divisibility" means "possibility of separation," and again, "To say Infinity of Extension is necessarily indivisible, is as much as to say, the parts of Infinity of Extension are necessarily indivisible from each other." Now, to divide matter is to alter the relative position of its parts in space; but we do not, and cannot, alter the position of the parts (if the term be allowed) of space itself. We can divide space mentally, in the sense of fixing our attention on a certain amount of space to the exclusion of the rest. In any other sense the division of space, mental or actual, involves a glaring violation of the Law of Contradiction. It amounts to supposing a certain portion (metaphorically speaking) of space to be, and yet not to be, the self-same portion of space. It is, then, only by a metaphor that we speak of space being "mentally divisible." We speak thus "in the sense of partial consideration only." The metaphor, it is true, is a valuable one, and there is no need to abandon it. But, in the literal sense of the words, Mr. Gillespie's second proposition defies contradiction. Before passing on, it will be well to observe that we grant, and by the constitution of our minds are compelled to grant, more than Mr. Gillespie requires. For his purpose it is only necessary we should admit that Infinity of Extension is indivisible; but it is equally true that pure space or extension, whether finite or infinite, is indivisible.

To this proposition a scholium is appended, to the effect that "It is a necessary consequence, that the thing, the parts of which are divisible from each other, is not Infinity of Extension; nor any part of it." This speaks for itself.

We have, then, a corollary to the same proposition, setting forth that "Infinity of Extension is necessarily immovable." This is defined to be "equal to saying, the parts of Infinity of Extension are necessarily immovable among themselves." To the corollary again we have a scholium which declares "that the thing, the parts of which are movable among themselves, is not Infinity of Extension; nor any part of it." Both to the corollary and its scholium we must heartily accede.

Proposition 3 lays down that "There is necessarily a Being of Infinity of Extension." Against this no one can have any reasonable objection. For a thing must either be capable of existing by itself, or else not. If the former is the case with "Infinity of Extension," that is just what is meant by the term, "Being." If the latter, then we have our being, or substance, in the thing on which Infinity of Extension depends. This is a dilemma from which there is no escape.

The wording of part of what comes under the head of the present proposition is open to a trifling criticism. Mr. Gillespie says, "First, If Infinity of Extension subsist without a sub-

stratum, then it is a substance. And if anyone should deny that it is a substance, it so subsisting; to prove, beyond contradiction, the utter absurdity of such denial, we have but to defy him to show, why Infinity of Extension is not a substance, so far forth as it can subsist by itself, or without a substratum." If this be meant as an argument, and it is put in that shape, it is precisely of the same validity as the following:—"There is a man in the moon. And if anyone should deny that there is a man in the moon; to prove, beyond contradiction, the utter absurdity of such denial, we have but to defy him to show, why there should not be a man in the moon." But in point of fact what Mr Gillespie means is this—"If you object to my using the word 'being' interchangeably with 'substance,' show some reason for your objection." He says this knowing that no good reason will be forthcoming. But surely it would have been neater to have formally laid down the implied definition, "A being is that which can subsist by itself." Anyone who dislikes this definition, instead of clamoring for its removal, should desist from arguing with Mr. Gillespie. Henceforward, then, "there is necessarily a Being of Infinity of Extension." The B is Mr Gillespie's. We do not generally spell "thing" with a T.\*

The statement we are next called upon to accept, in proposition 4, is that "The Being of Infinity of Extension is necessarily of unity and simplicity."

Now if the being here spoken of be infinity of extension itself, the acknowledged indivisibility of infinity of extension carries the two characteristics above mentioned along with it. The other being requires more looking after. Mr. Gillespie's method of proving his point in this case is, briefly, as follows:—"It is intuitively evident," he says, "that the Substratum of Infinity of Extension can be no more divisible than Infinity of Extension itself." Then infinity of extension being, admittedly, of unity and simplicity, because indivisible, it follows that the substratum must be so also. But what is meant by asserting it to be intuitively evident that the substratum of infinity of extension can be no more divisible than infinity of extension itself? This point will require some moments' reflection to elucidate it. Is it meant that, as a general truth, whatever can be predicated of an attribute can be predicated of the substance which has the attribute? Let us investigate a particular case—A lump of sugar is a being. (Start not, reader! We are bound to call it so.)

\* "Thing," without note or comment, is rather a question-begging word. It is used above in its very broadest sense, in which, so far from being opposed to "person," it includes it. The reader will kindly bear in mind that there are two distinct propositions—1, God exists; 2, The existence of God admits of demonstration. No man, I conceive, is warranted in denying the first or in asserting the second.



This being is possessed of an attribute, sweetness. Sweetness again may be said to be a simple quality incapable of analysis. Yet we are not forced to the conclusion that we cannot melt a lump of sugar in our tea. The sweetness may be one and indivisible, without the sugar, of which it is an attribute, being so. Since therefore the proposition under consideration is in this sense obviously untrue, we must not so understand it, if there be a better sense to put on it. But perhaps it will occur to the reader that while in the illustration chosen we have been dealing with a substance as clothed in the concrete, Mr. Gillespie never deals with it but as in the nudity of the abstract, that while we have been thinking of the whole congeries of attributes which forms our idea of a substance, Mr. Gillespie means by the term only the incognisable something which underlies, or is supposed to underlie, these attributes. This is undeniable: but, at the same time, the case is not altered in whatever sense the word 'substance' or 'substratum' be understood. It is true indeed that whatever may be predicated of an attribute may be predicated of the incognisable something underlying it in respect of the given attribute. But inasmuch as the incognisable something may have other attributes, in respect of which the thing in question may not be predicable, it follows that we are not at liberty to make the predication concerning the substance in itself. But to say that something may be predicated of a substance in respect of a given attribute amounts to no more than saying that something may be predicated of the given attribute itself. The very same lesson might have been derived from a contemplation of the humble being we before selected as an instance. Though a lump of sugar cannot be pronounced to be in itself simple and incapable of analysis, yet so far forth as the attribute sweetness is concerned, it certainly is so; but this again is a mere repetition of the statement that the attribute in question is simple and incapable of analysis. Applying these considerations to Mr. Gillespie's words, we see that from the indivisibility of infinity of extension he could only have been warranted in inferring that the substratum of infinity of extension is indivisible so far forth as its attribute of infinite extension is concerned, which is only another way of saying that infinity of extension is itself indivisible. Neither then can this be what Mr. Gillespie means: for we cannot think he would have omitted so essential a limitation. It is not, therefore, as an instance of a general axiom at all that the proposition in question is pronounced self-evident; but we are to understand that there are circumstances in this particular case which render it self-evident that a certain predicate is as applicable to the substratum we are concerned with as to its attribute. And so, no doubt, there are. For

suppose a thing infinitely extended, filling all space in the height, and breadth, and depth thereof. Such a thing must be completely motionless and indivisible. We cannot divide (except in the sense of partial consideration) without moving, and motion is impossible where there is no room to move in.

After this comes a corollary, not derived directly from proposition 4, but from the assertion, whose meaning we have just been investigating, that was thrown out in support of it. The corollary lays down that "The parts of the Substratum of Infinity of Extension are necessarily immovable among themselves.

After this again we have a scholium, which runs thus—"On the whole, therefore, the thing the parts of which are divisible from each other, is not the Substratum of Infinity of Extension, nor any part of it: And, the thing, the parts of which are movable among themselves, is not the Substratum, nor any part of it: Part, in the sense of partial consideration only." To the separate members of this scholium, under a slightly different form, we have already said "Amen": but a good thing will bear repeating.

Next, Mr. Gillespie proceeds to demonstrate that "The Material Universe is finite in extension." This is introduced as a sub-proposition. Some explanatory remarks are prefixed under the heading of "Postulata," of which I venture to give the gist in my own language. In the first place, Mr. Gillespie shrewdly remarks that only one reason can, by any possibility, be assigned for the allegation that "the Material Universe is of Infinity of Extension," to wit, that it is "the Substratum of Infinity of Extension." In other words, no reason can be assigned for the doctrine that the material universe is of infinity of extension, except that the said universe is infinite in extension. This is honourably distinguished by Mr. Gillespie from "an assertion made without the support of any reason at all." Perhaps the reader may not take so lenient a view. In the next place, the doctrine that "the Material Universe is the Substratum of Infinity of Extension" is identified by our author with contending that "the Material Universe is a thorough plenum—which is the equivalent of an absolute or completely incompressible solid—of Infinity of Extension." We, by the laws of dialectic, are bound to follow suit. Before plunging into the proof of the proposition we are now engaged on, it may be advantageous to take a review of the present state of the argument. It has been admitted, and must be admitted by all when the meaning of the words is understood, that "There is necessarily a Being of Infinity of Extension." In view hereof three hypotheses may be started—first, that the Material Universe is

this Being; second, that Infinity of Extension is itself the Being; third, that Something Else is the Being.

The opponent, imaginary or otherwise, who maintains the first of these hypotheses, is soon forced to bite the dust. "We know of a certainty," as Mr. Gillespie justly declares, "that some parts of the Material Universe are divisible from each other"; and we know it thus certainly, as he does not add, because experience has often apprised us of their actual division. Then by dint of the first half of the preceding scholium, the adversary is at once laid low. Mr. Gillespie, I am sorry to say, hits him with the other half after he is down. Even apart from this display of vindictiveness, however, the victory redounds more to the discredit of the vanquished than to the glory of the victor. For, if by the "Material Universe" is to be understood "a thorough plenum—which is the equivalent of an absolute or completely incompressible solid—of Infinity of Extension," it involves a palpable contradiction to maintain that the Material Universe is, strictly speaking, infinite. There cannot be such a thing as a thorough plenum, if motion be possible—and experience assures us that it is. The arguments of Lucretius on this head are entirely convincing. We do, then, seem to have valid ground of reason against a belief in the omnipresence of matter.

But there is a looser sense that may be put upon the phrase "infinite extension of matter." It may not be meant that matter is ubiquitous, but only that we should be liable to come across it occasionally, could we travel in a straight line to all eternity; that, however vast the oceans of vacuum traversed, there would still be continents and islands of matter to be encountered, nor would we ever reach an "Ocean-stream," as it were, of emptiness, which would be absolutely without a material shore. In other words, matter and void between them may be infinitely extended, and that not in the sense of void enclosing matter, but of the two occurring everywhere in alternate layers. On this supposition, matter alone is not the substratum of infinity of extension—that is to say, is not, truly and literally, infinitely extended. Infinite extension is not a mere mode of matter and impossible apart from it: because it is equally an attribute of void. This Mr. Gillespie has clearly seen; and he properly concludes, in the scholium appended, that neither in this sense is matter the substratum of infinity of extension. To put it differently, because the extension of matter here spoken of is not truly infinite, not being continuous, he justly maintains that it is not correct to talk of it as infinite. But Mr. Gillespie nowhere shows that matter and void do not extend alternately, in whatsoever proportions, as far as our imaginations can serve to carry us, and farther too, if the latter



expression have a meaning. He has not made clear that matter and void, as forming one whole, are not, to translate into his own dialect, the Being which is the Substratum of Infinity of Extension. His scholium does not demonstrate that matter *with hollow gaps* would not serve as the substratum of infinity of extension, but only that matter, with hollow gaps—a quite different thing—would not do so.

The truth is, the question whether there be limits to the habitat, so to speak, of matter, is one which we have no means whatever of deciding. Experience is obviously incapable of an answer; while the "*intellectus nudus*," as represented by Mr. Gillespie, is wisely silent on the subject. The point is not one for the expression of opinion, but for profound ignorance, and the hearty confession of such ignorance.

It is now time that we should advert to the fact that, although to talk in the loose sense described above of the "infinite extension" of matter may be very well in common parlance, it will not do in a metaphysical discussion. The assertion that the whole made up of matter and void together is the being which is the substratum of infinity of extension is only another way of enunciating the second hypothesis given above, namely, that infinity of extension is its own substratum. This will be evident from the following considerations:—Infinity of extension being an attribute of matter and void conjointly, it follows that extension itself is equally an attribute of matter and void. This being the case, the substratum of extension, whether finite or infinite, must be looked for only among the qualities which those things have in common; all qualities of matter not shared by void must be purely accidental and irrelevant, and capable of being removed without the substratum of extension being at all affected. What the common quality is need not be a matter of long search, since void possesses no positive qualities but the single one of extension. So that to say matter and void between them extend everywhere, is to say that extension is the substratum of extension, and that the substratum of infinity of extension is no other than infinity of extension itself. Thus we see that the common notion of the infinite extension of matter, when looked into, is found coincident with the second of the three hypotheses with regard to the nature of our necessarily existing "Being." To attribute infinity of extension to a thorough plenum of matter we have found absurd, unless we are prepared to admit that motion is a delusion: but if by the term material universe be meant a combination of matter and void, we have seen no reason for denying it the attribute of infinity of extension.

We now come to a "General Scholium as to Extension," in which Mr Gillespie calls attention to an ambiguity of language,

and (following Locke) proposes a measure for its avoidance. "Here are two sorts of extension. The one sort, that which the Material Universe has: And the other the extension of Infinity of Extension." That is the ambiguity. And the remedy suggested is to confine to the former idea the word "Extension," and to express the latter by the word "Expansion." It is with the latter idea we have been dealing throughout; so that all that has hitherto been said of Extension, the reader must now consider as having been said of Expansion.

With regard to this scholium the commentator is again forced to dissent somewhat from his author. It is true there is an ambiguity to be avoided with regard to the word "extension"; and we much need the sign-post of language to keep us from taking a wrong turn. Nevertheless, I cannot help thinking that to say there are two sorts of extension is a somewhat misleading way of expressing the fact that we sometimes use the word "extension" for space itself, sometimes for the quality of occupying a certain amount of space. This point will bear dwelling upon—Material objects must exist in space, though they may change their whereabouts indefinitely. When we talk of the "extension" of a material object, we do not mean the particular portion of space occupied by it at a given moment, but an amount of space equal to that portion. Wherever an object may be, this amount will be the same, provided the object has not been physically compressed or expanded. In any sense of the word, however, extension is (literally speaking) indivisible. Matter may be actually moved and divided; not so its extension. It is absurd to speak of the extension of matter as indivisible, except arithmetically, or "in the sense of partial consideration only."

From the considerations urged in the general scholium, Mr. Gillespie extracts the doctrine of "penetration." Even where matter exists, there exists besides, on any view of the case, another and immaterial being. Matter does not dislodge space, for the very good reason that there is nothing to dislodge. On the hypothesis, therefore, that our being is infinity of extension itself, the doctrine of penetration expresses no more than the admitted fact that matter exists in space. But on the hypothesis that the thing of which infinite extension is an attribute is something of which we have as yet no cognisance, a more important result follows, namely, that there is a being other than space, which "must penetrate the material universe, and every atom, even the minutest atom, of it."

Let us proceed to examine the next link in the chain of reasoning. At the point of the argument we have now reached, Mr. Gillespie seems to think the old honours fail. Not content with calling the thing, which, for aught yet shown, may be

nothing more than infinity of extension, a "Being" (it is the Being we complain of), he now confers upon it the title of "Spirit." The thing is done rather in a corner—in a sub-scholium. But when the ceremony is over, Mr. Gillespie faces round boldly enough, and declares that no one can "righteously" object to his calling our being an "Infinite Spirit." Now, I venture to think that we may, righteously enough, remark that the term "Spirit" is generally understood to imply more attributes than the sole one of extension, the attributes, to wit, of personality and intelligence; and that since our being may perhaps fail to make good its claim to the possession of these attributes, it is premature to dub it straight off with the appellation "Infinite Spirit." Some people even deny extension of spirit. There is no need to enter into that question. But because spirit may have extension, it by no means follows that everything which has extension is spirit. However, our dispute is about things, not words. We may call our being by any name that suits Mr. Gillespie, provided we are careful to bear in mind that we do not thereby invest it with a single attribute which it is not demonstrated to possess.

Proposition 5 sets forth that "There is necessarily but one Being of Infinity of Expansion." This is quite incontrovertible on the hypothesis which we must never lose sight of, unless forced to relinquish, namely, that infinity of expansion may itself be the being. It is evident there can be only one infinity of expansion. For if there were another, where would it be? If it be answered, "In the same place as the first, namely, everywhere," we may safely ask the objector wherein the two differ, so as to prevent our considering them identical? It remains for us to inquire how Mr. Gillespie secures his position on the other possible view. He sets off thus—"And, as 'tis evident there can no more be more than one Substratum of Infinity of Expansion (whatever that Substratum is) than there can be more than one Infinity of Expansion." To which he afterwards adds—"And, therefore, anyone who asserts he can suppose two or more necessarily existing beings, each of Infinity of Expansion, is no more to be argued with than he who denies, Whatever is."

Now this is no fit place to quarrel with Mr. Gillespie about his postulates. Still it may be permitted to remark that in view of the mystery of penetration, in initiating us into which Mr. Gillespie has himself played the part of hierophant, this declaration sounds very arbitrary indeed. A spiritual being and a material being can co-exist in the same portion of space. That is granted. Why, therefore, should not a spiritual being co-exist with a thorough plenum of matter, of infinite extension, supposing such a plenum to be, on other grounds, possible? Why not two

spiritual beings co-exist throughout space? Why not any amount of spiritual beings? But we are very ignorant; and Mr. Gillespie may be acquainted with something in the nature of spirit, which renders spiritual beings mutually exclusive as regards space, though matter and spirit are not so. Besides as we should be put beyond the pale of argument were we to maintain the existence of an infinite number of spiritual beings, each of infinite extension, it will be more discreet not to maintain it. "Then, there is, necessarily, but one Being of Infinity of Expansion." Here ends the First Part of the First Division, and with it our comments thereupon—save for one word in conclusion. The following is the present state of the argument:—Although the universe, which, if we admit the reality of motion, we are compelled to conceive of as a combination of matter and void, may be, nay, to our minds, is of infinite extension, yet that statement amounts to no more than a reiteration of the initial assumption that infinity of extension necessarily exists. Consequently, if Mr. Gillespie can demonstrate that infinity of extension, or as we ought now to call it, expansion, is not itself a being, but a mode of some being or substance other than the universe, he will be fairly on his way to the desired conclusion.

*(To be Continued.)*

## RESEARCHES IN SPIRITUALISM.

By M. A. (OXON).

### SPIRIT PHOTOGRAPHY—CHAPTER IV.—*(Continued.)*

M. BUGUET.

ANOTHER photographer who has been most successful in obtaining pictures of spirits is Mons. Ed. Buguet, 5 Boulevard Montmartre, Paris. As works of art, his photographs are worthy of high praise, and the spirit forms are remarkably distinct. Unlike the heavily-draped figures which present themselves on the plate at Mr. Hudson's studio, the figures on the photographs of M. Buguet are clearly defined and, in every case, recognisable. The faces are unveiled, and stand out with perfect definition, in the majority of instances. Some, indeed, are more defined than the faces of the sitters, in consequence of the latter being enveloped in the gauze-like drapery which the spirit wears. A notable feature in almost all these French photographs is the beautiful texture of the drapery, and the artistic manner in which it is disposed. The figure is usually placed behind the sitter—the hands outstretched over his head, as though in the

act of drawing that force which is used in manifestations. This is precisely the attitude in which clairvoyants see controlling spirits as they influence a trance medium. Out of a number of M. Buguet's photographs which lie before me, the first twenty at which I have looked show the spirit standing in this attitude.

From the outstretched arm depends a mass of extremely fine drapery—much finer than that shown in Mr. Hudson's photographs. In his pictures it is apparently substantial, like the orthodox covering of "the sheeted dead"—very like that mysterious substance in which materialised spirits clothe themselves. In these, on the contrary, the gossamer-like delicacy of the drapery is unlike anything of earth. It seems, in some cases, to be, as Lady Caithness describes, "fluidic." It falls in voluminous folds on the sitters, enveloping them from head to foot, and overlaying them in places with layer after layer of its impalpable, airy substance. In every picture that I have seen, some portion of the drapery falls *in front* of the sitter, while in some cases it envelopes him, and causes his face to look more ghost-like than that of the spirit above him.

These photographs, again, are quite unlike those taken by Mr. Mumler in America. Those are shadowy indeed, but not from the gauzy drapery which they wear. They are, as I have described them, quite unshrouded. There is no vestige of drapery in any of the American photographs, while all M. Buguet's spirits come with great masses of this airy covering, which gives the idea of a partial materialisation of that which the spirit has collected round itself for the moment. It seems, indeed, to be in motion, as though the atoms of which it is composed were kept in suspension and rotation round the figure of the spirit. When I come to treat of the means by which these pictures are produced by the Invisibles, I shall have something to say on this theory:—Is it not the case that photographs of spirits are in some cases photographs of pictures or sculptures (according as the presentation shows a flat or rounded surface), and in others photographs of a quasi-materialisation, in which the spirit condenses from the atmosphere a fluidic figure which is not substantial enough to make an impression on the retina, though it does on the sensitised plate? For the present, I confine myself to facts.

On Saturday, July 6, 1874, I paid a visit to M. Buguet. He was then in London, and had a temporary studio in Baker Street. The appearance of the room is described by Lady Caithness in her communication. I will therefore simply say that I examined all the apparatus, and followed the plate throughout in the manner which I have previously described, even focussing for myself, so as to prevent the possibility of any tampering with



the back-ground. A well-defined figure appears behind me. The features are clear, and I am enveloped in the drapery. I do not recognise the spirit, which, I have since been informed, is not one connected with me.

Mr. and Mrs. Burns, who were present with me, also sat, and although the day was unfavourable, being dull and rainy, eight spirit photographs were taken under test conditions. M. Buguet is evidently a very powerful medium. He is a tall, thin man, with earnest face and clearly cut features, and plenty of bushy black hair. I was sensible of great influence when near him. He would be a powerful magnetizer, I fancy. He acts throughout under spirit guidance, being in partial trance during the exposure of the plate. The length of exposure is regulated by spirit guidance—he does not stop the camera until he is told to do so.

I extract from the *Spiritualist* of June 26, 1874, the Editor's account of his experiment with M. Buguet. He has paid much attention to the question of Spirit Photography, is an expert in the subject, and will not be suspected of any credulity or lack of care in investigating.

"On Thursday, last week, I was invited, with other friends, to observe the manipulation in the studio of M. Buguet, spirit photographer, of Paris, who during a temporary visit to London is taking pictures at 33 Baker Street. Mrs. Makdougall Gregory, Mrs. Ross Church, Mrs. Showers, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Ivimey, Mr. Martheze, and other friends, were present.

"I offered to take the negative myself, he merely standing by to get the influence of his mediumship upon the plate. This he declined, saying that the manifestations were more likely to be successful if he handled the plates and chemicals throughout.

"After trying one picture, on which no spirits came, he began to take another, as follows: he cut a corner with jagged fracture off a bare plate of glass, and handed the little piece to the sitter, who was a friend of Mr. Coleman. The object of cutting off the piece was to show by the separated corner afterwards fitting the plate with its finished picture, that the plate had not been changed during the operations.

"He then cleaned the plate and took it into the dark room. Some rare samples of glass will retain an invisible image after one picture has been taken, which will faintly reappear after the plate has been cleaned, re-coated with collodion, and exposed on another sitter; but the resulting picture in this instance was not one of that nature.

"We then entered the dark room. I noticed that no diffused white daylight entered the room through cracks, nor was there any artificial light by which transparency printing on the negative plate might have been done. I examined the moveable bath, which was not a dipping bath, but a flat horizontal tray, in which the collodionised plate remained in my sight, face uppermost, while it was being sensitised in the nitrate of silver solution.

"It was then put in the dark slide which I had previously opened and examined, and in which it was carried in my sight to the studio. I examined the camera and lens thoroughly, taking them to pieces to a considerable extent. I took part in the focussing, and saw only the sitter on the ground glass—no spirits.

"During the exposure of the plate, M. Buguet stood near the camera, with his head leaning against the wall: he seemed to go into a semi-trance.

"Afterwards I followed him, with the dark slide in his hand, to the developing room, saw the plate removed from the slide, the developer immediately poured over it, and two spirits make their appearance on the plate behind the sitter. Their features came out distinctly; it was not a good photograph, artistically speaking; the chemicals were working badly, and threw down much loose silver deposit.

"The operations all through lasted from seven to ten minutes.

"Invisible pictures may be painted on a background with sulphate of quinine, resoline, or other fluorescent substance, which invisible pictures can be photographed so as to appear in any negative taken before that background. The photograph now under notice was not one of that nature.

"The background was the ordinary wall-paper of the private room in which the photographs were taken, and all kinds of spirits appear in M. Buguet's pictures taken before the same background.

"At the close of the operations the corner of the glass cut off was found to fit the plate on which the picture had been taken. The spirits on the negative and the finished prints, have not been recognised.

"M. Buguet is a thoughtful, intelligent-looking man, creating favourable impressions by his appearance.

"Obviously it is not possible to say much about spirit photography on the slender experience of observing one experiment, but I do not know how to produce by artificial means, a similar picture under like conditions."

Amongst the pile of photographs which lie before me are three very curious ones of John King, who must be quite used to sitting for his photograph by this time. (Mr. Hudson, by the way, I am glad to see, has succeeded in getting a picture of him by the magnesium light at the house of Colonel Greck.) In two of M. Buguet's pictures, the well-known turbaned head, square beard, and earnest features, are clearly presented; while in his hand he holds the lamp with which he lights up his features. In the third the turban is thrown back, and the face is more clearly revealed, the beard, with its long, curly hair, giving the face quite another appearance. This, however, may well be. Materialising spirits, I presume, can alter the shape of such a trifle as a beard at their will, and it need cause no more surprise to find them doing so than it does to see a painter idealising his subject, or a sculptor draping a respectable middle-aged gentleman of the present era in the graceful folds of a Roman toga. And any one who will try the appearance of his own head draped as John King's usually is, will see how vast the change is from his ordinary expression.

Another photograph is that of Sir Charles Isham. Though he is not able to recognise the figure, it is extremely well-defined; and the companion picture of Lady Isham shows very distinctly the aura which seems to join the hands of the spirit to the head of the sitter.

Mr. Gledstanes appears in another picture, with a very clear portrait of Judge Edmonds. He had sat down with the desire

of securing a picture of the spirit, who comes accordingly. A communication since received from the spirit through a perfectly independent source, authenticates the likeness.

Other celebrated faces appear. Miss Blackwell is favoured with the presence of her friend Allan Kardec, as is Lady Caithness also. Miss Blackwell further shows on another plate, with the historic features of Charles I. looking benignantly down upon her; and yet again, with Charles Dickens grimly keeping watch and ward behind her! Livingstone graces another picture, and Lamartine another. The conjunction is sufficiently odd. One would like to be present when the great Re-incarnationist enlightened Livingstone, Lamartine, Dickens, and Charles the King on their future prospects. One fears that Charles, at any rate, might not look forward to it with much hope. The purgatorial process, whether by re-incarnation or by spirit purification, will be likely to be severe.

A very curious group\* is one respecting which Mr. Gledstanes has kindly furnished me with particulars from the pen of M. Alfred Véron, one of the sitters. The account is translated from the original letter of M. Véron :—

"I reply, my dear Gledstanes, to your request, by sending you the account of the photographic phenomenon, which is not the only remarkable occurrence which has taken place at Buguet's. It is one, however, that I can certify as being true. This is the case. I was at home in company with M. Gailhard of the Opera, and Madame L., trance medium. The medium in trance gave us a rendezvous at Buguet's. (It was the spirit of her father who was speaking through her.) We all three kept the appointment; and while the photographer was preparing his plate in his laboratory, I put myself first in position. Then it was that Madame L. made a request, which Buguet, not being in the room, could not possibly have heard. She said, 'Pray do not make such great eyes.' (*Ne faites donc pas d'aussi grands yeux.*) Strange to say the spirit of the lady's father—the one who had made the appointment with us, and *who has thrown his image on four plates in four different attitudes*—presented himself on the first occasion with his hand over my eyes, as though he would say, 'I am here indeed, and, to shew you that I hear what is said, I cover M. Véron's eyes with my hand.' This is the history of the fact. It is useless to insist on the identity of the spirit who came four times. It is certainly the lady's father; and he has been recognised by the family.

(Signed) "ALFRED VERON."

In a letter addressed to myself Mr. Gledstanes further says:—

"There are one or two more points about this photograph. The gentleman died in hospital, and he had a gash on his forehead. He appears on the plate in hospital dress, with the mark on his forehead. Moreover the shape of his face, as you perceive, resembles that of his daughter, who had never seen her father, and consequently did not know who the spirit was, until she had shewn the photograph to her mother, who at once said it was her husband."

\* The group referred to may be seen in the window of the Spiritual Institution.

Another striking picture is that of Mr. Robert Cooper, of Eastbourne, respecting which he has favoured me with the appended letter of authentication. The spirit form is beautifully draped, the face and head being perfectly clear and free from all drapery. The hand is extended over Mr. Cooper's head, and the drapery from it covers his head and part of his body.

"Vienna Lodge, Eastbourne, Nov. 13, 1874.

"My Dear Sir.—I have read with much interest and pleasure your excellent articles in *Human Nature*. I had intended to send you a brief account of my experience with M. Bugnet, but somehow or other it escaped me. I do it with pleasure now. Two portraits were taken on one sheet of glass; on one there was only my own portrait, but on the other there was a female form standing behind me on one side. An inspection of the negative only did not lead me to recognise the figure of the spirit as that of any one I knew; but on seeing the printed photograph I at once saw a resemblance to my wife, who died some sixteen years ago. My children also saw a resemblance to their mother, as others have done who knew her. It was on one occasion shown to a person without any clue whatever being given, and my own portrait concealed from view. It was at once pronounced to be my wife. This of course is a most satisfactory and conclusive proof of the identity. I may mention that one reason why I did not recognise the likeness on first seeing it, was that the hair was plain instead of being in ringlets as I expected, that being the style my wife usually wore her hair; but I now see that the appearance represents my wife as she was before she died, when her hair was plain, as in the photograph. Thanking you for what you are doing for Spiritualism.—I remain, yours faithfully,

"ROBERT COOPER."

Another case I have received information of through the kindness of my friend, Mrs. Fitzgerald. The sitter is M. Clemens, a German friend of her's, who has lately been staying in her house, and who himself furnishes the account. The figure, though not so sharply defined as some others, is perfectly recognisable. This is M. Clemens' account, only verbally altered so as to remove grammatical peculiarities:—

"During the time I was residing in Paris last spring, I went to M. Bugnet, the spirit photographer. At the first sitting a spirit of a lady appeared behind me. I could not, however, recognise it on the negative. When M. Bugnet sent me the pictures I tried with a magnifying glass, and the idea at once flashed upon me that the spirit had a remarkable resemblance to an Austrian lady who is connected with my family, and who, with her daughter, passed last summer in our house. When she was going back to Austria she was in a state of great suffering, so much so that she did not expect to see us again. Since that time we received only one letter from her, and she was still suffering and ill. The spirit on my picture bore an astonishing resemblance to this lady. Four days after, I was greatly startled by receiving a letter from my father announcing the death of this same Austrian lady. *She passed away at the very time that I went to M. Bugnet—on the very day.* I said nothing to my family about this remarkable coincidence; but when I got back to Germany I gave my spirit picture to my parents, and at first sight they recognised in the spirit the likeness of the Austrian lady. I think the fact so remarkable that I cannot refrain from publishing it.

(Signed) "W. CLEMENS."

But by far the most remarkable experience has been that of Lady Caithness. She has been fortunate enough to obtain *five* clearly recognised portraits of relations and friends. One of these—the Count de Pomar with his father—is printed as an illustration to this article. I have received from the Countess a letter which authenticates these portraits. Her ladyship testifies as follows:—

“Barrogill Castle, Wick, N. B.

“Sept. 15, 1874.

“I must apologise for having delayed answering your letter; but besides having visitors at the Castle, I am very busy trying to finish my book (*“Old Truths in a New Light”*) before leaving to spend some months in Italy—so much so that I do not like to lose a moment, and yet your letter must be answered, and ought to have been so sooner.

“I send you the two photographs that are most likely to interest the public, each having a little history attached to it that M. Buguet could not possibly have known anything about. I must, however, say, in justice to M. Buguet, that the spirit likenesses on four others have also been fully recognised, two as those of my mother and sister, and the other two as distinct and different likenesses of my dear father, although we went as perfect strangers to M. Buguet’s studio.

“In one of those I enclose [*the one printed as an illustration in this number*] you will recognise my son, Count de Medina Pomar. The spirit who appears behind him is *unmistakably* his father—General the Count de Medina Pomar; and that there should be no mistake in identity, he brings in his hand an apple, which is the family crest, from Pome or Pomar.

“On my photographic card you will find the spirit of Allan Kardec, which, I assure you, I value most highly as a proof of his approval of my intention to make his works known in English, for which purpose, I believe I told you, they are now being translated.

“I have placed the likeness of the great French philosopher in my album of spirit-photographs collected in England and America in juxtaposition with five others of the same spirit; three with his wife, one with his great friend, M. Camille Flammarion, the eminent French astronomer, and the fifth with Miss Blackwell, as by so doing it can be seen at a glance that the six are all the same spirit, and yet each offers a totally distinct and different appearance from the other.

“Perhaps you are not aware that I have already said a few words on this subject in the *Spiritualist* of July 24, to which I beg to refer you for any particulars I may have omitted in this hurried letter.

“M. CAITHNESS.”

I append the account to which Lady Caithness refers, extracted from the *Spiritualist*, July 24, 1874:—

“I experience so much happiness every time I look at the photographs obtained through the celebrated French photographer, Monsieur Ed. Buguet, that I feel bound in gratitude, not only to him, but to the dear spirit friends who have come to us through his wonderful mediumship, to make the fact more generally known through the columns of the *Spiritualist*, than it can ever be by merely showing them to friends in my own drawing-room, which, however, has also been a great satisfaction, for the



spirit likenesses have been recognised again and again by old friends of my family, who were personally intimate with the originals.

"One lady in Edinburgh to whom I sent copies, and who had never heard of or seen anything of this wonderful phase of Spiritual phenomena, has since written to me that she could not sleep all night for thinking of them. Her words are as follow:—'I recognised every one; darling Ellen (my sister) is most wonderful, and your late husband and father not less so. I tossed about the whole night after seeing them, never slept, and Percy came to me at four o'clock in the morning, saying, "I cannot sleep for thinking of those photos; they are something wonderful!"' I can truly echo the words and fully endorse them.

"I went with my son, Count de Medina Pomar, both of us perfect strangers to Monsieur Buguet, found him as courteous and amiable as Mr. Burns had described him in the *Medium*; was introduced into his front drawing-room in Baker Street, which, I may mention, for the satisfaction of those who fancy that lay figures may be concealed, was perfectly devoid of furniture—an empty room, in fact. There was not even a second chair for me to sit on whilst my son was having the first *pose*, the only chair provided being for the sitter; this, with the tiniest of all tiny tables, and a long cheval glass, used for reflection, was all the furniture the room contained, the walls being perfectly bare.

"M. Buguet did not approach us, but stood at the other end of the room, near his camera, excepting on two occasions, when I asked for a support for my head. As soon as we were ready, each in our turn, he placed the glasses in the camera, and turning towards the wall, buried his face in his hands, as if engaged in prayer—which I presume was the case, as he had recommended us to raise a short prayer that our departed friends might be permitted to come.

"I must also mention in this place that a hint had been given to us by a French friend, a Catholic, to go to Monsieur Buguet on a Friday, if possible, it being a fast-day. As I was anxious to obtain the best results possible, I naturally availed myself of the advice, for it would have been foolish to neglect any hint of the kind from one who had also been most successful in his experiences with the mediumistic photographer.

"After a short absence from the room at the close of every *pose*, Mons. Buguet returned, bringing the negatives for our inspection; he had an anxious concerned look on his countenance until rejoiced by our expressions of delight on several occasions on our recognising, even on the glass, some dear and well-remembered features, long passed away from our midst. Sometimes no spirit form whatever was visible on the glass; this did not of course count, and was not charged for, but between my son and myself we were successful thirteen times; and out of the thirteen we distinctly recognised the spirit forms of five dear ones whom we had never hoped to see again on earth. One of these, my father, appears no less than three times, once with my son, once with me, and once as if floating over us both, and enveloping us with part of his fluidic drapery. Strange to say, in order that there may be no doubt about the identity of the spirit of my late husband, he brings in his hand the family crest and emblem.

"To those who still hesitate to believe, and fail to comprehend the possibility of communication between us and our departed relatives and friends, and who, in order to justify their unbelief, determine in their own minds that there must be collusion on the part of the medium—who they presume prepares the appearance of spirit forms beforehand on his glasses—I will only point to this extraordinary and beautiful test, and to these perfect likenesses, recognised by each and every friend who has seen them, and again

bid them remember that we were perfect strangers to the medium, who had never heard of us before.

"I must also mention one other wonderful circumstance, which may indeed be considered as a perfect test, and that is the appearance of the spirit of the late Allan Kardec on one of my *cartes*—perfectly recognisable by every one. This is most satisfactory to me, in more ways than one, as it also gives me a proof that he is near, and approvingly watching over me in the work I have undertaken, of translating one of his beautiful books, *La Genèse*, into English, and in making known his other works in England and America, by publishing them entirely at my own cost, which I am now about to do.

"This likeness of the spirit of Allan Kardec also affords yet another very good and satisfactory test. I have formed a large collection of spirit photographs, commenced last year in America through the aid of Mr. Mumler, and have now completed the album with those of Mons. Bugnet. Amongst the latter I have five others of Allan Kardec—three with his widow, one with Miss Blackwell, and one with the celebrated French astronomer and talented author, Monsieur Camille Flammarion. Allan Kardec's appearance on my own *carte* forms therefore the sixth. I have placed them altogether on one page of the album, and the test I allude to is most conclusive, for each is perfectly distinct in appearance and position from the other, and yet all are excellent likenesses of the great philosopher.

"MARIE CATHERINE."

Dr. Brocard Boulland adds his testimony to M. Bugnet's success thus:—

"5, Vincent Square, Westminster, London,  
Nov. 17, 1874.

"SIR,—Please to take from the following account what seems good to you. Spiritualism, from my point of view, is composed of a number of rings which must be linked one within the other to make an electric chain. That is the reason why I pray you to pardon me for trespassing on your valuable time.

"I did not know M. Bugnet at all until I learned from the newspapers that he was in London. As a Spiritualist and fellow countryman, I went to see him at his hotel. He was not in sympathy with me, I ought to say, and I left him without regret. As he asked me to go and see him at Baker Street I went there a fortnight afterwards, and he was good enough to give me a sitting, which I gladly availed myself of. I left him to *pose* me as he pleased. I can certify that there was nothing in his studio which would lead one to suppose that he had any apparatus for deception.

"I had desired the presence of one of my guides. I had not thought of my dear mother except in my private prayers, for I had been counselled by one of my guides in the month of April last to pray for her deliverance, and had been recommended expressly not to summon her and to wait with patience, so I did not anticipate anything in that quarter.

"After the operation I saw a spirit of a lady, and had no doubt that it was the spirit of my mother. Two days after I went again to M. Bugnet, and he gave me my photograph. I examined it with the most minute and scrupulous attention. I admit that the white hair bothered me a little; but all at once I recognised my mother, smiling at me with the same smile that she had when on this earth.

"My wife came to meet me at M. Bugnet's, and I put the photograph into her hand, leaving her at liberty to make it out and recognise the spirit standing behind me. After a quarter of an hour's examination she cried out, 'It is your dear old mother' (*C'est ta bonne vieille mère*).

"I should further add that it matters not to whom I shew this photograph: everybody sees between us a resemblance which was frequently observed in life.

"On my honour I certify that this authentication is the simple and honest truth.

(Signed) "E. BROCARD BOULLAND."

(*To be continued.*)

---

\* \* The Photographs referred to are on view at the Spiritual Institution, where many others by the same Photographer may be seen. In our next we shall print a copy of the most remarkable spirit photograph ever taken for clearness and life-like reality. The article on M. Buguet will be completed, and attention will be directed to the photographer, Mr. Parkes, of Gaynes Park Terrace, Bow, who has lately come before the public in a professional capacity.

---

## A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF "THE BOOK OF GOD."

### No. I.

By E. W. BERRIDGE, M.B. (Lond.)

OF late years, five volumes of a remarkable work have been published under the name of "The Book of God;" the first three consisting of the "Apocalypse of Adam Oannes," with an introduction and commentary; the last two, of "The Book of Enoch"; the rest of the series have not yet appeared. The principal teaching—the keynote—of this book is as follows:—"For the first 200 years after the creation of mortals," says our author (vol. 1. p. 51), "God taught them by divine instincts; after this, in every hundred years He set up a teacher, who kept alive His holy knowledge. Twenty-four of these appeared and taught, and they are commemorated in the Apocalypse [of Oannes] as the twenty-four Ancients." The first of these assertions seems very probable; it was the Golden Age of seers and poets, when *all* men were enabled to receive divine truth directly, though, doubtless, there were even then some especially set apart as teachers; and of this we have strong proof in the writings of spiritual seers of the highest kind, though this happy period was extended far beyond the narrow limits of 200 years. Of the second assertion we have but little proof—still it may be true, and it is not a matter which greatly concerns us now. The third and more important assertion is this: that after the last of these twenty-four Ancients had appeared, God sent forth a special Teacher or Messenger every 600 years (which is stated to be an astronomical cycle) and that there have been twelve of these special Messengers, the last having recently commenced his teachings, after whom there are to be no more *of this order*. The names as given by our author are:—(1) Adam Oannes, (2) Enoch, (3) Fohi, (4) Brigoo, (5) Zoroaster, (6) Thoth, (7) Moses, (8) Lao-Tsen, (9) Jesus, (10) Mohammed, (11) Chengiz-Khan, and (12) ———. He further states that the teachings of these Messengers have been greatly corrupted, and that his mission (in which he claims to act

"under a divine auspice," vol. 4, p. 22, preface) is to restore these lost and corrupted Scriptures. Whether the doctrine of the Twelve Messengers appearing at intervals of 600 years be true or not, and whether he has really restored the text of these ancient Scriptures, is a matter which I hope to investigate hereafter. Of one thing I am certain, that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures are *not* corrupt to the extent that he speaks of, and that in those instances which I have critically examined, his objections to them rest on erroneous translations, or misunderstanding of their true meaning; in fact, they are often stale objections, which have been raised and refuted in bygone years—ghosts that have long ago been laid, but are now resurrected. This, however, is a matter which I shall examine hereafter. The subject of my present paper is to show who the Twelfth Messenger is, and, in doing so, I take for granted for a time that the theory of the twelve Messengers is true, and the "restoration" of their teachings, so far as they have been published, are reliable.

We must, in order to ascertain this, first discover how the cycle of 600 years (otherwise called the *Naros* or *Sybilline* year) is to be reckoned. Chronology shows that we cannot reckon 600 years exactly from either the birth or commencement of teaching of one Messenger to that of another; nor is there any reason why it should be so, as the teaching of each was not confined to any one year, but extended through a considerable portion of his life. In p. 57 of vol. 1, our author says, "God resolved that this period should be the cycle of His Messiahs, and should constitute the interval *during* which they were each destined successively to appear." Again, he says (pp. 316-17) that Augustus Cæsar wished to be thought the ninth Messenger, but finding in the Sybilline books that *the eighth cycle had not run its course*, he destroyed all these writings that he could find. Since Jesus (the Ninth Messenger) was born in the reign of Augustus, it is evident that the Messenger appeared at the *beginning* of each cycle. When, therefore, did the 12th cycle begin? There is an error of five years in our ordinary chronology, so that the 12th cycle really commenced in 1805. By this time (1874) we should have expected that the Twelfth Messenger should have made his appearance.\* What is the characteristic of the Twelfth Messenger? Our author says (vol. 1, p. 634), "The Twelfth Messenger brings the key which opens *all* secrets. And again, after asserting that the *Naros* was *kept secret*, lest impostors should arise claiming the office, he says (vol. 1, p. 82), "Now, indeed, it may be revealed, for the 12th cycle is completed [*? commenced*] and a new era of light will prevent the uprising of any without the very seal of heaven itself." It should not, then, be very difficult to answer the question, "Who is the Twelfth Messenger?" There is only *one* man of the present century whose teaching agrees with the indications here laid down—THOMAS LAKE HARRIS, the human author of that truly sublime

\* Is it possible that the Messenger always appears in the first 60 years of the cycle? The number 60 would here again have reference to the *Naros*.

work, the "Arcana of Christianity." If the Twelfth Messenger holds the key which unlocks *all* knowledge, then this title belongs to him *alone*, if to any. Though he has at present published but a little of what he has in MS., I can assert, from a constant study of his writings for many years, that there is scarcely a single problem (if any) in spiritual matters which he does not elucidate, or at least give hints towards the complete explanation, which will be given in future volumes; solving difficulties which have hitherto puzzled mankind, and have remained unsolved by such writers as Böhmen, Swedenborg, and even the author of the "Book of God." In addition to this Harris *alone* has shown mankind the means of establishing a universal brotherhood, or Church (which our author so ardently desires, vol. 1, pp. 212-13), a brotherhood based, not on external forms or mere opinions or dogmas, like the man-made churches of the present day, nor even based upon an acceptance of the doctrines of the Twelve Messengers, as our author proposes (vol. 5, p. 147), but upon an *organic fact*, in the spiritual and natural constitution of men, viz.—internal respiration;\* by means of which the recipient, if faithful, is guided by his Heavenly Father in all things, and is eventually enabled to do His will on earth, even as it is done in heaven.

But it will be asked, does the mission of Harris agree with the predictions concerning the Twelfth Messenger in the Apocalypse of Oannes? It does in a most remarkable way; and I will now, assuming for the time, as I said before, that this Apocalypse is authentic, prove that it is so. In sections 43-45 of the Apocalypse we read of the Twelfth Messenger, "I saw a Messenger come down from Heaven having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain was in his hand." This has been exactly fulfilled. Harris has given us the only complete and satisfactory information respecting the present and future state of those who have confirmed themselves in evil when in the world, of any who have written on the subject; and as a key unlocks a door and reveals what was previously concealed, so he is said to have "the key of the bottomless pit." The Apocalypse continues, "He grasped the Dragon, that old serpent, who is the Accuser and Satanas, and he bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal on him that he might not wander any more among the nations till the thousand years be completed." Any one who has read Harris's writings,† and knows what he says concerning the *binding of evil spirits* by those who possess Internal Breathing, will see how forcibly this applies to him. In section 44 we read of a multitude (144,000) who "sang a new song before the Throne, and before the four Living Ones, and the Ancients; and none could learn that song, but the 144,000, who had been purchased from the earth. These are they who are undefiled

\* By the request of the editor, I am preparing a paper on the subject of Internal Breathing, in which I hope to elucidate its phenomena, both physical and spiritual, from cases which have come under my own observation.

† The works of Harris are in the Progressive Library.



with women, for they are as pure virgins." The "new song," our author says (page 637), is "the new revelation, that of the Twelfth Messenger;" and any one who has read Harris's teaching on the subject of marriage, and conjugal purity, free from all the perversion of the present social state, will understand at once how the latter part of this clause refers to those who receive his teaching, or I should say the teaching of God through him.

Again, in section 45, we have a most remarkable prediction, every word of which will apply to Harris: "And I heard a voice from heaven, This is my son, I will help him; this is my chosen one; my soul has accepted him. I have put my spirit [*breath*] upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the nations." This is a wonderful prophecy. Inasmuch as internal breathing, the original state of the inhabitants of this earth, ceased through their wickedness, and has been only restored in isolated cases till the time of Harris; and as he, with these exceptions, was the first to whom it was restored, and is now through it commencing the greatest spiritual and social work of modern times; can we not see how in a special sense he may be called "the chosen one"? The phrase "I will put my spirit [*breath*] upon him" is an evident prophecy of internal breathing, and is most conclusive. The Apocalypse continues: "He shall not cry, nor lift up his voice, nor shall his voice be heard without." This is also significant. Harris refuses to contend with any man, and prefers rather to be misrepresented or maligned by his enemies without replying, than engage in a quarrel with them. Lastly, this section says, "He shall shine forth, and not be discouraged, until he shall have set judgment upon the earth, and in his name shall the nations trust." This too applies eminently to Harris; his perseverance under difficulties, trials, and persecutions, without discouragement, is well known.

Thus far for the predictions in the Apocalypse. I will now adduce some further ones. The first is a most remarkable one. The death of Jesus, according to our author (vol. i. p. 481) took place A.D. 57; if we add to this 1800 years, that is, three Naronic cycles, we arrive at A.D. 1857, *the very year in which Harris received spiritually the first portion of the Arcana of Christianity*—a coincidence certainly as striking as any recorded by the author of the Book of God.

In vol. ii. pp. 420-4, &c., the author alludes to the mystic meaning of the Dove, and its connection with the Messengers. The reader need not be reminded," says he, "of the dove which accompanied Mohammed, the Tenth Messiah, or of that which is mythically related to have descended on Jesus;" and again, "hence arose the notions that Zeuth was fed by doves, and that Oannes, the Messenger of the Mystic Dove of heaven was himself also a dove." Whether the account of the doves is historical or allegorical it matters not for the present argument; it is sufficient that there is a connection between the Messengers and doves. Now we find in the Arcana of Christianity that that portion of the heavens

to which Harris spiritually belongs is called the *Dove Heaven*: another remarkable agreement.

In the "*Vision of Imaum Mahidi*," published by our author in *Human Nature*, 1874, pp. 123-4, there is a description of the Twelfth Messenger, "And I saw one who in his spirit was a lion, and a voice divine called to him from on high and said, Approach thou and receive the mitre, thou shalt wear it before all the children of men. And he whom the voice called went and received the mitre, and he wore it on his brow, but yet with childlike meekness, and it was the emblem before men of the power which he possessed. And out of the deep abysses, and out of the deep chasms I saw many shapes and monstrous formations, and they hissed aloud; venom was in their eyes and tongue; they sought to slay the wearer of that heavenly mitre. And many cursed, and many mocked with deep hate, young and old uplifted themselves against him; but he murmured not, neither did he destroy the life of one, though in his hand I saw the lightning cinctured thunders. But he breathed forth light and music from his lips, and beams that were as morning light, and were as sweet waters, and where they fell they fertilised the wilderness, and where they were received the poison plants withered." Words more expressive of the character of Harris, and the effect of the reception of his teaching, not only into the intellect but into the life, can scarcely be imagined.

In vol. 2, p. 211, we read of "that promise of Scripture which declares there should ultimately be One Shepherd (the Twelfth Messenger) and One Fold." This is eminently true of the teachings of Harris, for under no other system of doctrine can all be gathered, since all others are imperfect. To use Harris's own words concerning the teachings given him to convey to mankind, "Into this book the Lord has poured, as from Himself, such irrefragable truths as when understood and lived, shall enable the spirit to comprehend, better than ever before, its Father. Whosoever taketh this in a true sense taketh Him; for He is in it. The spirit of human books is man, but the spirit of this Book is God."

In vol. 3, p. 520, we read, "The name of this Messenger (Thoth), like those of all the other Divine twelve [eleven], is deeply mystical;" and elsewhere our author gives the meanings of some of their names. I confess I attach but little importance to this kind of argument, as by a skilful interpretation of names, amounting almost to a sort of punning, almost any theories could be erected. I am informed that a volume was once published under the name of "*Miranda*," the author of which said that his name could be traced in the stars, and that one proof of the universality of his teaching was that he lived in *University Street*! One of my patients, who was afflicted with insanity, partly induced by the doctrine of eternal punishment, displayed great ingenuity in putting interpretations on his own name, and drawing grievous conclusions therefrom. But still if there be anything in it, the name of Harris is as mystical as any of the rest. The H is either a mere aspirate, or it is a mark of dis-

tion, being one of the letters of the name Jehovah, and as such was added to the names of Abram and Sarai. The syllable AR we find in vol. 3, p. 42, is "a primitive radical signifying *Fire* and also a *Lion*; the second R is of course a mere reduplication for the sake of euphony; I is the initial letter of *Id* which (vol. 2, p. 115) signifies God, the last letter being omitted for euphony; while the final letter S signifies, in more than one language, *Saviour*, so that the name of the Twelfth Messenger signifies *The Lion of God, the Saviour, or The Fire of God, the Saviour*. If we take the first signification we are at once reminded of the Vision of Imaum Mahidi quoted above, where this Messenger is spoken of as "one who in his spirit was a *lion*." If, on the other hand, we take the latter meaning, then it has a clear reference to Internal Breathing, which Harris often speaks of as a spiritual *fire*.

Next, coming to vol. 3, pp. 666 and the following, we find of the Twelfth Messenger that he is one "who collects into one all the holy revelations of the Divine." This is just what Harris has commenced in his writings, by explaining the ancient mythologies. At p. 667 we read a Rabbinical prophecy, "Woe to him who shall live to see the time of this Messiah. Then a fire-pillar [Internal Breathing] will appear, which, for forty days, shall reach from heaven to earth, and shall be visible to all nations. On that day, the King, the Messiah, will depart from the Garden Odin, out of the place named Chen-Tzipor (the Place of the West, of the Bird, of the Morning; all of these Messianic allusions.) And on the day of His coming, the whole world shall quake, and all the children of the world shall hide themselves in holes and caverns, for they can no longer hope to be saved." Allowing for the usual incoherencies of Rabbinical lore, who can fail to see the reference to Harris and his mission? The fire-pillar is a plain reference to Inner Breathing. The forty days signify the state of *trial* and *temptations* resulting therefrom in its incipient stages (see Arcana Celestia of Swedenborg, 730); the Place of the West and of the Morning, evidently point to America as being the Western Hemisphere, and as being inhabited by a rising race typified by the Morning; and it was in America that Harris commenced his work and teaching. The rest of the sentence plainly refers to the judgments (sent by God in pure love to the human race), which will follow the incoming of Internal Breathing.

At p. 674, vol. 3, we read of "the kinship of the Twelfth Messenger with the British Isles." As the Americans are descended from us, this is perfectly true; I believe also that Harris was born in Great Britain, but I cannot lay my hand on the passage.

Again, vol. 3, p. 685, we read "The Twelfth Messenger's proper mission is to harmonize into one the perverted teachings of the mighty ones who have preceded him." This agrees with Harris's teachings also.

In vol. 5, p. 191 (the 2nd. vol. of Enoch) we read, apparently of the last times in which evil will be finally banished from the world,

"The stars of *Shesti Matri* shall be revealed; the former heaven shall wane away; a new heaven shall appear; all the powers of the Most High shall shine with seven-fold splendour, lustrous as serpents of fire; the House of the King shall be built up for ever." In a note the author states that *Shesti Matri* means "The child of six mothers of the Naros. By the Buddhists he is called *Sosi-osh*, which may be translated either the *Ocean-Saviour*, or the *Fire-Saviour*." The latter meaning again points to Inner Breathing, which was prophesied of old as the Conflagration of the World; the former, according to the author's plan of interpreting names, would have reference to the second name of Thomas *Lake Harris*.

Finally, in vol. 5, pp. 253-4, a beautiful description of the Twelfth Messenger, under the name of *Soshiosh*, is given, which applies in a remarkable way to this sublime teacher.

In conclusion I think it is evident, from all these proofs, that if the doctrine of the Naros and the Twelve Messengers is true at all, Harris and no other is the Twelfth Messenger.

I may add, for the benefit of those who may wish to read them, that Harris's works are published by John Thomson, 39 John Street, Glasgow, and the reader of the "Book of God" cannot do better than obtain the "*Arcana of Christianity (Apocalypse)*."\*

4 Highbury New Park, London, N.

### INSPIRATION.†

No one can possibly complain of the manner in which the writer of this essay has treated the subject. Fair and candid in his statement of the various theories which have been held by ancient and modern thinkers, the writer proceeds to point out what he conceives to be the errors involved in some of their theories, and the partial truths in others, and from these materials he constructs or adopts a view of inspiration which appears to some extent to be one of compromise. We read (p. 302, 303), "It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present, that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous. The existence of a human element and the existence of a Divine element are generally acknowledged; but the exact relation of the one to the other it may be difficult to define."

The argument then takes the following shape. "There can be no question," says the writer, "but that that inspiration of Holy Scripture, in which the Church has generally believed, is of the nature of a miracle, and so its rejection follows upon rejection of miracles in general" (p. 303).

\* Those who find any difficulty in obtaining this book can get it direct from the publisher, post free, on receipt of price—6s. 6d.

† By the present Lord Bishop of Winchester, published in a volume of essays, called *Aids to Faith*. London: John Murray.

It seems evident that, by "miracles," the writer refers to certain physical, and psychical phenomena, which are caused by no known laws. Further, we read, "Many marvellous things exist in nature, things, at least, as marvellous as any miracle recorded in Scripture." There is this difference, however, between the marvels exhibited in natural phenomena, and the miracles recorded in the Bible. The former are referred to as occurring by natural laws: "The uniform operation of those (natural) laws disposes us to doubt the probability that they will be ever interfered with. . . . This doubt is strengthened by the belief that the wisdom which first gave birth to a universe could ever have wrought so imperfectly as to require active interference, in order to remedy defect, or repair the machinery" (p. 304). The latter, the miracles of the Scripture, are regarded as *special active interferences* by the Creator Himself, for the purpose of communicating to His creatures "some special revelation of His will, and to teach them concerning Himself what they might not be able to learn from mere natural phenomena" (p. 306). Thus, the miracles recorded in the Bible are, in some way, evidences of the miraculous inspiration of the book itself.

After "miracles," we come to "prophecy." Speaking of "prophecy" as proof of the special inspiration of Scripture, the writer says, "If anything in the world can be supernatural, or miraculous, it surely must be the infallible fore-knowledge of future events. No elevation of intuitional consciousness can account for such fore-knowledge. None can certainly foretell the future, but one who can certainly guide the future" (p. 309). It may be remarked, in passing, that this opinion is based upon the assumption that the prophets *were* possessed of an infallible knowledge of future events.

On the question of "types" I must decline to enter. By an ingenious system of exegesis, which bids defiance to rational criticism, the Bible can be made to teach anything, from the wildest superstitions of the Peculiar People to the more subtle absurdities of Romish Sacramentalism.

The superior knowledge and general moral teaching of the writers of the Bible are next appealed to in support of the theory of a "special infallible revelation." We read, "It is ever so; each petty difference of date, each little inconsistency in two concurrent narratives, even the slightest appearance of doubtful morality, anything like a supposed repugnance to what we consider the necessary attributes of the Most High, have been dwelt on and magnified, and used as objections to the inspiration of Holy Writ; whilst the general truth of its history, the purity and holiness of its general moral teaching, the grandeur and sublimity of its doctrines concerning God, are altogether forgotten or concealed. Yet, is it not true that, both in moral and physical science, nothing short of miraculous inspiration can account for the superior knowledge of the writers of the Old Testament, compared with the most enlightened sages of heathen antiquity." The inspiration of superior knowledge, of more sublime conceptions of Deity, and of a moral



code in advance of the age, does not necessarily involve the *special, active interference of Deity*. On the contrary, the absolute permanence and perfection of God's laws alone renders science a possibility, whether in the sphere of morals or physics. It by no means follows that because a man has the power to work so-called miracles, or to predict future events; or because he happens to be a medium for the superior moral teachings of higher spheres, he is therefore the subject of a direct and special inspiration from Deity Himself. Herein, to my mind, lies the fallacy of the Bishop's argument.

It is further urged by the essayist as strong evidence in favour of a *special* inspiration, that Jesus appealed to miracles and prophecy, and to the Old Testament Scriptures generally, as testifying of himself. This might be allowed and yet the theory of a "special infallible revelation" be rejected. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus differed materially from the Jews of his own day in his estimation of the Hebrew sacred writings. He is reported as regarding himself as the "Messiah," for whose appearing the Jews were waiting, that through him they might be delivered from their troubles and restored to their own land and former greatness. But the premature death of Christ cut short any expectations that may have been entertained by those of his fellow-countrymen who, from the startling events of his short and sad life, were inclined to view with favour his reputed Messianic claims. The view of inspiration taken by the writer of the essay may in short be summed up as follows:

The inspiration claimed for the Bible is infallible so far as it relates to things pertaining to God, and fallible in matters of history and daily life. Thus, some portions of the Bible are given by organic inspiration, God Himself speaking through the medium of man's organism; and other portions are simply the expression of the author's own sentiments, it may be under the influence of a general inspiration, or by the exaltation of his natural faculties. "The difficulty," says the Bishop, "of enunciating a definite theory of inspiration consists exactly in this—in assigning the due weight respectively to the Divine and human elements." And a difficulty it remains, for the learned essayist fails to clear it up. He leaves us with a Bible containing a mixture of fallible and infallible statements, and tells us that those statements which refer to God—which are just those we have no power to test the truth of—are the words of Almighty God Himself; and that the statements referring to natural phenomena, of which we are capable of judging (at all events to some extent), if they happen to be contradicted by scientific researches, are simply the opinions of the prophets, and consequently fallible.

"A book," says a thoughtful lady, "which is partly composed of human remarks and observations, and partly of the words of a Supreme Being, the whole appearing in one form, clothed with the same authority, and with nothing to indicate the varying value of

its contents, would indeed be a fatal gift from God to man. Surely He cannot be imagined to make a special revelation of His will and then render it unintelligible by allowing it to be mingled with a mass of purely human inventions. If a revelation were needed to teach us His will, then most certainly it would have been given in plain terms, and we should not have been left to sift the wheat from the chaff, relying on our internal sense of right alone which we should retain and which cast away."

It is a mere evasion of the difficulties besetting the theory advocated by the essayist to assert that "we surely have no power to limit the operation of God" (p. 312). Of course not; but the remark would be equally cogent in the mouth of a Hindoo or a Mahomedan when offered in support of the special inspiration of the Vedas or Koran.

And yet it must be admitted the theory is a plausible, and also a convenient one, in so far as it removes the objections which are raised against Biblical statements on scientific and philosophical grounds, by providing a scape-goat in the shape of a "human element" to bear away the scientific inaccuracies, the logical inconsistencies, and doubtful moralities of the Bible.

Accepting, however, for argument's sake, the theory here propounded, a standard whereby to judge what is human and what divine in the Bible seems absolutely needed. Let me illustrate my meaning thus:—A Roman Catholic believes that the Bible teaches the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Evangelical regards this belief as blasphemous. They both appeal to the Bible in support of their conflicting views. Which is right? Where is the infallibility? If reason and conscience be appealed to to settle the question, then are they competent to decide the previous question, viz., as to the infallibility of the book in which the disputed doctrine is said to be found. On the other hand, if the *Church* be the suggested standard, it may be asked which Church, and further, by what standard are the Churches to be tested? I must confess there appears an insuperable difficulty here; on the one hand to avoid arguing in a vicious circle, and on the other to escape the self-evident conclusion that reason and conscience are, after all, the supreme interpreters—individually and collectively—of both intellectual and moral truth. And be it understood this is Rationalism pure and simple, and the legitimate child of Protestantism.

Thoughts such as these offer an explanation of many mental phenomena in connection with religious faith. Men postulate infallibility as a necessity. Doubtless this is so in the abstract, but in order to apprehend infallibility a man must be infallible. Hence man's knowledge of his Creator, which is the equivalent of God's revelation to him, is *progressive*. Who, it may be asked, decided that God's revelation to mankind closed with the books of the Bible? Men—fallible men—like ourselves. The Bible makes no such claim for itself, and we have no more reason for supposing that God's revelation to man is confined to the pages of the Bible

than we have for believing in the infallibility of the Pope. The conclusions of such men as Dr. Newman and Archbishop Manning are logical. The believer in a *special infallible revelation*, if he be rational and logical, is driven to find an infallible interpreter for his infallible book. Perplexed and distracted by the discordant and conflicting teachings of the various sects of Christians, he turns, it may be, sometimes in despair, to the only Church which has even the appearance of being at unity with itself,\* a Church which boasts an unbroken line of succession from Apostolic times, and claims to be a Divinely appointed authority for rightly interpreting the infallible word of God. Here at last is peace and security! What can man want more? One lingering loving look to the dear ones we are leaving, a plunge, and all is over! Henceforward, "to doubt," as Dr Newman puts it, "is to sin," and all this is the legitimate and logical issue of a belief in the infallibility of the Bible.

I will not burden this paper with the many and weighty reasons which have compelled me to reject the doctrine of Biblical infallibility,† and the co-relative hypothesis of a special miraculous inspiration, but proceed to offer a few thoughts on the subject of Inspiration generally, and then in its connection with the various religious beliefs of mankind.

With Emerson I regard "all creeds as the result of the necessary structural action of the human mind. Man made them, and in the future will continue to make others, ever newer and higher, each in its turn superseding its predecessors; but each, while it lasts, serving a useful purpose, and being absolutely necessary as a step on the upward path of progress, without which that which follows it could never be brought into being."

There is a fundamental fallacy underlying the appeal that is frequently made, both in this essay and elsewhere, to the possibilities of the Divine volition. "With God," it is said, "all things are possible," and yet God cannot contradict Himself. God cannot "repent," neither can Omnipotence be a "jealous God," however much these affirmatives clash with Bible statements.

Again, God's capacity to reveal Himself to man, if man be not an automaton, must be limited by man's capacity to receive the revelation.

Postulating Unity and Omnipotence, as essential attributes of the *Prima Causa* or Supreme Intelligence, we arrive at the necessary conclusion that, in some way, all that is is best. This proposition (unavoidable from the premises), be it understood, includes the aspirations of man's nature towards perfection, and the motives which impel him to strive to attain to it.

Let us trace for a few moments the generation of ideas in man. The fundamental basis of Intelligence is Intuition. Knowing and

\* Written before the publication of Mr. Gladstone's "Expostulation."

† Many of these reasons will be found in a little volume entitled "Truth versus Ecclesiastical Dogmas." Trübner & Co., London.

loving are spiritual perceptions, and constitute the essence of the Ego. It is by virtue of these intuitions man is related to his Creator. For our present purpose we need not enquire as to the *how* and the *why* of man's entrance into this world, or whether the individuality of the Ego is the result of physical or spiritual causes, or both. It suffices to know, as a fact of universal consciousness, that this Ego feels, and thinks, and loves, and that sensation and intelligence (which embraces volition, thought, and love) constitute the fundamental basis of individualised human existences.

Sensation, as connected with the body and its needs, we may leave, observing that what the Ego requires in relation to thought and love, is simply *knowledge*. To grow in the knowledge of that which is—Intellectual Truth, and to learn to love that which is Right and Good—Moral Truth or Goodness, is, as far as we can see, the object and end of our being. The knowledge and love of God is spiritual life, the glory of the Creator consummated in the happiness of His creatures. Surely, if creation is not aimless, and the universe nought but a dream, this, and this end only, is worthy of a Being whose attributes are Unity and Omnipotence. Man cannot think less or desire more. But in order to love, in the highest sense of the word, a man must have an object presented to his consciousness as worthy of his love. This object may be an ideal one, but for a man to love it, he must *know* and appreciate its worth and beauty. Hence, knowledge precedes true spontaneous love. People are bidden to love God as though it were not irrational to suppose that any one can love God because he is told that it is his duty to do so. We love because we cannot help it.

Having thus arrived at the necessity for this knowledge which must precede the love of God (using the word love in its higher sense as indicating reverence, adoration), we are in a position to consider the method, so far as we can see indication of it, by which the Creator is accomplishing His Divine ends; and here it is necessary to take issue once and for all with the Hebrew conception of man's origin. Whatever be the origin of the individualised entity, man, it is becoming more and more evident, as knowledge increases in the various sciences which encompass this question, that man, as to his body, has been evolved from lower animal life. This is reduced almost to a certainty by the consciousness which man possesses of his relationship to the selfishness and sensuality of an animal nature. There is no need of a personal Devil, with all the absurdities and inconsistencies that a belief in such a being involves.

No mythological Satan is required to account for the propensities attached to human nature. Selfishness and sensuality, originating in the necessities of animal life, are the prolific parents of all so-called evil, of which, so long as man's ancestors remained in the "Garden of Eden" (animalism), they were unconscious, and were consequently in a state of happy ignorance.

Organic evolution, during possibly countless ages, had been

preparing an organism sensitive to the influences of *Spirit*—Love and Intelligence. The germination of the seed of spiritual perceptions (intuitions, scintillations from the Love and Wisdom of the Supreme Intelligence), in the prepared soil of a receptive organism, resulted in the incipient aspirations after the fruit of the tree of knowledge, of which our remote ancestors ate, when the Light of the Divine Spirit broke in upon the darkness of their animalism and ignorance, and their eyes were opened, and they perceived that they were naked. Thus, in the fulness of time, a body was prepared, "the word was made flesh," and man began to be.

The seed of the spirit taking root in the soil of man's animal nature, developed within him a consciousness of something higher than himself—the knowledge of a higher and a lower good—good and evil. Henceforward, man is related to the Creator in his participation of the principles of love and intelligence. The perception of good and evil was the birth of man's *will* and consequent responsibility. Made thus in the image of God, so far as his spiritual nature is concerned, and with a sense of his own ignorance and imperfection revealed to him by the light of the divine spirit within him, man commences his search after God, the knowledge and love of Whom is alone capable of satisfying the yearnings of his spiritual nature. In the dual constitution of man's nature is found a sphere for his education. Through the indwelling spirit of the Most High he is attracted toward goodness and truth. In the conflict with the propensities of his animal nature he finds a field for the exercise and development of these spiritual instincts. This conflict between his two natures is man's first perception of God, and the Creator's first revelation to man.

It has been necessary to enlarge somewhat on these points, as it is on the fundamental difference of the conceptions of the origin of man that reason takes its stand. If there has been no fall from a perfection, which man is supposed to have originally possessed, then the necessity for the orthodox scheme of salvation falls to the ground, and we are face to face with a consistent philosophy of the evolution of religious thought and emotion, analogous to the system of gradual and progressive development we are recognising as having taken place in the sphere of physics and other sciences.

The purport of these somewhat discursive remarks is to point out the basis of all religion—which is to be found in the universal intuitions of man's spiritual nature. Man, by virtue of these intuitions, is in direct communication with absolute truth and goodness, that is, with Deity. Man's intellectual perceptions (individually and collectively) of these principles constitute the measure of Divine revelation to humanity. This I take to be the true theory of inspiration, so far as Deity is concerned. Partiality is incompatible with any notions of justice. Hence, Divine inspiration is *universal and constant*. If God, by any arbitrary process, were to



put into men's brains a knowledge of that which they were unable to attain by the use of their faculties, it would be at the expense of their rationality, individuality, and responsibility. The test of God's revelation to man is its universality and consistency. Man has within him the seeds of perfection; they require, however, light (knowledge) and heat (love) for their development. Whatever obstructs the entrance of light and love into the soul of man retards his progress, and places a barrier between him and his Creator.

So much with respect to "inspiration in its general or universal sense." We will now turn our attention to the question of "Inspiration in its connection with the various religious beliefs of mankind."

In all religions there is the universal element to which I have alluded, and also a special element, which—arising out of its particular origin and development—is peculiar to each. The unity of religions must be sought in the universal element which contains within itself all that is necessary for man's growth in the knowledge and love of his Creator. In the various peculiarities of religious beliefs, we meet with a substratum of the "supernatural," out of which the special element of historical religion has undoubtedly arisen. There is also a decided relationship existing between the "supernatural" phenomena recorded in the sacred books of the various faiths of the world.

Dreams, visions, spiritual appearances, obsession, exaltation and trance, are common to all. That these phenomena are possible we have evidence of no ordinary quantity or quality at the present day—evidence which is capable of verification by the earnest and honest investigator. That they have been observed along the ages religious history amply testifies. If the possibility of communication between mortals and the spirits of those who have left this earth be admitted—and it is difficult to see how a believer in the Bible can doubt it—we are in possession of a key which will unlock many of the mysteries of "revealed religion."

Here is a field for investigation worthy the best energies of the man of science and the philosopher. To be able to throw light on obscure phenomena, which the ignorance of past ages has attributed to the special and direct action of the gods, is surely no unworthy aspiration for any earnest truth-seeker! To shun the inquiry does not get rid of a question which sooner or later will demand attention.

If there is such a thing as trustworthy testimony at all, and if there is evidence upon which we deem it right to send our fellow-creatures to the hulks or to the scaffold, then indeed must the phenomena of "Modern Spiritualism" be accepted as facts, and if so, their identity with much of the Spiritualism of the Bible cannot fail to be perceived.\* The appearances of "spirit hands"

---

\* "Of the members of your sub-committee about *four-fifths* entered upon the investigation wholly sceptical as to the reality of the alleged phenomena, firmly believing them to be the result either of *imposture*, or of *delusion*, or of *involuntary*

(Dan. v. 5, Ezek. viii. 3.) are common occurrences at the present day. "Tongues of fire" fairly so described, I have myself witnessed over the heads of sitters at séances for spiritualistic manifestations. The vibration of the room I have also felt. These illustrations might be multiplied to a considerable extent. Friends on whose powers of observation, and on whose veracity I can implicitly rely, have witnessed phenomena which, in past ages, would have been deemed miraculous, and have heard the unlettered ignoramus speak fluently in a language with which he was totally unacquainted.\*

Spirits, good and bad, are represented in the Bible as constantly influencing material substances. Phenomena of a similar character may be witnessed at the present day by those who care to investigate for themselves. The agency engaged in their production is professedly that of disembodied spirits. If spirit agency be disallowed in the explanation of present-day phenomena, the objections to this theory will have a proportionate value when applied to the Spiritualism of the Bible.

In mesmeric phenomena there is abundant evidence of the power of one mind over another, even to the extent of a complete control. I will not stay to offer evidence in support of what is capable of demonstration. Suffice it for my present purpose to point to the possibility of an embodied spirit gaining the complete control of the mind and will of another embodied spirit; and if this is capable of proof, which I unhesitatingly assert, then on the admission of the possibility of spirit communion with mortals we are advancing fast to the theory of "Inspiration in its connection with the various religious beliefs of mankind," which suggests itself to me as the only one capable of affording a rational and consistent explanation of historical, as distinguished from natural or universal religion. According to the theory advanced by the more thoughtful and intelligent Spiritualists, and taught, it is asserted, by the manifesting spirits themselves, the process by which the "magnetiser" obtains partial or complete control over the mind and will of his subject is identical with that by which a disembodied spirit *inspires* or takes complete possession of the organism of a spirit in the body. When the control is partial only then the natural powers of the magnetised person become exalted by the influx of ideas from a higher sphere. The subject of the inspiration

---

*muscular action.* It was only by irresistible evidence under conditions that precluded the possibility of either of these solutions and after trial and test, many times repeated, that the most sceptical of your sub-committee were slowly and reluctantly convinced that the phenomena exhibited in the course of their protracted inquiry were veritable facts."—*Report of No. 2 Sub-Committee of the London Dialectical Society, in their investigation "of the Phenomena alleged to be Spiritual Manifestations."* London: J. Burns.

\* The testimony of such men as Mr. Alfred Wallace, Mr. Crookes, Mr. W. Howitt, Mr. Cromwell Varley, and Mr. Robert Dale Owen, can hardly be ignored, neither can their asserted facts, with a due regard to modesty, be attributed by non-investigating opponents to mere phantasy.

feels that he is speaking under the influence of a power beyond himself, and his hearers are often spell-bound by the fervour of his eloquence.

This it is that explains the exceptional powers of such men as Wesley and Whitfield, and it is in this direction we may look for a philosophy of "genius" in its various manifestations.

In the case of complete control, the controlling intelligence, embodied or disembodied, takes full possession of the brain organism of the subject, and is able to use it to the full extent of its powers. By this I do not mean the normal powers of the subject only, but the inherent possibilities of its organic capability when under abnormal cerebral excitement. This qualification, for which there is plenty of evidence, it is important to notice, inasmuch as it shows that although the controlling intelligence, whoever it be, can use the brain organism of the medium to the fullest possible extent, he is nevertheless limited by its organic capacities and idiosyncrasies, and is unable through it to transcend the limits of human apprehension. This circumstance supplies an answer to the question often propounded with reference to both ancient and modern Spiritualism, "If the controlling intelligences are really the persons they profess to be, why don't they tell us more about the next world?" A pertinent and fair question, undoubtedly, the reply to which is, on our present hypothesis, that the *conditions* of life after death are so different from anything that comes within the range of our present experiences that any attempt to convey ideas of heavenly surroundings through the medium of earthly imagery—in the present state of man's knowledge and development—only tends to confusion, inasmuch as it necessitates the employment of a symbolism so mystical as to be incoherent, if not at times almost grotesque. (Rev. iv.)

Some of the more mystical of the prophetic books, the Apocalypse, and the trance visions of Emanuel Swedenborg, are instances of the endeavour on the part of manifesting spirits, or the entranced media themselves, to give utterance to ideas which transcend the powers of human apprehension. St. Paul acknowledges the impossibility in 2 Cor. xii. 3, 4.

A dispassionate survey of the whole bearing of this subject tends to my mind to support the following propositions:—

1. That communion between the material and spiritual world is an established fact.

2. That Modern Spiritualism is a continuation of the same phenomena as those recorded in the Bible and in the other sacred books of the world, which phenomena have occurred, with a greater or lesser degree of intensity—dependent upon conditions with which we are at present unacquainted—in every age.

The difficulty presented by the conflicting statements and teaching of spiritual beings is a real, but not, I think, an insuperable one. The testimony of those who have investigated the

phenomena, and studied the philosophy of spirit communion, is to the effect that genuine spirit communications are not only not infallible, but in many cases unreliable. The laws governing spiritualistic manifestations are, as yet, almost unknown by us, and there is reason to suppose they are but imperfectly understood by the manifesting intelligences. There are probably many difficulties to be surmounted by spirits in communicating with mortals. Playful, foolish, and lying spirits may, under certain conditions connected with the mental and moral temperament of the circle, obtain control over the line of communication and endeavour to carry out their various idiosyncrasies. These and many other reasons will suggest themselves to the thoughtful investigator in explanation of what is undoubtedly an unsatisfactory phase of spiritualistic phenomena, and point to the necessity for "trying the spirits." As I have before urged,\* "we ought to require the same credentials from a disembodied as from an embodied spirit, and receive with the same caution the testimony of one as of the other."

It is no uncommon occurrence at the present day for the intelligences manifesting through media to assume certain positions, names, and characters, not necessarily with a view to deceive, but in order to give greater weight to their testimony, or it may be to place themselves *en rapport* with the mental conditions and prepossessions of the media. Copying from a recent number of the *Chicago Illustrated Journal*, *The Medium* of November 27th, 1874, affords an illustration of the mental influence exercised by spirits over their media. In an interesting and an apparently well-authenticated account of the liberation of an Indian warrior, by President Lincoln, at the instigation of a spirit who manifested through the mediumship of Mrs. H. Conant, it is stated that E. C. S. Dow, Esq., a well-known lawyer of Davenport, Iowa, was the person selected by the manifesting intelligence to seek an interview with the President of the United States, and to endeavour to obtain the prisoner's release. After some considerable difficulty this was accomplished, and Mr. Dow was then instructed by the spirit to procure an interview with the Indian Chief, and obtain from him a promise that if he were released he would keep the peace in future and use his influence as a pacificator with his people. The spirit is reported as adding (and this is the point of interest in connection with our present argument,) "I will go forth with you, and should that warrior—filled with bitter memories of his subordinate's action—refuse to listen to your words, if you will take the Chief's hand, I will influence him to such an extent as to impress him that the Great Spirit is speaking with him." That this has been done in past ages is more than probable.

(To be continued.)

---

\* "Psychism and Spiritualism," a paper by the present writer.—Vide *Human Nature*, May, 1874. London: J. Burns.

## THE ANGLO-SAXON.\*

At the dawn of tradition, Britain appears preponderantly, if not purely, Celtic. Yet, at the commencement of history with Cæsar, colonies of the Belgæ were already established. The Teutonic invasion had commenced. That the British Celt was no despicable exile from the continental claus is obvious, from the circumstance that the Gauls were accustomed to send their more studious youth hither for the completion of their education. The Druidic hierarchy of these Western Isles, were esteemed the wisest and most learned of their order. Already it should seem Britain was a citadel, where heroism might take shelter, and whatsoever of the nobly devotional remained of the primitive faith of the Cymri, here sought and found a home. With such a priesthood, we cannot suppose that the warrior caste was of an inferior type. Whatever of manhood could be predicated of the Celt, existed in this insular fastness. The Phœnician came as a trader, and in the South and West also as a colonist and miner. The Tors of Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset, are the landmarks of his temples, and evidences of his settlement, if not of his supremacy. He doubtless brought with him that high type which we term Greek, and of which we have such noble individual examples in the medallions of Hannibal and Hamilcar. On the principle that the highest, best, and purest race ever tends to perpetuate itself, such blood could not be lost. It must be in the veins of some Englishmen still, whom perhaps we meet in the mart, or whose thoughts flash upon us from the canvas or the page. The stern, and at that time invincible, Roman followed. He entered with his legionaries, who were eventually succeeded by civilian colonists. We under-estimate the Ethnological effect of this Latin invasion. Its results are still seen in many a stern face, and wiry frame, and, we may add, in many a cranium, where the governing principles constitute the predominant organs, and give English independence and Roman pertinacity. The masters of the world might bring their energy here, but they did not leave their slime; that was not worth removing so far. As so many of our still existent cities were of Roman origin, and must have preserved their existence uninterruptedly during the period of Saxon predominance, it is not to be supposed that their original inhabitants altogether perished. Their descendants are still among us, and perchance their voice may even yet be heard in the Forum and the Senate, if not in our halls of justice. Only the most enterprising subjects of the empire would think of emigrating to the *Ultimâ Thule* of Britain, and in addition to some veritable "citizens," we probably obtained a sprinkling of the daring and self-reliant from every country of Southern and Western Europe. Rome withdrew her legions, but she left her blood.

We fancy that the Saxon entered Celtic Britain, such perhaps

---

\* Extracted from "Ethnology and Phrenology:" by the late J. W. Jackson. London: Jas. Burns, 15 Southampton Row.



as it was in the days of Cæsar, only rather effeminized by four hundred years of Roman domination. There cannot be a greater mistake. He found a country covered with cities, traversed by roads, abounding in villages, and fertile with centuries of cultivation. Rude as he was, he did not destroy the people, he conquered them; and this was a work of a hundred and fifty years, of nearly five generations of conflict, and accomplished not by Saxons only, but by Jutes, Angles, and, in short, Teutons of every name and lineage willing to risk and adventure by sea rather than land. It was a part of the great Gothic invasion of the Roman Empire, and was no more accompanied by *entire* destruction or displacement here than elsewhere. That there was a very large infusion of Teutonic blood cannot admit of a doubt, of this the language is a sufficient indication, but it did not, and under the circumstances could not, proceed to the extent of annihilating the previous possessors of the soil. The Saxon was a warrior on his arrival, and would have been worse than mad to have destroyed the poor serfs on whose labour he was to live as an armed superior. He was barbarous, and needed the merchants and artisans of the towns to find him in luxuries, and supply him with conveniences. A little common sense, combined with a study of the great examples and laws of racial conquest, might have saved us from much learned twaddle on this subject. Not long did the Saxon retain undisputed possession. The Northman followed close upon his track, bringing with him the lofty stature, herculean strength, and fearless daring of his Scandinavian blood—this long line of invading immigrants being closed by the Norman, in reality a second and civilised edition of the Norwegian. Never was there a graver mistake than regarding this as, Ethnologically, a French invasion. Had it been so, eighty in place of eight hundred years would have been found too long for its duration. Even that portion of William's army not of Norman descent—namely, the military adventurers who flocked to his standard from all parts of Europe—were nearly all of Gothic blood, Franks and Germans, scions of those noble houses whose warlike ancestors were the conquerors of the Roman Empire.

Here, then, we have an admixture of type almost equal to that of Italy in diversity, but with this fundamental difference, that none were introduced as slaves, but all came in as conquerors, thus insuring that the progenitors of each successive layer of the population should be daring and energetic immigrants, not debased and emasculated serfs—that they should come in with the exalting consciousness of victory, not with the depressive feeling of defeat. Thus, at each invasion, as our political and social history clearly demonstrates, the country advanced in civilisation and increased in power. And while the old possessors were temporarily subdued by force of arms, they were permanently invigorated by the addition and admixture of alien, but generous blood, from their conquerors. This was our racial history, till the Norman conquest, in virtue of which, and the previous Danish invasions and settlements,

our Celtic, Roman, and German elements, became finally compacted under Scandinavian supremacy; the strongest man coming last to give guidance and character to the next great movement, which was one not of further admixture from without, but of final amalgamation and development from within. The Anglo-Saxon, as we now understand him, had as yet no existence. The scattered elements destined to constitute this exalted type, had not yet crystallised into form. It needed several centuries of Norman rule with its gallant chivalry and iron feudalism, to accomplish this. And not till the wars of the Roses had in a measure removed the scaffolding by which the temple was built, did the latter appear in all the grandeur and beauty of its fair and harmonious proportions. The Anglo-Saxon, in short, is not simply the product of an admirably proportioned amalgamation of powerful racial elements, but also of a peculiarly evocative and invigorating discipline in addition. His island home has preserved him for eight hundred years from foreign conquest, during which lengthened period his women have never seen the smoke of an enemy's camp. From the germs of liberal institutions which the successive conquerors, Romans, Saxons, and Scandinavians, brought with them, and which their successors never wholly abrogated, he has gradually developed a constitutional liberty, which is the admiration of the world, and under which every order of the State attains, if not to its maximum of free and healthy expansion, yet at least to the nearest approach yet made to so desirable a condition of things. Roman genius for legislation finds an appropriate sphere for its activity, on a grand scale in the Senate, and on a smaller in the management of our municipal affairs. Saxon industry finds a befitting field for its occupation, in our agriculture and manufactures. Scandinavian adventure founds colonies in, or carries on a maritime commerce with, the most distant countries of the world, and occasionally girds up its loins for a Camperdown or a Trafalgar. The Norman chivalry achieves a Cressy or a Waterloo, whenever the necessities of war demand a decisive action. Thus, then, we hold the Anglo-Saxon to be a result of race, place, and circumstance, all uniting to produce what may be called pre-eminently the man of the time—the providential supply to the world's present necessity. Let us, then, look at this marvellous product of causes operating over so prolonged a period—at this child of to-day, the effect of two thousand years of parental preparation, to whose schooling the experiences of all time have contributed, and on whose brow the mystic crown of Futurity's imperial supremacy is already visibly descending.

The Anglo-Saxon seems to have inherited the strength without the weakness of those from whom he descends. In him the activity and impulsiveness of the Celt are so controlled and directed by Teutonic self-command, as to eventuate only in sustained and well-directed energy; while Roman decision and firmness of purpose, are united with an expansion of intellect and versatility of faculty, to which the specially endowed "*dominos rerum*" never approached.

He has the massiveness of the Goth without his phlegm, and the enterprise of the Norseman without his ferocity. And what is somewhat remarkable, although now subjected during several centuries to what are usually considered the exhausting influences of civilisation, he has preserved the robust qualities of his variously gifted predecessors, more effectually than their immediate and comparatively unmingled descendants in the older countries whence they emigrated to Britain. No one, we suppose, will be inclined to deny that the English are more energetic than any purely Celtic stock, more persistent than the Italians, more industrious than the Germans, and more enterprising than the Scandinavians. They are so, primarily, in virtue of their inhabiting the highest Ethnic area in the world, and secondarily, from their uniting the better endowments of these diversely characterised peoples in one vigorously trained nationality, in whose phrenological type we may still detect the manifold cerebral forces which constitute that amalgam of power, that strong man, that hard worker, that unwearied producer and vigorous distributor of this industrial era, the politically independent, the socially free, and the willingly laborious Anglo-Saxon.

The accusation of the whole Continent, as with one voice, against us is, that we are capable only of a gigantic practicality; that we are the kings of this age because it is a manufacturing, commercial, money-getting, and materialistic time, in which the shopocracy are supreme; our merchants are princes, and our sailors are heroes, but there is an end of us. Let us examine these assertions, and compare them with facts. We have confessedly produced the first dramatist, and the most nearly universal mind of all time. Shakespeare is in himself a host. Our great Epic is second only to those of Greece and Italy: John Milton knows no superiors but Homer and Dante. The master-mind of the Inductive philosophy was Lord Bacon; and its greatest exemplar, as an experimentalist, Sir Isaac Newton. The same illustrious name stands also pre-eminently the first among modern mathematicians. In mechanics we are by universal admission without a rival; and from Watt to Stephenson, our inventors have displayed a genius and obtained a reputation, eclipsed only by the almost mythical fame of Archimides. Chemistry knows no brighter name than that of Sir Humphrey Davy. We are the only Orators the world has seen since the thunders of Demosthenes lapsed into silence, and the eloquence of Cicero failed to awaken the echoes of the Forum. There is but one History in spoken language, that of the "Decline and Fall;" all others will have to be re-written, but this has been done once and for ever. We are the best Animal and Landscape Painters in the world. And thus, as it should seem, can produce something besides calico and broadcloth, crockery and hardware. Finally, have we not developed the British Constitution—a rather original structure, and altogether of home growth. Perhaps, on a reconsideration of these matters, foreigners will be willing to admit that we have at

least performed our share, as pioneers of progress, in the sphere both of thought and action. We do not ask for more. They, like ourselves, have their specialties, in which we readily accord them that supremacy which their acknowledged superiority demands.

The Anglo-Saxon type is large. Physically, we are the most powerful people in the world. Our force especially resides in head and chest. The latter is without parallel, and makes us the bruisers and athletes of the world. Our sports are manly. We are the hardest riders and the best huntsmen in Europe. Our soldiers surpass all others in weight; and as they were once renowned as bowmen, are still formidable with the bayonet, both weapons implying superior bodily strength. Our cranial development is distinguished by volume. It has been noticed that the proportion of large heads is greater in free than in despotic countries, under the Protestant than the Catholic faith. And as we have long enjoyed both political and ecclesiastical liberty, and have undergone many changes, and much excitement in both, somewhat of our superior cerebral energy may perhaps be due to the hereditarily transmitted effects of this invigorating discipline, which cannot fail to have corroborated the tendencies and strengthened the qualities originating in that robust mental constitution we have derived from our ancestors. But here again, let us remember, that there must have been something of high manhood inherent in our blood, otherwise we had still been, like less fortunately circumstanced peoples, the subservient tools of a tyrant or the cringing slaves of a priest.

As might be expected from our mingled descent, we have every variety of temperament, and almost every shade of organisation. We can still show the nervous Celt, the fibrous Roman, the lymphatic Saxon, and the sanguineous Norseman. More commonly, however, two or more of these diversified elements are mingled in the same individual. From climate there must always have been a powerful development of the sanguineous element, and from the mental activity of the last few generations we have reason to believe there has been a tendency to the nervous and a proportionate diminution of the lymphatic. In structure we have the basilar force of the Celt controlled and directed by Gothic sentiments. Our energy is proverbial. Judging from its effects, it is the greatest which the world has ever seen. This arises from passionate impulse being restrained from excess, yet corroborated for endeavour, by moral determination. We are, from the powerful development of Caution, prudent in the formation of plans, yet, from our elevated Firmness and Self-esteem, eminently persistent in their execution. We are enterprising, yet not rash; daring, yet not thoughtless. In respect for law and devotion to the State, mankind have not seen our equals since the time of the Conscript Fathers. And like these rulers of the world, we are qualified equally for conquest and colonization. Our march to empire has been Roman rather than Greek—the steady assertion and stern assumption of predominance by a vigorous and victorious race, rather than the brilliant achieve-

ment of a single individual. Our numerical increase and colonial expansion are unexampled, and threaten the absorption, at no distant date, of every outpost of the uncivilised world. The family is our stronghold. We are great, because we are domestic. We are prosperous and progressive, because our hearths are altars, and our homes are temples. We unite Teutonic affection with Roman principle, and wherever we settle, carry our "*dii penates*" as the firmest assurance of success. Practical, almost to a fault, we are nevertheless by no means devoid of the higher sentiments; and as our affections are warm and our patriotism ardent, so our devotion is fervent and our beneficence almost unbounded. Roman in the governing principles of Caution, Conscientiousness, and Firmness, we are more than either Greek or Roman in the anterior sentiments of Veneration and Benevolence, which, as already observed, we probably derived from our Gothic ancestors. Indeed, we may here remark, that in the higher type of the Christian head, more especially among nations, or in individuals of Teutonic descent, there is an altitude in the coronal region, indicative of a development of the moral nature, unexampled among the nations of classical antiquity. Such are the heads of our own Shakspeare and Bacon, of the French (Frankish) Sully, and the Spanish (Gothic) Calderon. Such beings, we hesitate not to affirm are the germs of a new order of humanity, as superior to the merely classical type, morally, as the latter was to that of the Mongol, intellectually. We are, indeed, quite mistaken in supposing that the moral man has yet attained to collective existence. Strictly speaking, the world has yet seen but two historical phases of humanity—the passionate and the intellectual—the moral, which is to effectually control the first and sanctify the last, being now only in the process of emergence, under the beneficent influence of an expansive civilisation and an exalting faith.

The distinctive feature of English intellect is solidity, the result, in part, of a well-developed anterior lobe, reacted on by a sufficiency of impulse to give a capacity for action, and regulated by such an amount and proportion of moral principle as to ensure a right direction of the whole being. Large volume has also had much to do in producing this result, while political liberty and commercial activity have not failed to corroborate the tendencies arising from cerebral organisation. There is a breadth of view, in reality, a many-sidedness, on practical subjects, and consequently a soundness of judgment characteristic of the English mind, unsurpassed by any people, ancient or modern; and which, in the end, generally proves more than a match for the brilliancy and astuteness of our continental neighbours. As merchants and manufacturers, time has never seen our equals. We keep the exchange and the banking house of the world. Our colonial extension is a part of our commerce. We peopled America in the way of business, and conquered the East Indies that we might trade with their inhabitants. As a result, the former is unique; and as a feat of arms and policy,



the latter is without a parallel. We are the giants of practicability. Not content with manifesting our unequalled ability for it in the sphere of action, we have evolved its philosophy. Political economy is almost as thoroughly a British production as constitutional liberty. Free trade is an Anglo-Saxon idea. To buy in the cheapest market, and sell in the dearest, is the height of our axiomatic wisdom. Had it not been found out long since that to work is to pray, we should have made the discovery. We have many sceptics, but none of them doubt the sufficiency of wealth. Our material Trinity is £ s. d., and our temporal Bible is the ledger. Our Olympus is the Stock Exchange, and our Mount Zion is in Threadneedle Street. We are superabundantly eloquent on the dignity of labour, and unwavering believers in the power of capital. We hold virtuous poverty to be an Arcadian myth, and esteem no respectability as perfectly reliable, which is not based on a good banking account. We have made indigence a crime, and want an indictable offence. We treat a vagrant worse than a felon, and feed a burglar better than a mendicant. Yet in a good cause we can be liberal. Our beneficence is the admiration of the world. There is no end of our subscriptions. We go to the remotest parts of the habitable globe to do good. Our very religion is practical. So, also, is our loyalty. We have combined monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy in more harmonious and workable proportions than any other people. While rapidly progressive, we are eminently conservative. Nowhere is good birth more highly esteemed. Even genius pales its ineffectual fires in the presence of high descent; yet nowhere is really superior merit more heartily recognized or more honourably rewarded. There is no position short of the throne to which it may not legitimately aspire. We are proud of our ancient nobles, yet we boast of our merchant princes, and rejoice that the son of an actress or a cotton-spinner may become prime minister of England. We thus moderate extremes by their union, and maintain an equilibrium by the balance of antagonistic forces. To have accomplished all this we must be a superior people. A weak race would have failed in any one of the attempts, which with us have proved so uniformly successful. Our boasted constitution would not be workable for a day by a nation devoid of personal independence, or deficient in self-command.

We have said that the Ethnic history of Britain is that of a thoroughly baptized Celtic population, which has been so effectually suffused with Teutonic blood as to undergo complete regeneration. Thus renewed, the race has started on a fresh career of progress, the epicycle, doubtless, of its preceding fortunes. Our earlier annals have utterly perished. The fact that we had war-chariots and corn fields when invaded by the Romans, may suffice to dispose of the absurd notion that we were merely painted savages. Mechanics and agriculture imply much else as their necessary accompaniments; and the worst that can be affirmed of the ancient Britons in the days of Cæsar is, that they were brave barbarians.

But the whole tenor of mundane history indicates that they had been for ages in a state of collapse. The entire period required for the transmission of the Imperial centre of civilisation from West to East, and its return from the Euphrates, or perhaps even the Ganges, to the Tiber, must have intervened, since their energetic forefathers, as the then leaders of humanity, antedated and prepared the way for the later and higher Cyclopean civilisation which succeeded that of the extreme North West. Judging by the period which the return wave has taken to reach the Seine and the Thames, the primeval Celts of Western Europe must have culminated fully six millenniums previous to the Roman advent, itself an important incident in the Occidental movement of humanity. Now, all the facts of history, and all the laws of Ethnic science imply that, during this prolonged interval of subsidence they must have suffered many invasions, and been exposed consequently to considerable racial interaction from immigration. Although here again the larger course of mundane history would indicate, that while the great tidewave was moving steadily eastwards, the extreme Occident would remain for the most part in undisturbed collapse, its severest sufferings from invasion synchronizing with the return of population and power westwards, these later movements constituting the Belgian, Roman, Saxon, and Scandinavian invasions and settlements, of which history and tradition have furnished us with the narration. While from the period of the Norman conquest, the process has been one of absorption and amalgamation, perhaps not yet completed.

Of the popular mistakes in reference to the former part of this process we have already spoken; but there are misapprehensions in reference to the latter, equally grave, because opposed to the established laws of Ethnological Science. Thus, for example, it is supposed that a certain proportion of Saxon or Scandinavian blood, being once introduced, must have remained to this day as a distinct element, easily separable from that of any other Ethnic type around it; whereas, all the facts with which Ethnology has rendered us familiar, indicate that its ultimate absorption into the common, that is, normal type of the country, would be merely a question of time and circumstance, its proper office being, not the supercession and destruction, but the invigoration and expansion of the original stock—the gradual conversion, in short, of the primeval Celt into the existing Anglo-Saxon. Nor is this all; for the same facts also assure us that it is during this process of assimilation and growth, or at farthest, immediately after it, that the culminating point of racial vigour is generally attained, this period corresponding to the youth and early manhood of the type in its era of resurrection. Now, it is at the earlier portion of this stage that the Anglo-Saxon or mingled population of these islands have now arrived; our stupendous energy in the sphere of action showing the first outburst of our youthful and conquering vigour; while a calm reliance on the laws and sequences of Ethnic growth and development, may

enable us to predict that in our riper maturity we shall yet exhibit fully proportionate power in the sphere of thought.

The higher artistic and literary mission of Britain is obviously yet to come. We are now rejoicing in the physical strength and consequent material resources derived from our muscular baptism by the Teutons. But as an inherently Celtic, and therefore essentially nervous race, we shall gradually throw off some of the coarser elements derived from this source; and, while retaining much of its strength, shall attain to a degree of activity and energy, and even of susceptibility and refinement, of which the pure Teuton seems quite incapable. Already in some of our higher individualities this process of transformation, or rather translation, is distinctly perceptible. It was perfected in Shakspeare, and was approximated to by Milton and Byron; while, in private life, what is generally known as the Anglo-Norman type, is simply the Aristocratic variety, that is, the military and gubernatorial caste of this new and improved phase of the British Man of the Future.

And now a still graver question presents itself for solution in connection with the racial destiny of Britain. Of her ulterior supremacy in arts as well as arms all Ethnology is a prophecy. But will her higher mission be simply intellectual? Is it not also moral? What again say mundane history and the doctrine of Ethnic correspondences between the correlated realms of Europe and Asia to this important query? And the unhesitating reply from these profound oracles is—that whatever Palestine was Britain will be, not simply the seat of Phœnician commerce, but also of Israelitish sanctity: the faith of humanity ultimately returning here, as to its well-head in the sacred land of the West—the highest Ethnic realm of the ruling continent of the earth. Yes, we hold that Britain is a queen, upon whose head will rest many crowns, her temporal being completed by her spiritual supremacy, when she will possess not merely the social, political, and intellectual, but also the religious leadership of the world, as the especially chosen seat of a sacred pontifical empire, whose boundaries will be co-extensive with those of civilisation, and whose duration will smile at the short-lived glories of Lassa and Mecca, Jerusalem and Rome.

---

### THE LILY-OF-THE-VALLEY.

Oh lily-of-the-valley, why will you be so coy,  
 And hide away where few of us your beauty can enjoy?  
 Your little flowers, so white and pure, are fragrant to the smell;  
 Yet in the valley's cooling shade you always love to dwell.  
 If you will listen very close, I'll tell you, little maid,  
 Why thus I pass my lily life here in the cooling shade;  
 If I were on the sunny bank, where all could see and praise,  
 In such a glare I'd find it hard to live out half my days.

## THE EARTH'S AGE.

Marine shells, found on mountain tops far in the interior of continents, were regarded by theological writers as an indisputable illustration of the Deluge. But when, as geological studies became more exact, it was proved that in the crust of the earth vast fresh-water formations are repeatedly intercalated with vast marine ones, like the leaves of a book, it became evident that no single cataclysm was sufficient to account for such results; that the same region, through gradual variations of its level and changes in its topographical surroundings, had sometimes been dry land, sometimes covered with fresh, and sometimes with sea water. It became evident also that, for the completion of these changes, tens of thousands of years were required. To this evidence of a remote origin of the earth, derived from the vast superficial extent, the enormous thickness, and the varied characters of its strata, was added an imposing body of proof depending on its fossil remains. The relative ages of formations having been ascertained, it was shown that there had been an advancing physiological progression of organic forms, both vegetable and animal, from the oldest to the most recent; that those which inhabit the surface in our times are but an insignificant fraction of the prodigious multitude that have inhabited it heretofore; that for each species now living there are thousands that have become extinct. Though special formations are so strikingly characterised by some predominating type of life as to justify such expressions as the age of molluscs, the age of reptiles, the age of mammals, the introduction of the newcomers did not take place abruptly, as by sudden creation. They gradually emerged in an antecedent age, reached their culmination in the one which they characterised, and then gradually died out in a succeeding. There is no such thing as a sudden creation—a sudden strange appearance—but there is a slow metamorphosis, a slow development for a pre-existing form. Here again we encounter the necessity of admitting for such results long periods of time. Within the range of history no well-marked instance of such development has been witnessed, and we speak with hesitation of doubtful instances of extinction. Yet in geological times myriads of evolutions and extinctions have occurred.—*The Conflict between Religion and Science.*

---

MISCELLANEA.

---

DUPES, indeed, are many; but, of all dupes, there is none so fatally situated as he who lives in undue terror of being duped.

A MAN'S true wealth is the good he does in the world. Men may ask what he leaves behind, but God will ask what he sends before.

PRIVATE judgment and free thought were in no sense the doctrine of the Reformation. Calvin had no respect for the private judgment and free thought of Servetus. Cranmer had no respect for the private judgment and free thought of Joan Bocher. Cranmer, above all, throughout life freely burned all who exercised their private judgment in a different way from himself, till he lost the power of burning others by being burned himself. But the position of Calvin and Cranmer was not the less the result of private judgment and free thought. By the exercise of their private judgment they came to certain conclusions, and, as they had the luck to get kings and senates to adopt their conclusions, they had the pleasure of burning those who by the same process came to other conclusions. No king or senate adopted the conclusions of Servetus or Joan Bocher; had they had the same luck as Calvin and Cranmer, most likely they would have burned somebody else. —*Saturday Review.*

RELIGIOUS FRAGMENTS.—On Sunday morning, the 22nd ult., Dr. Stanley preached at Westminster Abbey for the first time since his return from Paris. The sermon, which was based on the words, "Gather up the fragments, that nothing may be lost," was an eloquent and practical exhortation to endeavour to extract some good for ourselves and others out of everything in this life. If they had any scruples about the authorship of particular books in the sacred writings, let them gather up those fragments of doctrine before the supreme divinity of which all alike bowed down—the beauties of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, the description of charity in the 13th chapter of St. Paul to the Corinthians, the penitence of the 51st Psalm, and the wisdom of Ecclesiastes. He who occupied himself with putting into practice these truths would find enough and more than enough to do. Let them gather also out of the sacred books of other religions, of other nations if they would, that which had stood the wear and tear of time, and which had nourished the faith in all that had been best in heathen and Mussulman nations. It might be that oftentimes a verse from the Koran, or a saying by some heathen philosopher, scholar, or poet, would from its novelty strike the heart on which, from their familiarity, the words of the Bible would fall flat. He would have them gather out of literature, science and art whatsoever had a tendency to elevate the human soul; for these were all amongst the means of God's grace. A philosopher of our day had said that in his best and healthiest moods the arguments for a Divine, eternal cause outweighed all that could be said against it. And this was true of all men. In their purest, gentlest, and most elevated moods they rose above themselves; he would therefore have them gather up the best experiences and convictions of their minds as men garnered their resources in a beleaguered city against the coming siege.