LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
RECEIVED
JAN 16 1901
PERIODICAL DIV.

The Ideal Review

FORMERLY THE METAPHYSICAL MAGAZINE

DEVOTED TO

SCIENCE, PSYCHOLOGY, ART, LITERATURE,
PHILOSOPHY AND METAPHYSICS.

LEANDER EDMUND WHIPPLE, EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. No. 2.

AUGUST, 1900.

CONTENTS:

$2.50 a Year. **25c. a Number.**

NEW YORK:
THE METAPHYSICAL PUBLISHING CO.
465 FIFTH AVENUE.

PARIS: BRENTANO'S, 37 Avenue de l'Opéra.

Foreign Subscription, 12s. Single Copies, 1/3.

Copyright, 1900, by The Metaphysical Pub. Co. Entered as second-class matter at the New York, N Y., Post Office

A NEW EDITION

OF

Some Valuable Works.

We are sole owners of the plates and all American rights of the following standard books in

Theosophical and Metaphysical Literature,

and are issuing a New Edition, enlarged and improved in such ways as to make each book suitable for the library. The cheap and unsuitable editions previously issued have become exhausted and will not be reproduced. This edition will maintain the high character of the writings of these most important authors, and should be in every library. The list is as follows:

	CLOTH AND GOLD.	HALF MOROCCO.
OCCULT SCIENCE IN INDIA, - - - Jacolliot,	$3.00	$4.50
THE PERFECT WAY, - - { Anna Bonus Kingsford and Edward Maitland, }	2.50	4.00
THE LIFE AND DOCTRINES OF JACOB BOEHME, Franz Hartmann, M. D.,	2.50	4.00
MAGIC, WHITE AND BLACK, " " "	2.50	4.00
PARACELSUS, - - - - " " "	2.50	4.00
THE TALKING IMAGE OF URUR, " " "	1.50	2.50
Each with a new full-page Portrait of Dr. Hartmann.		
REINCARNATION: A Study of Forgotten Truth, E. D. Walker,	2.50	4.00
THE PILGRIM AND THE SHRINE, Edward Maitland,	1.50	2.50
THE IDYLL OF THE WHITE LOTUS, - Mabel Collins,	1.50	2.50
THE BLOSSOM AND THE FRUIT, - " "	1.50	2.50
LIGHT ON THE PATH, The original writing and an ideal edition. " "	.75	1.50
The Entire Set, at one order, for - - - - - -	20.00	32.00

SENT POSTPAID UPON RECEIPT OF PRICE.

THE METAPHYSICAL PUBLISHING COMPANY,
465 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

THE

IDEAL REVIEW.

VOL. XIII. AUGUST, 1900. No. 2.

THE ROMANOFFS AS REFORMERS.

BY CHARLES JOHNSTON—*Bengal Civil Service, Retired.*

"I am willing to lay down my life for Russia."
—*Peter the Great.*

The Hapsburgs hacked their way to the Austrian throne. The Hohenzollerns, struggling through nine red centuries, won successive rank as Counts, Electors, Kings, and Emperors. The Hanoverians were summoned to reign in England, because they were distinguished by purely negative virtues, and it was hoped that they would do no harm. The Romanoffs were called to rule, by the voice of a whole people, in an epoch of dire distress and misery; and by the same right they govern to-day the greatest of Western nations.

Much has been written, in a spirit of the bitterest criticism, concerning the despotism of the Russian Tsars, and, unless we gain a clear insight on this point, at the very outset, we shall constantly fail to understand the simplest problems of Russian life, and misinterpret the whole course of Russia's development.

In all that is said against Russia, it is taken for granted that the Russian people are, in spirit and aspiration, exactly like the Teutons, who fill so large a part of the horizon in Western Europe and North

America. In reality, Teutons and Slavs are as different in all their ideals of life as Mohammedans and Buddhists, or as the Old Testament and the New.

For the Teutonic nations, the ideal, the key-note of life, is individualism, a commonwealth built on personal rights, on the largest assertion of self, by each man in the state. The Teutonic nations are a web of forces all tensely straining the one against the other, and thus maintaining a more or less stable equilibrium of political life. As against this individual liberty, there is the keenest individual liability, a call for the weak and less endowed to fight on equal terms against the strong and the privileged, with the penalty of absorption and extinction in case of failure. Privilege and responsibility are counterpoised, so that the brow of care is far more universal in the lands of freest individualism.

The Slavs, on the other hand, are born Socialists, in the best and mellowest sense of the word. Indeed, all Socialistic theories are more or less successful attempts to assimilate modern nations to the traditional village communities of the Slavs, where all property was owned by the whole village, considered as a single family; and where if there was no such thing as individual wealth, there was no such thing as individual debt. Among the Slavs, the unit is the whole people and never the individual. Nowhere among the Slavs is there any keen consciousness of individual life, or any of that restive worship of one's own personality, which distinguishes the Teutonic race. It is, of course, true that the unity of the Slavonic state may not always be in harmony, and the parts may be divided against one another. But this is true also of the Teutonic unit, the individual, where the ambitions of the will so often destroy the health and stability of the nerves. In either case, a revolution is the result. But in neither case does this destroy the unity of the state, or of the individual.

Some of the greatest religions of the world have addressed themselves to this very task, the absorption of the individual in the larger life of the nation or race, through the destruction of that very

militant egotism which is characteristic of the Teuton individualist. All Christendom is pledged to a teacher who declared that a man can save his life only by losing it. Therefore the whole truth cannot be on the side of the self-asserting Teuton. But, on the other hand, no nation has found it possible to realize this teaching, without injuring its life and development. Therefore the whole truth cannot be with the self-forgetting Slav. The ideal is the assertion of a common self; and Teutons and Slavs stand at opposite sides of this ideal. Therefore, while the utmost individualism may be best for the Western nation, it is as certain that national unity, embodied in an individual ruler, is best for the Slav. The Polish nation tumbled to ruins by neglecting this truth; the Russians have built up the greatest continuous empire the world has ever seen, by adhering to it; and this splendid development has been embodied, from the very beginning, in the life of the Romanoffs.

The Romanoffs were called to rule over Russia almost at the same time that the Stuarts ascended the English throne. But, while England was enjoying a period of unequaled peace and security, Russia was still prostrate after years of blood and fire, harrowed by the tyranny of a maniac, and crushed under the tread of Tartar, Turkish and Polish armies. At that time, the territory of Russia was greater than that of the United States to-day, but with only a fifth of the population. In vast prairies, clearings in boundless primeval forests, and on the shores of frozen seas, were clusters of huts, villages which were hardly better than an assemblage of hovels, and towns which were only larger villages. Hardship and privation were the daily lot of the people, and they were exposed to the tyranny of a largely Teutonic nobility, who hesitated at no act of extortion or violence. All men lived in daily dread of invasion by merciless hordes of savages, or by armies whose civilization only made them more effectual in the work of plunder and rapine. Out of this chaos, Russia has been steadily rising, though growing so rapidly as often to outstrip her vital powers; and that the whole national life of this swiftly increasing multitude has been directed, on the whole, in

wholesome and safe channels, is due, more than all, to the succession of strong and powerful rulers of the house of Romanoff.

It is only when we come to actual counting, that we see what a remarkable work the Romanoffs have done; that we realize that they have, not once, but many times, stood for the foremost ideal, not of Russia only, but of the whole modern world. Thus it is in consonance with all modern history, that the living head of the house of Romanoff should attempt to take the lead in a world-wide movement against the grinding oppression of modern armaments.

The Stuarts, called to the English throne in a time of profound peace and national glory, lost no opportunity of going wrong; of thwarting the current of modern freedom; of asserting monarchical privilege against personal right. Sympathetic, perhaps, in person, on the throne they were bigots and tyrants. The Romanoffs, facing the same problems, went wisely and right, as far as was possible without a miraculous transcending of the ideals of their time. The first Romanoff, Tsar Mikhail Feodorovitch, chosen to rule when only seventeen, was a monarch of peace, conciliation, and justice. He reigned for thirty-three years in a turbulent epoch, hemmed in by enemies, yet never plunged his country into war. He found Russia poverty-stricken and starving; he left it rich and renowned for good government. Few wiser princes have ever reigned, over any land. He first governed for the people.

Young as he was when he came to the throne as founder of a new dynasty, he was succeeded by his son Alexei when that prince was still younger, being only sixteen at his accession. The reign of Alexei finds its greatest interest in a contrast with the second of the Stuarts. Almost at the same time when Charles I. was fighting in the death-struggle against the liberties of the people of England, Alexei was called to face a popular revolt, supported by the Russian army, to protest against the tyranny of his ministers. But, where Charles, "the Martyr," fought bitterly against popular right, Alexei conciliated, lightened unjust duties, abolished monopolies, and enlarged the privileges of the people. Therefore Russia also passed through

a revolution, but it was a successful one, and in nowise disturbed the unity of national life.

But the house of Romanoff first attained world-wide significance, in the person of Peter the Great, the son of Alexei. He was the first great democrat, the first and most splendid embodiment of modern man. His reign represents, for Russia, the birth of the modern spirit, from the long travail of the middle ages. He was the first great captain of industry, the first to recognize fully and strenuously apply to life the twin principles of discipline and mechanism, which have transformed the middle ages into the world of to-day. If we were to regard him only as a great manufacturer, he would take a foremost position among the men of our age; but, besides this, he was a great warrior, a great lawgiver, a great administrator, and a great student of all that was best in the science and philosophy of his time. But perhaps Peter the Great stands out best as an ideal of manliness. No figure in our epoch can compare with him for inherent power, unless it be the first Napoleon; but, while Napoleon destroyed, Peter the Great built up; while Napoleon won victory after victory, and yet left his nation defeated, Peter was vanquished time after time, and yet left his country victorious. Peter established the foundations of national life so strongly that Russian history has been, since his time, an unbroken progress; while Napoleon's land has passed through one revolution after another, sinking back in national insignificance after every change. With equal genius, the Russian built, while the Frenchman only destroyed.

No trait is so worthy of admiration, in the life of Peter the Great. A century before Burns, he asserted, in the large life of a mighty monarch, the principle that manhood is the true gold, and rank but the conventional decoration. His history is an epic on the dignity of labor. There is hardly a finer or more humorous picture in all history than that of Peter at Zaandam, not only working himself, but making his nobles work, in the dress of the dockyards, as common ship's-carpenters; and with his huge figure and splendid physique to set the example of unremitting toil, it may safely be supposed that they

were not allowed to indulge in any shirking. Had they wanted to, Peter was thoroughly capable, both morally and physically, of laying one of his princes or dukes across the imperial knee, and administering such personal chastisement as would have brought a healthier state of mind. Peter, who was then absolute lord of the most extensive empire in the world, lived in a hut with two rooms and a loft, and worked daily in the dockyards, with an energy and skill that no craftsman there could surpass.

"I am living," he said, "in obedience to the commands of God, which were spoken to Father Adam: 'In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread.'" Once again he carried with him his band of noble fellow-craftsmen, and set them all to work in an iron-foundry, he himself doing the work of three; he finally demanded payment, at the same rate as the other workmen. When he had received his wages, he looked down at his worn shoes:

"My wages will serve to buy me a new pair," he said, "of which I stand in great need. I have earned them well, by the sweat of my brow, with hammer and anvil."

Like all the other workmen, Peter rose early, lit his own fire, and cooked his own meals. He was a man of extraordinary stature, and splendidly proportioned, as have been many of the Romanoffs since; so much so, that it is doubtful whether any family in Russia has been able to count a larger proportion of tall and strong men, than the family of the emperors. The three Alexanders and Nicholas the first were all remarkable for great stature, and the late Tsar was one of the strongest men in Europe. One of his Zaandam friends has described Peter himself as being "very tall and robust, quick and nimble of foot, dexterous and rapid in all his actions. His face is plump and round, fierce in its look, with brown eyebrows, and short, curly hair of a brownish color. He is quick in his gait, swinging his arms, and holding a cane in one hand."

At Amsterdam, Peter attended a course of anatomical lectures, and acquired sufficient skill in surgery to perform several operations himself. He studied natural philosophy at the same time, also

acquiring practical skill in making ropes, paper, oil and wire, and indeed anything which Zaandam had to show, in the useful or ornamental arts. In the Hermitage at St. Petersburg, they still show a series of watches made by him, as well as models of the ships he built or helped to build. In all this, there was nothing of the royal amateur about him, but, on the contrary, he was far more efficient in all the arts he took up than the majority of workmen who practiced only one; such was his tremendous energy, and the marvelous grasp and power of his mind.

All these varied energies are of value as a test of his character, in two quite distinct ways. They show, first, that never man was so thorough a democrat, so perfectly, even unconsciously, convinced of the dignity of manual labor. In this, he is the first of modern men. But this sense of actual and real values, as opposed to traditions; this insight into the power of discipline and science, as transformers of the old medieval world, helped to make him one of the creators of modern Europe, of modern life. For his interest in these things was no mere fancy and curiosity. It was because he came from Russia, a country more than all others subject to the spirit of medievalism, where birth and privilege everywhere ruled energy and work; where all influence was in the hands of the old warrior nobles, instead of the producers, the men who work, and create wealth. It was because Peter saw this, and used his splendid energy and power to correct it, that his personality was of the utmost value. He was the first man to exemplify, in his own person, the transition from a feudal to an industrial age. It is two hundred years now, since Peter returned to Moscow with his army of mechanics; and men of affairs—three captains of men-of-war, twenty-five captains of merchant ships, forty lieutenants, thirty pilots, thirty surgeons, two hundred and fifty gunners, and three hundred artificers. And a like colony was brought from Italy, to give Russia their skill in decorative art. So that, as a captain of industry, Peter the Great would be a remarkable man in any age. For his own time, he was easily supreme.

(*To be continued.*)

PSYCHIATRY AND PSYCHAL FORCE.

BY DOCTOR ALEXANDER WILDER.

A physician of my acquaintance named as an imperative condition of success in professional treatment, *Confidence in the Curative Action of Medicine*. This is correct enough for dogma, and at the same time it suggests a wider range for our thinking. The moral effect upon a patient, when the medical adviser imperiously commands the swallowing of a drug or compound, having little confidence in it, nevertheless, is easy to apprehend. Even though such medicine be of itself specific, the unfaith of the prescriber will be very likely to prevent its action, and even to render it inert. Indeed, he has done an immoral act, and must be conscious of being a hypocrite, not deserving of trust; and hence, it is natural that he is prone to speak slightingly of those who are more sincere and successful.

There is a theory extant that medicines will at all times under similar conditions, have a like action upon the human economy; and from this the conclusion is deduced that if they are curative once, they will be so again in the same way and always. This is plausible and hard to dispute because of its apparent mathematical exactness. An Homœopathic practitioner whom I formerly knew, used to give the explanation for his prescribing of a particular medicine: "Because it is the right remedy." It is not easy to breathe a full breath when one is so dogmatically circumscribed. We do not feel satisfied. There seems to be something omitted; we instinctively require some further understanding of the matter. We do not patiently tolerate that materialistic something in the assumption which seems to compress thinking and to forbid questioning. I would fain push further and search for reasons that show why such virtues exist in these particular articles. I am willing to acknowledge the unknown, but I am slow to cognize the unknowable in matters which I conceive to come within the purview of possible knowing.

Van Helmont, who was in many essential particulars, a Father in

Modern Medicine, evidenced a profounder conception of the matter. In certain respects many would consider him visionary, but this is more easy to say than to show. He taught explicitly that material nature derived her forms and energies from above, and that heaven, the superior region, received in turn an invisible potency from below: both of which outflows are in every person. Somewhat of this sentiment pervaded his writings upon the Art of Healing. He believed it to be in the power of individuals, through the suggestion and force of the imagination to transmit energies and qualities to others and even to inanimate objects. Many herbs, he declared, will acquire an extraordinary power through the imagination of those who gather them. We have in later years observed the introducing of new remedies with glowing certificates of their demonstrated virtues, and their speedy discarding as useless. Again, medicines which have been commended as serviceable in one direction, have been found really so for some different purpose. This hypothesis of Van Helmont seems to afford light upon the matter. It may explain why certain medicines and treatment are successful in the case of one practitioner and ineffective with others. Van Helmont further informs us that his presence was frequently sufficient to cure the sick; and also, that he not only operated upon others by his will, but actually imparted through it a peculiar virtue to medicines.

It is the province of the philosophic investigator to examine these matters. We are wise in disregarding whatever is absurdly fanciful, as well as what is grossly materialistic. But no discovery or phenomenon which can afford any light can be honestly ignored or despised. We want a suitable foundation, and with it, as far as practicable, a scientific reason. Our physical senses may give their testimony and the logical faculty do its proper work. Nevertheless, both are limited in their scope. "Beyond the veil of the seen," says Professor George Barker, "science may not penetrate."* Yet the knowl-

*Address delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at its annual meeting in Boston, August 25, 1880, on retiring from the office of President.

edge which is of the senses alone is superficial only, illusionary and often deceptive and misleading. Professor Barker remarks accordingly, that whether a living organism is plant or animal, the whole of its energy must come from without itself, being either absorbed directly or stirred up in the food. It is respecting this energy that we will now consider. Of it the properties of an organism consist; and the hypothesis of Van Helmont is in no way incompatible with the action as explained. Thus, the knowing of disease well and prescribing for it aright, will show familiarity with physiological science; but in order to be a good and competent physiologist it is imperatively necessary to make a careful study of mind, its functions and operations. There is something which makes certain foods repugnant, and the administration of a medicine or other remedial expedient, more or less unwholesome. It is by no means a problem of mathematic preciseness. Two patients that are apparently disordered alike are sometimes not benefited alike by similar measures. Methods and agents which are successful in the hands of one person are liable to be unavailing with another.

In order to understand such discrepancies it is necessary to examine further into the facts, which are not open at first to our apprehension. The mechanism of the human body will not disclose the laws which control it; nor will our chemical and empiric knowledge of drugs suffice to explain their influence upon functional activity. No intelligent person for a moment supposes that the gases and earthy material which the manipulations of chemistry evolve from a medicinal substance are the containers of its virtues; for in fact, the constituents of foods and those of poisons are often not greatly different. The properties pertain to the something-beyond, which is not to be measured by weight or dimension. This fundamental fact underlies them all.

In an analogous manner, the will, the moods, the emotive conditions of an individual, transform the very elements of the body and change the properties and operations of food and medicine. Faith or the want of it is known to be all-potent. "As a man thinketh, so

is he." Psychologic knowledge is the complement of the Healing Art.

In affirming this, I do not mean a disjoining of the mental and psychic from the material nature. This mundane life of ours is a condition in which they interblend as one whole, and this so perfectly that many plausible arguments can be advanced to prove that the corporeal existence includes all. I cannot go thus far; I have evidence which assures me otherwise. Yet it is not amiss to consider everything, so far as it is in our power, from the scientific point of view. There are so many facilities for this, at the present period, that we may keep within the scientific pale with comparative ease. Only, we should not consent to be impounded there.

There is a theory of psychiatry now in vogue which not only contemplates all neuroses and mental aberrations as comprised in its department, but also as constituting the whole of it. Many writers, indeed, seem to have no other conception of the meaning of the term, Psychological Science. This is one of the unfortunate outcomes of the materialism which to a great degree has obscured the intellectual sky.

We may not doubt by any means, however, that insanities, as well as other disorders of the nervous systems, are to be regarded as phenomena intimately associated with pathologic conditions of the body. Indeed, I would, I think, go further than our principal accepted authorities, in making but minor account of lesions of brain and disorganization of nerve-centres in that department of the organism, while I attach greater importance to certain other deteriorations. Changes may occur which will be sufficient to cause the most acute disorder, or even to destroy life, and yet be so subtile as not to be demonstrable to the senses. At a certain lunatic asylum in England a considerable percentage of the inmates, who were to all appearance insane while living, nevertheless disclosed upon necropsy no sign or evidence of altered brain-structure. I do not consider any hypothesis of a person's sanity as tenable which is based upon the fact of no discoverable affection of the cerebral substance. And I

feel very certain that insanity is not primarily or essentially a disease of the brain. Bodily debility is at the bottom of mental disorder, and none of the aberrations entitled insane are exceptions to this fact. The disturbance of the emotive nature is inseparable from an abnormal condition of the ganglionic nervous centres. The morbific influence upon the brain is a sequence to this, and the skillful psychiatrist will act upon that suggestion.

We come nearer to a right understanding of the subject when we cognize intelligently the existence of the Psychic Force. This hypothesis has been conceded with reluctance, and not without endeavors to circumscribe it within the limitations of materialism It bears, however, the authority of Sir William Crookes, of the Royal Society, distinguished alike for scientific acumen and the courage to declare his convictions when they transcend the limits of accepted learning. He explains the force as a form of energy hitherto recognized, and declares that its existence is not a matter of opinion with him, but of absolute knowledge. He leaves no reasonable opportunity to slur the subject over as fanciful, or without proper support. It is impossible to place him under the ban of irregular, as is done by medical men when knowledge is exhibited outside of their prescribed limits. Nor may any one apply to his views the stale epithet of "unscientific" because they had not been already accepted. But the endeavor has been made to qualify them by representing the psychic force as not being derived from any ulterior spiritual source, but as inherent in the nerves and muscles of the body. It is a curious fact, however, that this explanation corresponds very accurately with that of the *nervengeist* or nerve-spirit, as described by the *Seherin von Prevorst*. Without commenting further upon the matter, however, it is enough to remark that the great pains to shuffle off all consideration of this feature of the subject, ridiculing and hissing down every evidence that is submitted, and seeking to exclude it from the scientific circle, indicates fear and moral cowardice, rather than a manly love for genuine knowledge. But there are breaches in the wall, and the light will shine through, bedimming the lustre of all

the candles. The force which is inherent in muscles and nerves is a part of the essential selfhood of the individual, and this fact inevitably carries our study of physiology over into the realm of psychology.

Human science, and medical learning in particular, will not be complete, or even practical in character, except with this culmination. Nor is this hypothesis in any legitimate sense a novelty or new departure. Ancient teachers of the Healing Art recognized it as the essential principle to which their methods were subordinate. It is no more visionary to accept this doctrine than to recognize the fact that the human body holds together while pervaded with life, and dissolves only when that agency is withdrawn.

The late Professor John W. Draper distinctly affirmed that there is a psycho-physiological science. "There animates the machine a self-conscious and immortal principle—the Soul," he declared. "In the most enlarged acceptation, it would fall under the province of Physiology to treat of this immortal principle." I agree with him that the medical curriculum, rightly and intelligently arranged with the paramount view of fitting the student for his vocation, must embrace this department of knowledge. The practitioner must know his art both experimentally and intuitively, or he is liable to failure in his endeavors. That art depends upon the science that exists with it, and yet more upon the philosophy that includes all knowledge and sets it in order.

It is the proletarian of leechcraft that ignores this and is wedded to the drugging and routine of the medical trade. The liberal physician perfects his knowledge of disease and the means for its remedy by researches into the depths and explorations into the zenith of anthropologic learning. He does not hesitate to discern the spirits as well as the ashes. Life is more than a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury signifying nothing. It is a drama rehearsed in a temple with all the denizens of the universe for audience. It everywhere carries into action the sublime discontent which impels the soul. If psychologic study evolves religion as well as philosophy, what matters it? Every principle of life always tends to what is

above itself. The theories, the trend of which is to dethrone and imbrute man are so many attempts to despoil him of his heritage. The animals of a higher order always employ those parts of their nervous structure which are superadded to those of the lower races, subordinating the inferior to the nobler. So, likewise, may the expert in psychologic lore transcend the methods and procedures which are most esteemed by those who have not become matriculants into the school of profounder knowledge. Indeed, it will be perceived by the intelligent, that this is science and technic, and not the romance of medical learning.

ALEXANDER WILDER, M. D.

FORGIVENESS.

BY AARON M. CRANE.

"Forgive us our Debts as we Forgive our Debtors."

Although for centuries children have been taught to repeat the words of the Lord's Prayer, men have yet to attain to its deeper meanings; and however completely mankind may comprehend it, they will never outgrow it. When the prayer is considered without addition or diminution and the plain meaning of the words is accepted as they stand, it presents many remarkable features which touch closely upon what is called the "practical side" of every-day human affairs. Viewed as a means for shaping the lives of men, this prayer is more far-reaching than the ten commandments. There is in existence no more radical document; nor, when considered in its relations to the existing conditions of society, is there one more revolutionary. If the principles the words express or suggest were accepted as true in the fullness of their meaning, there would follow radical changes of opinion that, acted upon, would revolutionize prevailing social conditions. When men shall themselves seriously attempt to do their part toward accomplishing the things they ask

for when they repeat the words of this petition, the world will be so changed that its present inhabitants would scarcely recognize it.

In this prayer the petition for forgiveness differs essentially from that of any other ever uttered; the defining and limiting effect of the form of language used is most remarkable.* Jesus here instructs us to ask God, our Father, to forgive us as we have forgiven others. The "as" in this place is like the sign of equality in an algebraic equation. On one side of this sign is the forgiveness we ask for; on the other is the forgiveness we render to others. The one is *as* the other; that is, they are equal. The statement can be recast in the mathematical form without modification of its meaning. What we ask for ourselves is equal to what we give or have given to others. Like every equation, its terms may be reversed. What we give to others is the equal of what we ask for ourselves. Hence the forgiveness which we have rendered is the exact measure of the forgiveness which we ask God to grant us; and, according to the verbal terms of the petition, we do not ask for any more. It sets the boundary of our request for forgiveness here, in what we grant to others, and Jesus does not go beyond this limit anywhere in his teaching.

There is no more luminous or convincing definition of forgiveness than is afforded through a recognition of the equality of the two parts of this petition. He who asks for forgiveness† in the words of this prayer is asking another to send away, to put out of sight, or out of recognition, the feeling, thought, or attitude toward himself occa-

* It is a curious and important fact that the two most ancient and authoritative manuscripts of the New Testament originally read: "Forgive us our debts *as we have forgiven our debtors.*" The Vatican manuscript remains unchanged. The Sinaitic appears to have been changed by some other hand than the one which first wrote the body of the manuscript so as to make it read: "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." The latter manuscripts agree with this latter reading, and these earlier ones were not accessible to the translators of the King James Version. There may be a very broad difference in the meaning, but without a doubt the more ancient reading is the correct one. Indeed, the broader meaning is really included in the King James translation, though not so clearly expressed.

† See Appendix A.

sioned by his having done the wrong action which he ought not to have done, or by his having failed to do the right thing which he ought to have done. The petition for forgiveness is the request of the petitioner to be reinstated in that good will of another which he has lost by his own wrongful act. He asks to be placed in the same relation to the one whom he has offended that he would have occupied had he not done that thing for which he asks to be forgiven. Such reinstatement constitutes forgiveness, and the forgiveness is never complete nor satisfactory to the petitioner unless the reinstatement also is complete. This, then, is the definition of forgiveness; and this is the forgiveness which Jesus Christ would have us render to others.

Therefore, the rule included in the petition is that each must first give to others the same full forgiveness which he wishes to ask God to grant unto himself. As the petitioner desires forgiveness so must he also forgive. Each one knows how completely he would have our Father forgive him; and since, by the words of this petition, he asks no more than the forgiveness which he has already rendered to others, therefore he ought to give to all those who have offended him and to those who have in any way failed in their obligations to him the exact measure and kind of forgiveness which he wishes to receive from his Father and his God. If it is complete forgiveness that he wishes, then it is complete forgiveness that he must render before he asks it for himself.

The absoluteness of the requirements of this petition and the way they enter into every-day affairs, as well as the radical results which would follow compliance with them if they should be taken as rules for conduct, may be definitely illustrated by considering somewhat in detail their application to one single item which is most obviously included in the request and is prominent in the words, though, strangely enough, it has not been very generally noticed. The petitioner asks for the forgiveness of his *debts*—forgiveness for what he *owes* to God. Because "forgiveness of debts" has so often been overlooked as a part of the prayer, and because it is so directly

applicable to the most common human concerns, and because it is also in accord with certain radical and exacting peculiarities found in every petition in the prayer, as well as in all the other teaching of Jesus, it is chosen here to illustrate the thought which the words express.

An examination of the word "debts" is desirable as a preliminary to the consideration of this particular item, because there may be some question about what is meant by it.* It is the thought that is important, not the words; but a discussion of the words is useful as a means by which to find what thought the one who used the words wished to express by them.

The signification of the Greek word which occurs in this place is the same as that of the English word debt in its most inclusive meaning. That the two words are as nearly equivalent as any two words in languages as diverse as Greek and English will be found by consulting any good lexicon or dictionary. A debt is whatever is due from one to another, whether it be friendship, love, good will, services, goods, money, or any other thing; and this is also the meaning of the Greek word for which the English word debt stands in this place. It follows, then, that in this petition we ask God to forgive us what is due from us to Him *as* (in the same manner that) we have forgiven, or do now forgive, others what they owe us. This language is very comprehensive and exacting, but according to the best authorities it expresses the meaning of the Greek correctly and is the only translation allowable by the language of the original manuscripts.

The word trespass is often used in this place. This is a survival of the translation in the Bishop's Bible, the use of which preceded the King James Version in the English Churches. The word trespass is not a proper nor a sufficient rendering of the Greek word, because its meaning is less inclusive. A trespass may be something stolen. All trespasses, in this application of the word, are debts; but not all debts are trespasses. A loan becomes a debt, but it is

* See Appendix A.

not a trespass. The word trespass may mean any wrongful or improper act. There may be nothing wrongful or improper about a loan or a debt, and therefore the loan is not included in the signification of the word trespass; so that word, even with its widest range of meaning, is not sufficiently inclusive to represent properly the word in the original, which, as ordinarily used, meant to owe money, but which, in its larger and broader sense, meant any obligation—anything that one ought to do. The Greek word in the oldest and best manuscripts meant debts, as the English word is understood to-day, and he who uses the word trespasses in this place leaves out a part of the prayer—omits all those debts which are not trespasses.

This position relative to the use of the word trespasses is fully maintained and even emphasized by the form of the petition which is given in the gospel of Luke: "Forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us."* The phraseology is different from that in Matthew, but the idea is the same. In Matthew the petition is, "Forgive us our debts"; in Luke, "Forgive us our sins." The debt is what is due, and in its figurative meaning includes sin, because in sin there is always something due; the sin is an error which involves immorality; but the Greek word, here translated "sin," includes in its meaning all errors, small as well as great, and those that do not involve any moral consideration as well as those that do; therefore the petition as it is given in Luke is really for the forgiveness of all errors. It is an error to fail in what one ought to do, or to do what one ought not; and both these forms of expression include the idea of obligation or indebtedness in its larger as well as its more restricted meaning; hence, in this particular, both forms of the petition are for the same thing at last. In Luke the reason why we ask for forgiveness, and the basis on which it may be granted, lie in the fact that "we also forgive every one that is indebted to us"—every one who owes us; and, as the words stand, if we have not done that, there is no reason why we ourselves should be forgiven our own sins. As has been shown already, in Matthew the forgiveness asked

* Luke xi., 2-4.

for rests upon exactly the same basis and is strictly limited by that which we have rendered. Substantially, therefore, these different terms have the same meaning; but the Greek word which is translated *sins* can by no possible verbal process be limited in its meaning to that indicated by the word trespasses. These differences of language used on these two occasions point to the fact that Jesus intended to express a broader thought than is included in the word trespasses, but one which, as will be seen hereafter, is fully expressed by the word debts. All these considerations unite in showing that the word "trespass" does not properly represent the meaning of the Greek original in either Matthew or Luke, and that it is not therefore an admissible translation.

Debts, then, is the correct word in this place; and, having settled that fact, we are now ready to enter upon the consideration of the meaning and application of this petition and to suggest something of its possible effect upon society if men were seriously to act upon the idea which they express when they pray this prayer, just as they do in regard to anything else which they ask of others besides their Father in heaven.

The plain meaning of the terms in which this request is made, as already indicated, are such that the man who does not forgive his fellow-men their financial or money indebtedness to him does not, by the use of this language, ask God to forgive him anything which he himself owes to God.

This is a tremendous limitation; but in this connection the fact should not be overlooked that the limitation is made, not by God, nor by Jesus Christ, but by the man himself through his own failure to forgive his fellow-men. The language of the petition is inflexible; yet every man is free to enlarge or contract the dimensions of his request as he pleases, by himself granting or refusing forgiveness to others. If he first forgives his fellow-men all their debts due to him, then he asks the same full forgiveness for himself; but if he does not do this, then to the same extent that he fails to do it, he limits his own asking for himself. If by refusal to forgive others he so con-

tracts the meaning of the prayer as related to himself that he casts out of it every vestige of a petition for his own forgiveness, this exclusion is not the action of God, but solely that of the petitioner himself. Then let him, as well as all others who are cognizant of the facts, beware how he charges God with that evil which he may by his own action bring upon himself.

Because the petition is for the forgiveness of debts, the language necessarily includes, as one of its many special applications, the whole subject of property-indebtedness. If one does not forgive* his neighbor the debt of money due to himself, then, by the terms of the prayer, he places himself in such a position that he does not even ask for that forgiveness which he desires of God, because, as already shown, he is here limited in his asking to the forgiveness which he renders or has rendered to others. This rule of the petition makes forgiveness obligatory upon every one who recognizes that another has offended him or failed in any duty to him, and that whether or not it has been asked for by the offending one†; more than that, it fills the offended one with the desire to forgive the offender as he himself desires to be forgiven. Duty passes out of sight in the wish for forgiveness and to forgive.

Full compliance with these terms is the only preliminary which brings to the petitioner the forgiveness which he seeks. He who recognizes his own inability to pay what he owes to God, and that his own release from that indebtedness depends entirely upon his releasing others from their indebtedness to himself, and that his own release is no greater than what he renders unto others, and that he cannot even ask God for anything more than he has granted to

---

* The reader should continually bear in mind that one definition of the Greek word here translated "forgive," as well as of the English word "forgive" itself, as given by the lexicographers, is, "to remit, as a debt."

† It is worthy of note that Jesus Christ does not anywhere suggest that forgiveness should be withheld until it is asked for; but, on the contrary, that it should always be granted as soon as there is a recognition by any one that there is something in another to be forgiven.

his brother, is effectually prohibited by these circumstances from demanding, enforcing, or attempting to enforce the collection of financial obligations. He cannot even ask for payment, because if he has really forgiven the debt as freely and fully as he would have God forgive him, he no longer desires its payment. As he himself wishes to be reinstated by the Father in the same relation that he would have occupied had he not done the wrong act, so must he fully reinstate the borrower in that relation to himself which the borrower would have occupied had he not borrowed the money. That which is less than this is not the forgiveness which the petitioner would ask of God himself, nor is it the forgiveness which is indicated by the terms of the prayer. The "legal status" of the creditor is thus destroyed by his own act of full, free and willing forgiveness of the debt; and all distinctively "property-rights"* also disappear with it.

There is only one logical or reasonable basis on which this, as a prohibition, can rest. If it is right for a man to require or exact the payment of a debt due to himself, then, because in demanding the payment of the debt he has done nothing wrong, that act cannot properly nor justly hinder him from doing any other thing which is in itself right; and least of all can it hinder him from asking for his own release from what he owes to God. But the terms of the petition, both in Matthew and Luke, do prevent him from even asking for that forgiveness except as he has already forgiven his fellow-men. It follows, then, that the failure to forgive cannot be right; and, if it is not right then, as a necessary deduction from the fact that the debt ought to be forgiven, it follows that it is not right to exact its payment, because payment cannot be exacted when the debt has been forgiven.

---

* By "property-right" is here meant the possession, ownership, custody, or use of a thing as belonging to the possessor to the exclusion of any one or every one else from such possession, ownership, custody, or use of the thing, except by the permission or consent of the owner—that claim of right by which we say of a thing "it is mine" or "it is thine."

This last conclusion, in its turn, can rest on only one logical basis. It must be right for a man to secure and hold that which is his own, and there can be no wrong in any proper attempt to recover it after it has passed into the possession of another; but he has no right to that which is not his own, nor has he any right to attempt to obtain it except by giving its full equivalent or by seeking it as a free gift. Since a man must have the right to regain possession of his own when he has parted with it, then that cannot really be his own which he has no right to demand, especially if demanding it brings to him such a deprivation as to take from him the ability or the right to ask God's forgiveness for himself. He has not the right to demand what is another's; therefore if a man has not the right to ask for the money which another owes him, it cannot be his. The only possible reason why Jesus Christ, in making this prayer for us, directed us to express our petition for forgiveness in such language must be found in the fact that there is no rightful ownership of property as that ownership is now understood and legally recognized. Thus, from this point of view also, "property-rights" wholly disappear.

While these deductions and conclusions are most sweeping and important, there are also some most noteworthy omissions from this petition for forgiveness. The conclusions which can be drawn from these omissions are important also. It is very peculiar that this petition contains nothing whatever about the debtor, but is wholly engaged with the creditor. In this particular it is in strong contrast with distinctively human laws, which generally have for their objective point the debtor, either being intended to compel him to pay the debt or else to relieve him from its payment. On the contrary, the man who possesses is the only one considered in this petition, and he is to surrender willingly and freely what is due to him. The creditor is the one to be changed, not the debtor. Neither does this petition contain anything which may be subject to variations of opinion. Nothing is made to depend upon the justice or injustice of the debt, as those things are ordinarily considered; nor is there anything about the right or wrong of the attendant circumstances; nor any

word about the ability or inability of the debtor to pay. All considerations of this kind are rigorously excluded. The position of the debtor is not changed by anything in this petition, but he is left with all his liability upon him, unless released by the voluntary action of the creditor.

Another remarkable peculiarity is that the initiative of this action must come from the one to whom the debt is due. The forgiveness is not to result from the opposition of the debtor, nor because of his requests, nor from any condition connected with him or the debt, for all these considerations are excluded; but it is to come solely from the free action of the creditor in response to his own desire alone. The action indicated by the language is not resistance by the one bound, though it contains nothing to prevent the debtor from asking release; but the law of forgiveness in its backward swing would prevent him from making demand for his release and from all forcible prosecution of his request. Forcible resistance of any kind by him is impossible under the principles involved in this prayer and would be a violation of the principle on which the petition rests.

No release can come to the debtor through the action of the principle involved in this petition, except such as may be freely granted by the creditor. So far as the debtor is concerned there is for him, over and above all other considerations, the fact that, either directly or indirectly, he has promised to pay the debt; and the promise once made ought to be fulfilled to the last item, unless he who promised is released by the one to whom the promise was made. In the teaching of the Master there is not anywhere a shadow of any other doctrine on this point. The promise should be performed. He does not repeal, but emphasizes, the old law: "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths."* He teaches nothing more explicitly than he does faithfulness, even in the unrighteous mammon. For the debtor not to pay, unless the debt is forgiven, is to break faith and to make himself a liar.

It may be objected that such an application of this petition to the

* Matt. v., 33, 34.

This last conclusion, in its turn, can rest on only one logical basis. It must be right for a man to secure and hold that which is his own, and there can be no wrong in any proper attempt to recover it after it has passed into the possession of another; but he has no right to that which is not his own, nor has he any right to attempt to obtain it except by giving its full equivalent or by seeking it as a free gift. Since a man must have the right to regain possession of his own when he has parted with it, then that cannot really be his own which he has no right to demand, especially if demanding it brings to him such a deprivation as to take from him the ability or the right to ask God's forgiveness for himself. He has not the right to demand what is another's; therefore if a man has not the right to ask for the money which another owes him, it cannot be his. The only possible reason why Jesus Christ, in making this prayer for us, directed us to express our petition for forgiveness in such language must be found in the fact that there is no rightful ownership of property as that ownership is now understood and legally recognized. Thus, from this point of view also, "property-rights" wholly disappear.

While these deductions and conclusions are most sweeping and important, there are also some most noteworthy omissions from this petition for forgiveness. The conclusions which can be drawn from these omissions are important also. It is very peculiar that this petition contains nothing whatever about the debtor, but is wholly engaged with the creditor. In this particular it is in strong contrast with distinctively human laws, which generally have for their objective point the debtor, either being intended to compel him to pay the debt or else to relieve him from its payment. On the contrary, the man who possesses is the only one considered in this petition, and he is to surrender willingly and freely what is due to him. The creditor is the one to be changed, not the debtor. Neither does this petition contain anything which may be subject to variations of opinion. Nothing is made to depend upon the justice or injustice of the debt, as those things are ordinarily considered; nor is there anything about the right or wrong of the attendant circumstances; nor any

word about the ability or inability of the debtor to pay. All considerations of this kind are rigorously excluded. The position of the debtor is not changed by anything in this petition, but he is left with all his liability upon him, unless released by the voluntary action of the creditor.

Another remarkable peculiarity is that the initiative of this action must come from the one to whom the debt is due. The forgiveness is not to result from the opposition of the debtor, nor because of his requests, nor from any condition connected with him or the debt, for all these considerations are excluded; but it is to come solely from the free action of the creditor in response to his own desire alone. The action indicated by the language is not resistance by the one bound, though it contains nothing to prevent the debtor from asking release; but the law of forgiveness in its backward swing would prevent him from making demand for his release and from all forcible prosecution of his request. Forcible resistance of any kind by him is impossible under the principles involved in this prayer and would be a violation of the principle on which the petition rests.

No release can come to the debtor through the action of the principle involved in this petition, except such as may be freely granted by the creditor. So far as the debtor is concerned there is for him, over and above all other considerations, the fact that, either directly or indirectly, he has promised to pay the debt; and the promise once made ought to be fulfilled to the last item, unless he who promised is released by the one to whom the promise was made. In the teaching of the Master there is not anywhere a shadow of any other doctrine on this point. The promise should be performed. He does not repeal, but emphasizes, the old law: "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths."* He teaches nothing more explicitly than he does faithfulness, even in the unrighteous mammon. For the debtor not to pay, unless the debt is forgiven, is to break faith and to make himself a liar.

It may be objected that such an application of this petition to the

* Matt. v., 33, 34.

prosaic, materialistic, property affairs of every-day, human business and common life degrades it from its ethereal and purely spiritual meaning and removes it from the high domain which it may have been supposed to inhabit. But this is not correct. While the one is true, the other is true also. Men's inner lives and thoughts are evidenced by the things they do: and their actions are the results of their spiritual and intellectual convictions—the things they really and truly think and believe, not the things they only say they believe. No one has ever doubted that the spiritual, intellectual, or moral phase of this petition is fully the equivalent in that respect of what has here been suggested. That is its external manifestation. If this holds true in one domain, simple consistency requires that it must be true in the other. If it really means that we ought to forgive morally, it follows, even as sunlight follows sunrise, or as action follows thinking, that this moral forgiveness and consequent change of disposition toward another must find its expression in corresponding outward conduct toward that other in all the affairs of the world. If any one really believes in the moral and spiritual interpretation ordinarily given to this petition and complies with the requirements of such a belief, then he will, from choice, practice the external manifestations of the same moral qualities and forgive even his brother's financial indebtedness. Do we not all say, "*Our* Father"?

The foregoing proposition which is expressed in the statement that man has no property-right in or to the things in his possession, thus deduced from these words of Jesus Christ which he would have us put in our hearts and mouths, in the most solemn form of a petition to our Father in heaven for our own forgiveness, is exactly in harmony with his other utterances on this and kindred subjects, and is clearly and directly set forth in many of them. There is nothing in any of his teaching which in any way contradicts or modifies this; but it may be said to find a parallel in some of the declarations of the Old Testament.

AARON M. CRANE.

(*To be continued.*)

THE MAKING AND DECAYING OF THE CREED.

BY THE REVEREND HENRY FRANK.

(III.)

"THE ANATHEMAS OF CALVIN."

We have now reached a very important period of the history of creed development. The age of John Calvin, thanks to his own superior genius and the lingering echo of his authority in the Westminster Confession, borders very closely on our own. Is it any wonder that staunch and stalwart Presbyterianism is stirred to its very depths and shudders throughout its frame, when, at the glorious dawn of the Twentieth Century, the livid corpse of mediæval Calvinism is exposed to the scorn and horror of modern intelligence? Is it any wonder that the whole world is crying out against such an atrocious libel upon the spirit and learning of the age, as is contained within the still extant and somewhat worshiped symbols of Westminsterism?

It remains for us to inquire how these lingering relics of superstition, ignorance and bigotry, came to be so long-lived, to lurk surreptitiously within the niches and recesses of great institutions of learning; and to lie, like a repulsive skeleton, beneath the cloth of the sacred desk.

It cannot be denied that Calvinism is to-day a theological dead-letter. No preacher dares to elucidate or sustain it. Every apology will be made for it—it will be plastered over, daubed with whitewash or fascinating hues, variously construed, excused or defended. Yet Calvinism, pure and simple, no man dare to vindicate in the face of popular intelligence.

No less a man than the learned Dr. Philip Schaff, an eminent and erudite Presbyterian theologian, has himself saved the army of liberal teachers the onerous necessity of awakening the conservative

L. of C.

multitudes of our age to the realization of a vigorous fact in what he said some years ago:

"I know of no Presbyterian minister in these United States who preaches the decree of reprobation or preterition, the irresponsibility of the sinner for not accepting the gospel, the limitation of the atonement to the small circle of the elect, the eternal damnation of non-elect infants dying in infancy, and the damnation of the non-Christian world—Heathen, Jews and Mahometans—who still continue by far the greatest part of mankind; and yet these doctrines are supposed to be taught expressly or implicitly by the Westminster standards. (*Creed Revision*, pp. 13, 14.)

How, then, came such doctrines ever to be accepted? How came the world, and its very best people at that, at one time to believe that these very doctrines, now so repulsive and atrocious, were the revelation of God himself and the truest interpretation of the scriptures?

May we not here ask if it is a source of wonder that multitudes are refusing henceforth to be driven in the leash of theological authority, refusing to bow and cringe in abject servility to the dictates of Heaven's own ambassadors and vicegerents, the clergy, in matters pertaining to religious truth and spiritual revelation, when they observe at every epoch of the world's history these vast eruptions, welling from the depths of popular intelligence, which so effectually overthrow the assumed wisdom and learning of those who have so long sat in the high seats of power? As one well says: "Revision is in the air"—revision of Bibles and creeds and confessions! And this means at once the disenthrallment of the human mind in matters of religion and the displacement, from false seats of authority, of those who have so long deluded the people in the belief that what they declared to be the truth must be accepted as such at the peril of their eternal ruin!

In order, therefore, to understand how the Westminster standards were hoisted into authority and power, we must revert to the history of the Reformation, inaugurated in the fifteenth century. This

period of the world's history was similar to the one in which we live. The discoveries of human research, the inductive process of reasoning, the inventions of genius, the expansion of the known surface of the earth, the rising of the physical sciences from mere empiricism and speculative conjecturalness to careful experimentation and accurate generalization, the slow bringing of the starry heavens from the realms of romance and fancy to the keen and searching study of the human mind—these were some of the forces then in action which were rapidly supplanting the usurpation of pretentious authority and disenthralling the race from mental slavery. Theretofore the Roman Catholic church had been in supreme power. Her sceptre was feared as a wand of terrible potency. She gave life and imposed death. She held in her wizard-hand the sun and all his wandering retinue of worlds. The earth trembled beneath her anathemas. As a consequence, the human mind had grown stolid and indifferent in its slavish ignorance. Individual liberty was a sentiment whose realization had long since faded away from the sunny fields of Papal Italy, or died to swan-like echoes in the unfrequented groves of classic Greece. The whole human race was swallowed up in the church, and the church was swallowed up in "one only man." Ignorance, total ignorance, had lowered like a cloud of midnight blackness upon the earth.

But of course it could not always be so. Slow and suppressed rumblings were often heard rising from the lower strata of society. But they who sat on Vesuvius heights cared little for the feeble warnings. Roger Bacon, John Huss, John Wyclif, had already shaken the foundations of authority until the base had become unsteady. Therefore when Martin Luther, Zwinglius and Melancthon came upon the scene, they found an already honey-combed ecclesiasticism yielding to their resistless blows.

Naturally, at such a time, we should expect a general breaking-up of all established conventionalities; a general letting-loose of the dogs of mental warfare, resulting in partial bedlam and confusion and in some cases descending to positive degradation. This same

fact has been true of every period of revolution or general reformation. Immediately after the introduction of any great truth into the world, and its popular acceptance, there is a sudden rebound from severe authority on the one hand and groveling subserviency on the other, till the heavens grow dark with maudlin sentimentality, and the world is deluged by a sea of speculative folly and ethical experimentation. It was so immediately after the popular acceptance of the religion of Jesus. Every phase of physical investigation and absurd credulity came rapidly in vogue; the earth swarmed with theories, fancies, sentiments, deluding dreams and dreary vaporings, till it seemed that the Almighty himself must take his place in the seat of authority and declare to man the indisputable dicta of truth.

The same state of things we discover, though perhaps in a less marked degree, (from the fact of the far less general diffusion of knowledge) at the time of the introduction of Buddhism into India and the general breaking up of the Brahminic religion. I will reproduce here an eloquent passage of Rhys Davids', which vividly pictures the chaotic condition of the social and moral world at a period of general religious awakening, moral regeneration, and intellectual disenthrallment: "How much greater the disaster (than the fall of an individual) when a whole nation to whom the doors of liberty have once been opened closes them upon itself and relapses into the bondage of delusion!"

Describing the feast of Juggernaut he gives a fine symbolic illustration of the chaotic, yet tragic moral and mental condition of such a momentous epoch:

"When we call to mind how the frenzied multitudes, drunk with the luscious poison of delusions from which the reformation might have saved them, dragged on that sacred car, heavy and hideous with carvings of obscenity and cruelty—dragged it on in the name of Jagannath, the forgotten teacher of enlightenment, of purity and universal love, while it creaked and crushed over the bodies of miserable suicides, the victims of once-exploded superstitions—it will help us to realize how heavy is the hand of the just; how

much more powerful than the voice of the prophet is the influence of congenial fancies and of inherited beliefs." *

And this Jagannath, or juggernaut, feast of suicidal insanity is enacted at every turn of the wheel of universal reformation and religious transformation. Long confined in the dungeon darkness of superstitious ignorance and fear, when suddenly released the multitudes are crazed with visions of freedom and possibilities of individual liberty, and naturally conjure up every departed spirit of long-cherished delusions to feed their fancies and glut their curiosities.

What unwisdom therefore, at every such period of the world's history, to assume that such social upheavals and mental ravings are unique and unparalleled, and must therefore be extirpated at the point of the sword and with the scourge of the flame, lest like poisonous weeds, once rooted, they will grow profusely, and ultimately choke out the fairest flowers in the paradise of truth! But with what far finer sagacity and insight did the intuitive teacher of Galilee discern the true cause of such incidental overgrowths and perhaps poisonous infections, when he enjoined the servants to suffer the wheat and tares to grow up together till the day of reaping should come, when Truth, the final reaper, would separate them, and reveal the kernel intact in purity and untarnished by its association!

Here is a strong hint for the chaotic mental period through which our age is passing. The insanity of this Jagannath feast (if all these wanderings, dreamings and ravings of mental investigation and spiritual speculation can be called insanity) can never be checked by laws and legislatures, by priestly potentates and papal bulls, by the denunciations of ecclesiastical conclaves and the defiant utterances of teachers clothed in the prerogatives of their audacious usurpation. Truth alone, slowly revealing her unguised visage through the veil of time, can check what conceptions have deflected

---

*(*Origin and Growth of Religion, Illustrated by Buddhism*, p. 33.)

from her steady and persistent path. Until Truth speaks from the throne of individual consciousness in the name of her own undisputed authority, ignorance can never be dissipated or its retinue of plausible delusions swept from the mind of man.

Perhaps at no period of history is this fact better illustrated than at the entrance of John Calvin on the arena of the Reformation. There had grown up during the first century of the reformation many of these erratic sects or committees which had undertaken to solve the great problem and mystery of life by shattering every conventionality and laughing at the tyranny of all antiquity. They were variously called—Anabaptists, Hoffmanists, Spiritualists, Liberalists, Pantheists, Antinomians, Brethren of the Free Spirit, Rationalists, etc. These ultra sects were the result of nothing but another outcropping of the speculations of Neo-Platonism.

To show how in all ages the trend of free religious thought is along identical lines, I will give a brief description of these sects which I borrow from an article in McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature:

"The system of the Libertines was pure Pantheism. They held that there is one universal spirit which is found in every creature and is God. All creatures, angels, etc., are nothing in themselves and have no real existence aside from God. Man is preserved only by the spirit of God, which is within him and exists only until that spirit departs from him; instead of a soul, it is God himself who dwells in man; and all his actions, all that takes place in this world is direct from him—is the immediate work of God. Everything else, the world, the flesh, the devil, souls, etc., are by this system considered as illusions. Even sin is not a mere negation of what is right, but, since God is an active agent in all actions, it can be but an illusion also, and will disappear as soon as this principle is recognized. They made great use of allegory, figures of speech, etc., taking their authority from the precept 'the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.'" (Article "*Libertinism.*")

Here we discover a clear intimation of the spiritual philosophy which is so prevalent in our day.

It is no wonder that in the age of John Calvin, as in all other awakening periods of history, these teachings should have led off into erraticism and vagaries; should have led some, perhaps many, into devious paths of compromise; should have tended somewhat to loosen the ethical standards of the age. Yet I will confess it is a debatable question whether the ethical standards adopted by the church under the leadership of the great Reformers, as we shall soon see, were any less inclined to lead humanity astray than were the alleged deviations of the Brethren of the Free Spirit. But John Calvin found himself at once occupied, after the assumption of his clerical duties in Geneva, in combating these growing and popular erratic sects. The author of this article in the Encyclopedia says: "No one really did more to counteract the principles of Libertinism than did Calvin himself. It is, in fact, due to his efforts that this sect, this baneful curse, left France to take refuge in its native country, Belgium, and that it finally disappeared altogether." John Calvin's "Institutes" were largely written in order to counteract the influence of this sect. His whole soul was aroused to indignation and hatred towards this system of speculation; and history proves to us that Calvin's conscience was not too sensitive to use for the extirpation of this phase of free thought, means which to-day would receive no countenance even in the ultra conservative quarters of Christendom.

Of course we cannot, at this late date, say much in defence of Libertinism. It doubtless sank into an immoral sect and a dissolute community; but I think the charge is falsely made against its philosophy and highest leaders. All who have studied the course of Liberalism everywhere, know well how the offscourings of society congregate around its outer edges, and in its first stages frequently cover its surface till the clean body of its primitive hope is wholly covered with a mantle of coarseness, grotesqueness and indecency.

Universalism, Spritualism, Rationalism, Socialism — all these movements have passed through these early phases. One may

even discover this condition in the early history of Methodism, and will find John Wesley himself testifying to the wild fanaticism and indecent extravagances of which he himself was the avowed but unwitting instigator. (See his "*Christian Perfection.*")

Libertinism, the first bold, uncompromising rebound from ultra Romanism and half-developed Reformationism, was just passing into this, its natural development, when John Calvin confronted it. Had it been left alone; had the executioner's axe and laws of exile been unconcerned about this new uprising, and had it been allowed to run its course, doubtless it would have evolved into an ultimately purified and attractive spiritual and social force.

But Calvin seethes and grows irate at mention of its name. He writes to Margaret, Queen of Navarre, who had exultingly embraced its spiritual philosophy, and therefore was much offended by Calvin's insinuations against it:

"I see a sect the most execrable and pernicious that ever was in the world. I see it does harm, and is like a fire kindled for general destruction, or like a contagious disease to infect the whole earth. I am earnestly entreated by the poor believers, who see the Netherlands already corrupted, to put my hand to the work."

He did put his hand to the work; and the last of the sect were driven from Geneva in 1555, either through the prisoner's cell, exile, or the executioner's axe.

Now, in this stormy period Michael Servetus appeared upon the stage. He was a pupil of Calvin. But he could not accept his dogma of the Trinity. Therefore he left Calvin's school and dissociated himself from orthodox circles. Calvin found a slight plea against Servetus's moral conduct, because he affiliated with his antagonists; but against his personal, moral character no charge could be brought.

Calvin alone was responsible for the committal of Servetus to the flames. Calvin had complete control of the Geneva Republic and was the leader of the council. He had once before "saved" Geneva from the Anabaptists. The council was therefore ready to pay him

any honor. It is useless to undertake to defend Calvin. At best it can be said he pleaded for a milder method of execution. Yet who shall say that slowly bleeding away at the sharp point of a sword is a more merciful death than being consumed by angry flames? If Calvin was averse to the burning or execution of Servetus, it is strange that he followed his barbarous "taking off" with a vigorous vindication of the propriety of banishing or slaying obnoxious heretics. It is well known that Luther and Beza and Melancthon applauded the deed. Dr. Philip Schaff silences the tongues of those who would exonerate Calvin and the Reformers from any culpability in the execution of heretics. He says: "Calvin wished the sword to be substituted for the stake in the case of Servetus; but as to the right and duty of the death penalty for obstinate heretics he had not the slightest misgiving, and it is only on this ground that his conduct in the tragedy can be in any way justified or at least explained." (Footnote p. 7 "*Creed Revision.*")

I cite this case of Calvin and his sympathizers and coadjutors, not to cast any vicious stain upon their names, but simply to illustrate how, when one subjects his conscience and judgment to the tyrannous authority of a creed, it may harden his heart and dethrone his reason. Therefore the spirit of the age rises in arms against the claims and commands of creeds. Therefore the judgment of the age cries against the right or duty of any individual to sign away his personal liberty by his subscription to the authority of any theological confession. But why should there be any effort at this late day to exonerate the Reformers in their well-known occupation of persecuting the heretics, when it is commonly known, as Hallam so well puts it, that "Persecution is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches: that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive"?

Again, to prove the immoral consequence of a popular subjection to the tyrannous authority of creeds, hear what this sagacious but cautious author elsewhere says: "At the end of the sixteenth century the simple proposition that men for holding or declaring hetero-

dox opinions in religion should not be burned alive or otherwise put to death, was itself little else than a sort of heterodoxy."

Now, it is very natural to pass from the career of John Calvin to the history of the creation of the Westminster Confession. It is very natural; because the Westminster Confession stands to-day perhaps the clearest, strongest and most plausible exposition of simon-pure Calvinism.

JOHN CALVIN'S ECHO.

We shall now study the history of the formation of the Westminster Confession. The conclave which created it had originally intended simply to revise the Articles of Religion in the Anglican church; but finally abandoned that idea and labored for a long period to formulate what has been for centuries the boldest and most startling landmark of the theological expression of any age.

The especial feature to which I wish at this juncture to call attention, is that of assigning to the *civil government* the right and duty of calling synods, protecting orthodoxy and *punishing heresy!* Here was the entering wedge of all the barbarism which ensued. Here we shall discover another illustration of the despicable tendency of authoritative and tyrannous creeds to spread savage and barbarous customs throughout the world. No sooner had the creed been formed and legally established than its murderous work began.

The Episcopalians had been in control of Parliament till the Revolution. The Protector was himself a moderate and tolerant man. His voice was for peace and charity. He would even remove certain legal disabilities from the Jews. But "the Presbyterians constantly labored to thwart the measures of the Protector. They declared that those only should be tolerated who accepted the fundamentals of Christianity, and they drew up a list of these fundamentals which formed as elaborate and exclusive a test as the articles of the church they had defeated." (Lecky, "*Rationalism*," Vol. II.)

Neal, in his History of the Puritans, affords some very positive but startling information on this theme, as evidenced by the following :

"In 1648 the Presbyterians tried to induce the Parliament to pass a law by which any one who persistently taught anything contrary to the main propositions comprised in the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation should be punished with death; and all who taught Popish, Arminian, Antinomian, Baptist or Quaker doctrines should be imprisoned for life." (Pp. 211–222.)

Now let us not forget, as Mr. Lecky so comfortingly reminds us, that one of the motives furnished the Presbyterians of Cromwell's day, who were so anxious to imprison their opponents, was the speculative theory of the Anabaptists that the soul sleeps after death till Gabriel blows his trumpet! Then Calvinists could be satisfied with nothing short of seeing the rejectors of the creed cruelly burning forever and forever in the caldrons of hell.

Perhaps we have produced sufficient historical evidence to illustrate the barbarous influence of mandatory creeds; to prove how heartless and savage they will make their sincere professors; and to illustrate how as yet a usurpatory creed has never afforded the world an iota of good, but has proved everywhere harmful and demoralizing.

No one can justly object to a written creed as being the best attainable expression of supposed truth at certain stages of the world's history. But when these fallible and feeble expressions are set down as august and absolute authority, as very revelations from on high: when these are set up as standards beneath whose yoke all the prisoners of the faith must stupidly bow and march—then they become not only libels on the God-given intelligence of humanity, but slayers of freedom, founders of slavery, and instigators of atrocity and injustice.

In the face of such faults is it not amazing that learned, conscientious, tender-hearted and honorable gentlemen should assemble at this day in a public conclave to debate the question of the revision of this creed whose subject-matter is so obnoxious and repulsive, whose history is so replete with disgrace and outrage! One would think that men of the high, respectable standing of these clerical

gentlemen would rather blush for shame because of the past history of this creed, and would much prefer to keep it buried beneath the dust of the ages where, until its recent resurrection, it had so long silently lain.

But I desire to call attention to one grave point. Why are the Presbyterians debating the question of creed revision? Had they been left alone this discussion would never have sprung up within the confines of this most Calvinistic church. It is because of the strong and persistent antagonism of liberal religionists and untrammeled thinkers and teachers, that the long complacent and indifferent pulpit-toilers have suddenly awakened to cast their eyes athwart the world, and to discover the chaotic uproar and furious antagonism which this creed had aroused. Had the liberalists adopted anything but an aggressive warfare the church would have remained silent and moribund, the creed would have continued a living lie, and the world would have more and more drifted from its doors. Thus much does the established church owe to aggressive liberalism. But of the creed itself—its repulsive dogmas, its barbarous portrayal of Deity, its absurd heaven and exaggerated hell, I shall speak further on.

Up to this point we have learned at least that historically the creed has accomplished no iota of good for the world, but filled it with torture, distress and despair. But be it ever remembered that the creed in itself, were it but delivered as an expression of thought, would never have produced such outrage; but the creed as autocrat, the creed as king and parliament, as army and ordnance, has whelmed the world in agony and woe, severed the bands of natural relationship, dug trenches for the legions of its slain, and deluged the earth with streams of fratricidal blood. It has painted the features of God in such diabolical fashion as to make him appear fiercer and more vicious than Satan himself, and portrayed heaven in such selfish and absurd figures as to make hell more tolerable. If there are infidels in the world, let the Presbyterian church thank John Calvin, its theological progenitor, with the Westminster fathers and their parliamentary creed!

But at last the Presbyterians are truly aroused. At last this bold, defiant and compact Gibraltar of theology, so long oblivious of the storm of scorn it has aroused, sends forth its watchmen beyond its gates to learn the occasion of the popular outburst! At last the Gamaliels of divine wisdom are willing to come down from the heights of Sinai, where alone and so long they held communion with God, to throw a sop to Cerberus!

The situation is amusing. It is enough to compel the sallowest Nestor in a theological seminary to shake his sides with laughter. The creed that for these two hundred years has been hoist so high, as the strongest and surest symbol of Christian truth,—a veritable revelation from God through his prophet, John Calvin,—is called before the bar of common-sense and asked to show cause why it should not be forever squelched! But the situation is especially amusing from the fact that the only opposition to a remodeling or a rescinding of the creed is advanced from the point of view of pure policy or expediency. No one seems to argue that the creed must be maintained intact because it is right, true and beautiful; but because the cause of religion and the integrity of the Presbyterian church will be materially compromised if the plea for revision is assented to.

Here, for instance, is Dr. Francis L. Patton, president of Princeton University, who leaves no doubt in his grandiloquent sentences that his only reason for opposing revision arises from the plea of expediency. In the discussion on Creed Revision, ten years ago, he said:

"It is because of my interest in maintaining the common faith of all Christians; I do not say Protestants, but all Christians—Roman Catholic and Protestant, as well as because of my desire to see the Presbyterian church stand true to her glorious history, that I am opposed to the proposition to revise her standards. I am sorry that the agitation has occurred; but I trust that God in His good Providence may make it the occasion of a *more emphatic avowal of the system of doctrine*, in the maintenance of which our Church has been

so greatly blessed. I do not anticipate a storm, only a little breeze that will break the folds out of the old blue banner of the Covenant, and set it fluttering with the promise of new achievements as it heads the advancing column of the Calvinistic forces, which, I do not doubt, will keep the fame already won of being among the heaviest and the best in the sacramental host of God's elect."

How fervently John Calvin's martial spirit breathes anew in these warlike utterances of Dr. Patton! Calvinism was born in the throes of conflict: its breath is flame; its speech is sharp as Damascus blade; its imagery is of the battlefield; its prayer is for Victory, or right or wrong.

Dr. W. C. Roberts, a former moderator of the General Assembly, at the same conclave, asserted his position on the question of revision with far greater clearness—purely one of policy; and that, too, a paying one. He said in an interview in the Pittsburg *Despatch:*

"An attempt to construct a new Confession with such doctrines as that of the Trinity, Election, Perseverance of the Saints, and even Preterition left out, would not only open flood-gates not easily shut, *but endanger donations and bequests amounting to millions of dollars.*"

Now Dr. Roberts doubtless did not perceive the laughable absurdity of the words in this interview, which I have italicized, when he uttered them. Truth, apparently, is not to enter into the question at all: simply money, donations and bequests: these are to determine the question to revise or not to revise. How absurd, pitiably yet grossly absurd, would such an attitude appear to Jesus, who hated every phase of Phariseeism!

But the confusion of the Presbyterians is further evidenced by the curious apologies they are publishing *apropos* of the proposition to revise the creed, in many delicate particulars. I copy the following from the New York *Evening Post*, April, 1890, as a specimen of the extremities to which Presbyterianism is being driven:

"The air is full of dreadful phrases, 'prenatal damnation,' 'perdition of infants,' even 'infants in hell,' and others which I will not quote, all of them attributed to Calvin, or held to be expressive of

his teaching. Not one of them, scarcely anything whatever to justify them, can be found in his voluminous writings. On the contrary, he pleads earnestly that children should be admitted to baptism as a means of their regeneration, and at the same time denounces 'the fiction of those who would consign the unbaptized to eternal death.' . . . . . There is not, nor has there ever been, a line in the Westminster Confession about the 'fate of non-elect infants.' The chapter in question is setting forth *how* the elect are saved; adults by faith, infants dying in infancy, and idiots by other means. It is not discussing the subject of salvation at all. The phrase 'elect infants' of course, implies non-elect infants; but that any non-elect infants die in infancy, or any who die in infancy are non-elect, is not involved in a fair interpretation of the language used. What some of us would have preferred would be a less ambiguous statement here, and an explicit statement elsewhere, of the salvation of all infants, which we believe the Scriptures to teach; not, however, by the absurdity of making the non-elect infants participate in the salvation of the elect, because to a Calvinist salvation implies election."

Now, it would much delight me, as doubtless it would every lover of his race, who longs to exercise faith in its intelligence, sincerity and magnanimity, if the rash vagaries of the above communication could be proved to be truth. But alas! for the rarity of literary honesty. I am constrained to show that so far from the truth is this lawyer's effort to enter a demurrer and quash the case, that it were not more untruthful to declare the west to be east, the heavens to be the earth, and the milky nebulæ to be flat-surfaced planes of cosmic dust.

First, let us read the Creed itself, and see whether it is simply defining the question of salvation, and has no reference to reprobation or damnation.

"*Elect* infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit who worketh where and when and how He pleaseth . . . . Others *not* elected . . . . *cannot be saved!* . . . .

and to assert and maintain that they *may* is very pernicious and to be detested." (Westminster Confession, ch. II.; §§ II. and IV.)

In the face of this statement how green and how great must have been the gall of the individual who wrote in the above newspaper: "There is not, nor has there ever been, a line in the 'Westminster Confession' about the fate of non-elect infants." Such advocates and apologists must surely have persuaded themselves that this ancient and mouldy code of faith is so securely held within the musty vaults of ecclesiastical seminaries, accessible only to the elect, that the common student could not avail himself of the pleasure of dissecting its carcass. It happens, however, because of the anserine loquacity of certain eager revisionists, and certain other equally eager anti-revisionists, that the whole air of late has been filled with gaseous explosions, emanating from the musty vaults, until the doors have been thrown wide open, and everybody has been invited to examine for himself. The result is that now the masses themselves are apprised of the fact; yea, even the sometime ignorant and deluded communicants of the Presbyterian faith, likewise, now know that what has been so long supposed to be a fabrication, spun out of the vapory brains of anti-Christians, and so-called infidels, is proved indeed to be a fact; stubborn, stunning, and unanswerable. The Creed is now popularly known to be as bad and bold as it has ever been declared to be by those who had learned long ago to despise it because of its spiritual inanity and dogmatic audacity.

The especial section of the Creed which proves to be very horrifying and repulsive to the modern conscience is that above quoted, referring to the damnation of non-elect infants. This is by no means the most repulsive or morally audacious teaching of the Creed, inasmuch as it is simply incidental, as I shall soon show, to its logical conclusions. But the modern conscience has evolved to a higher appreciation of truth and sympathy than that of three centuries ago, and hence cannot now believe that the human, say not the Christian, conscience was ever so low.

HENRY FRANK.

(*To be continued.*)

Department of Philosophy.

DEVOTED TO

Art, Literature and Metaphysics.

EDITED BY C. H. A. BJERREGAARD.

THE OCCULT, PSYCHOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED.

We are not able to define the essential nature of Spirit, but we can know and we do know one of its essential characteristics, and that is, its development or evolution. This evolution is so essential that some philosophers have characterized the Spirit as being essentially evolution, or the appearance, under the form of motion, of Being. Be this as it may, the evolution we observe is a movement from possibility to reality, or, as it also has been described, the return of the Idea from the manifoldness and distraction of the Natural to its own Inner Freedom. We also observe that this "return" from the Natural, or, this movement from the possible to the real is one of struggle; is essentially a process of liberation.

Spirit is neither nature nor in blind subjection to nature. Spirit is essentially itself, but when first appearing so that it can be observed it seems only a mere possibility and seems totally immerged in the manifold. Spirit is in this state merely the Common, something which promises well when certain "ifs" can be overcome.

To speak psychologically of Spirit means to see Spirit as soul or human spirit.

When Spirit, as soul or human spirit, is in its most common form, it is what we call the "natural soul." As such it can best be studied in children and nature-people. The "natural soul" manifests itself

in a double way. One of these contains the common, natural qualities, alike to all; also race characteristics, temperaments, etc. The other side of the soul's life is often called "the night side of the soul" and "the magic soul life." It is this which in our day has been the object of special attention, and it is of this that I would say a few words.

Every human being, at the moment of awakening, finds itself in an environment of facts and circumstances—in Karma. That awakening is called consciousness, and it is of a two-fold character. It has an external side, or is mere sensation such as hearing, seeing, &c. It has also an internal side—let us call it intuition, feeling or spiritual perception. These two are not distinct and apart from each other; each is the other's complement, so to say, and exists only because they express the soul's consciousness of its own existence and its relationship to something, not itself.

But the soul is not at once and at the moment of awakening in reflective and volitional possession of its own consciousness; on the contrary it is in bondage to its environment and feels this bondage as a contradiction in its existence. Therefore at the very moment of awakening it is in conflict with the environment, be it expressed by the baby's cry at the first breath or be it the young man's disobedience to his elders. The soul while in mere consciousness and without reflective and volitional possession of its own consciousness, lives in a world largely and exclusively *its own*. It is disposed to retire within and give exclusive reality and moral value to its own intuitions and spiritual perceptions. And this is the "magic soul life."

The most common and the most natural form of retirement within is sleep. In sleep the soul closes the door more or less firmly against the outer world and places its intuitional perceptions before itself. We call them dreams. But, inasmuch as the soul's consciousness is, as stated above, external as well as internal, dreams are an interfusion of sensations, thoughts, feelings and volitions, which overwhelm the soul and do not submit to rational ordering,

because Reason does not as yet exist. But, if the soul is powerful and rational and the intuitions stronger than the sensations, then of course the dream rises in character and comes to be of the greatest value for the soul's moral life. In antiquity, when man did not subject himself to the thousand and one useless and hurtful influences of to-day, the dream was of the highest value and served an important purpose in the soul's life. The dream may still be of fundamental importance to us of to-day; but we cannot be guided by such intuitions unless we live in silence and solitude. There is, however, one essential point to remember when we let ourselves be guided by dreams. In the dream-state all time-distinctions are lost. Dreams are therefore rather visions of conditions than prophetic statements of coming time and space events.

When "the magic soul-life" becomes so powerful that it controls the soul even in the waking state, then we have what is called ecstasy.

The first or simplest form of ecstasy is an immediate and indefinite realization of something coming or something hovering over us; a something of profound significance which throws us into a state of expectancy with its attendant exclusiveness of everything that seems antagonistic. In ordinary language we speak of this state as one of foreboding, presentiment, anticipation, etc. It is a characteristic of this form that usually it concerns us only personally, and very rarely relates to impersonal affairs.

When this form of ecstasy appears in clear and definite conceptions we call our presentiment a vision, and when the vision expresses something external, of which the senses cannot take cognizance on account of time and space conditions, we call the vision clairvoyance or second-sight. The general characteristic of presentiment, vision and clairvoyance, is the soul's immediate or direct relation to the object; it somehow "reaches beyond itself" and comes *en rapport* with it. It is this coming *en rapport* which is so characteristic of mesmerism. It is rather remarkable that the mind which in this condition seems to triumph in freedom also most easily

falls into bondage. It can easily be controlled by another mind. Another element of bondage is the fact that the mesmeric condition can be artificially produced.

At this point our metaphysics, however, would interfere and demand that a distinction be made between the hypnotic condition artificially produced and the one coming as a natural result of increase in ecstasy. And the objection seems well taken, for experience teaches us that there is a radical difference in the spiritual value of the manifestations under the two conditions. The highest, most universal, and sublime is reached only where the ecstasy is of natural development and self originated. As in the case of those dreams which are indefinite and not clear, when sense-perception is not thoroughly excluded, so in the ecstatic vision, it is often disturbed by foreign elements. In antiquity the sayings of the prophet were therefore often passed upon by another prophet or a council of prophets. These latter applied their own prophetic power to the elimination of all extraneous matter. At the present day people who have the gift of vision apply, in quieter moments, their reason and experience to an examination of their ecstatic state and soon find the truth. And that is a rational procedure.

If the hypnotic ecstasy becomes permanent we get a condition called insanity. Insanity is the disturbance of the normal relationship betweeen Inner and Outer, and such an one exists when the soul "sticks" in the ecstasy. Such a distorted condition was often, in antiquity, called divine; and with some right, because the soul was absent from that which disturbed it and external sensations were supposed to be disturbing elements.

The popular opposition to the occult life of the soul has its root in ignorance of the soul's constitution. It is not known that the soul is a duplicate of spirit and body and can choose to live in either of those extremes or to live a double life by at-one-ing the two. Ignorance, too, is the main obstacle to all those who are anxious to develop their occult powers. They either do not know, or will not omply with, the simple rule of lowering their sensibilities in order to

allow the "heavenward" side of their soul life to have its freedom. In view of the solidarity of the human race it would seem to be the duty of "those who know" to work systematically for the enlightenment of their fellowmen.

C. H. A. B.

ART AND CAMERA NOTES.

The modern photographic salon is making inroads upon that which used to be considered the exclusive domain of art, and the pictorial movement in photography is of profound significance.

This new movement has for its object the creation by means of photography of pictures which invite criticism by art canons. It will use the mere mechanical application of light and chemicals in such a conjunction with other devices that it produces works of art. The leaders of the movement do not trouble themselves with charges brought against them about "unphotographic photography" nor with being called "despoilers of art." They claim the right to manipulate their plates with pencil, stylus and brush as much as they like, provided they produce a work giving æsthetic pleasure. And why should not Joseph T. Keiley use glycerine to correct shortcomings of tone and Chas. I. Berg to eliminate entire backgrounds? Artistic photography cannot object; it is art in the sense in which many moderns use the word and it is the work of the æsthetic faculties.

I have visited the recent exhibitions of the New York Camera Club and have before me the elegant official organ of the club. At both places I found the air full of vigorous discussions on the pictorial qualities of photography, and saw presentations of work that no one would dream of who knows photography only from a few sittings for a portrait. These enthusiasts have got so far in the ranges of tone that you can almost guess the color of each separate part of "Miss Jones's" collar, tie, shirt-front and hat. Such are the accomplishments of Frank Eugene. In texture he has been equally successful. One feels that "Miss Jones's sleeve is made of some woolen fabric of a medium tint, the collar of some dark, smooth cloth, and the vest of

what is called in the dry-goods store piqué." Mr. Eugene has done all this by manipulations on the plate. It is an interesting and pleasant innovation and a tremendous step in the direction of overcoming the mechanical shortcomings of photography.

This new movement has brought up the old strife about what is nature and what is art. Every article in the "Camera Notes" bears witness to it and the opening essay deals directly with the subject. It brings out several points of comparison between the Englishman and the American which I feel I ought to reproduce and to which I ought to add a few words. The author, Charles H. Caffin, says:

"This difference in the painter's point of view produces the broadest differences in the character of the landscapes. Compare, for example, those by Englishmen, whether executed in color or monochrome, with the work of our own landscapists. The former are, almost without exception, frankly objective; the latter almost as exclusively subjective. And the Englishman's point of view is not only objective, but for the most part superficially so: overlooking the inwardness of the subject in his satisfaction over the more obvious facts. Hence the subject he selects to paint or photograph is nearly always more obviously beautiful than the American's, but lacks the artistic qualities which make the latter's a more beautiful picture. Nature absorbs the one, art the other. The Englishman is satisfied with nature in her broadest and simplest phenomena, for her own sake, while the American rather uses nature as a means to an artistic end, carrying his purpose so far, that he will often deliberately choose an ugly scene in order to prove the triumph of art over material nature.

"But, while admitting the intrinsic inferiority of the English picture or print as a work of art, let us not fail to note the big cause behind it, which goes far to compensate the Englishman. That cause is the national fondness for out-of-door life. In no other country are there such facilities for it. With a climate, never very hot or very cold, with twilights in summer time extending to nine or ten o'clock, with no mosquitoes to worry them, Englishmen and women live and

love the open-air life to an extent that is not dreamed of in this country. They know intimately every spot of beauty in their neighborhood, walk to them frequently just for the pleasure of seeing the view; their very intimacy with the material phenomena blinding them to the subtle aspects, but giving them, on the other hand, a companionship with their surroundings that forms one of the most beautiful traits of English life. The habitual fondness for nature in this way is so universal, that the artists also come under its influence. They paint the landscape as the Englishman loves it and sees it; and the Englishman buys it. The American's canvas is finer, very likely, as a work of art; but too often it stands in a stack of others, with its face to the studio-wall, covered with dust; neglected, for the average American's love of nature is practically non-existent."

What is meant by art, and the American picture being "more beautiful" than the Englishman's will be understood by reference to what I said above about the manipulation of the photographic plate. The American work is said to be "art," that of the Englishman is "nature." But the point I want to emphasize is the admission of the American lack of intimacy with nature. In that I see the reason for our many defects in art and literature. The feelings of the American are stunted because he does not live in communion with the outdoor forces. City life and petty jealousies confuse him. To many American artists the love of their art becomes an antithesis to love of nature because they give too much attention to the attainment of skill; and that very devotion becomes a snare.

But we have in this country some brilliant exceptions to these remarks. The last exhibition (in May) of the young "Society of Landscape Painters" contained these. Here was in several instances such work as that produced by Englishmen, and with a super-addition of inspiration and the spirit of long comradeship with nature, which gave the paintings the subtlety of mind, necessary to class them as high art. They represented "realism made to yield up its ideal essence." The art to live is the æsthetic Whole and the Beautiful is the cream of all.

C. H. A. B.

NATURE'S CALENDAR.*

Ernest Ingersoll has made the long-needed book. He has given us a year's record of nature's gradual movement from seed to fruit, from generation to maturity; and that is a meritorious undertaking. Our text books and even the numerous nature books of to-day all fail to describe the life in nature as it moves from season to season. They give general descriptions applicable to species and of local character, but they do not paint the ever varying forms, color and activity of plant and insect, bird or reptile. Ingersoll has put us on the track of these vibrations of nature. On any day or month of the year I can go into the fields or the woods or along the brooks and shall know exactly what I may find or see and make no mistake—if I have his book with me. And more than this, he gives me a sound philosophy of nature into the bargain. His book is full of synthetic reflections and picturesque views, drawn with both pen and pencil.

Ingersoll's work is opening new ways and will no doubt be followed by numerous editions and by imitations, because we are shown how to get at the secrets of nature—something the Spirit of the Time is prompting everywhere. We do not care so much about pistils, stamens, or claws or size of bill or wings. It is necessary perhaps to know how many they are and how they are shaped, but it is much more important and interesting to know why one plant seeks the shade and another the open; why this must have a rich soil and why that can grow upon an almost bare rock; why one claw is long and sharp and other short and apparently cut off; why birds' bills are so different, and why one plant flowers but once in a century while others exhaust all their vitality in a Summer. These questions and their answers are so important because they are parallel to phases of human-society life and imply problems of ethics of the gravest import. The dynamics of life underlying both spheres of existence are perhaps the same. If so Nature's Calendar and our new science of Sociology become most important and parallel studies.

It is safe to say that every outdoor naturalist, be he professional or not, must necessarily hereafter have this book at hand. Nature's miracles or the songs of life and love, heard everywhere, must be

* Nature's Calendar, by Ernest Ingersoll. New York and London. Harper & Brothers, MCM.

recorded calendar-fashion and in field-books, hour by hour and day by day, because

> Whether we look, or whether we listen,
> We hear life murmur, or see it glisten;

and that "stir of might" is the Spirit of Nature, which we worship and which is "the light of men." It is not fixed in immovable fashions and forms, it is the soul of souls,

> He whose sole presence fills a place,
> Whose absence makes a void in halls.

C. H. A. B.

THE NEW HUMANISM.*

Humanism is no new term, but may be said to stand for new ideas. Humanism of the Renaissance period reached no deeper than to create a culture mainly in imitation of classical models. It never even suspected individual man's personal and social position in the community or state. It was satisfied with him as a mere member of a commonwealth and sought to give him a classical training and the elements of polite knowledge. The New Humanism means a new consciousness with the individual as the centre, and the individual studying his personal and social development. Professor Griggs understands it so.

The ten chapters in this book deal with:

(I) The scientific study of the higher human life.
(II) The evolution of personality.
(III) The dynamic character of personal ideals.
(IV) The content of the ideal of life.
(V) Positive and negative ideals.
(VI) Greek and Christian ideals in modern civilization.
(VII) The modern change in ideals of womanhood.
(VIII) The ethics of social reconstruction.
(IX) The new social ideal.
(X) The religion of humanity.

It is hard to say which is the most important or interesting; each presents the general subject of the book under a new aspect and adds

*The New Humanism, Studies in Personal and Social Development. By Edward Howard Griggs. Second edition. The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 111 South 15th street, Philadelphia, Pa., 1900.

something to our comprehension not only of the *Zeitgeist*, but of the true Objective which lies beneath phenomena. All the essays bear the stamp of the New Humanism preached in the book, in this, that they are all singularly broad and democratic, at the same time that they maintain very forcibly all the rights of that authority which belongs to the idealist as a born aristocrat and a man of exclusive tendencies. Prof. Griggs sees both sides and brings them out everywhere. The most interesting quotations I could give are perhaps those from "the religion of humanity":

"The new gospel must be one of positive culture and progress. The need is not merely to have faith in a possible future world, but to have our eyes unsealed to the infinite meaning of the world we live in; to replace the doctrine of asceticism and unreasoning self-sacrifice by a gospel of nobler self-realization in harmony with all others, of greater industrial justice and higher social unity. The new human brotherhood must be not only in the spiritual life, but in all the action and interests of the daily world. In those splendid ideals, old as the inspirations of the heart, and new as the dew upon to-day's grass, lies the answer for to-day and the hope for to-morrow."

"The time is ripe for a new prophet, who shall call the world back to the simple realities of human life. The awaited teacher should found no order and establish no sect. It is not the multiplication of institutions that is needed, but the consecration of individuals. He must have the reserve of wisdom; he must forego authority and disclaim unusual election. He must find the ideal by transfiguring the commonplace; he must see and teach the divinity of common things. He should live in the world, and yet maintain a perfect consecration to an ideal of simplicity, spirituality, and personal helpfulness. He should call men away from the senseless rush for luxury, fashion, dissipation; and turn them to the things of the spirit—personal love, thought, beauty, immediate helpfulness. It is not a new gospel that is needed, but *the gospel anew*."

Many new ideas and forceful presentations of old thoughts are given in "the evolution of personality" and "the dynamic character of personal ideals." These chapters especially are thoroughly Anglo-Saxon and American. The essay which deals with "Greek and Christian ideals" is full of food for our readers. We fear that many do not know how much they owe the two great factors of the past, called Classicism and Christianity, and that they therefore are neither

able to continue in the subsequent historical development nor to set themselves free from inherited ideas. Such should begin a study of themselves by a careful reading of this chapter in the "New Humanism." If they cannot master it, let them club together and engage Prof. Griggs for further elucidations.

"The New Humanism" by no means exhausts the subject it deals with. Its underlying philosophy has not been set forth, nor the means of propagating it. Nor has anything been said about the mystic and occult factors of life. They certainly play a rôle in the "New Humanism." We trust that more books will be forthcoming on this all important subject and that Prof. Griggs ere long will contribute to it something new and more exhaustive.

C. H. A. B.

NATURISM AND DE BOUHÉLIER.

Naturism is the opposite to naturalism in art and literature. There is really nothing in the term itself that warrants so high an office as that given to it, and it is of rather recent origin, having been invented by M. de Patte, the Belgian critic. But since it has come into use and answers its purpose, I will endeavor to show just what it means and for what we can use it.

A literary naturist, like Saint-Georges de Bouhélier, meets the realist upon his own ground, but he revolts against the scientific method in art. He wants to do more than to observe and catalogue individuals and things. He is an idealist and a creator at the same time that he is a realist. The only reality to him is Thought or the One Intelligence, the One Will which permeates this beautiful world, but which can no more be seen by observation than the intelligence that constructed my watch and keeps it going. A naturist sees by reflection and describes the visions seen by the "mind's eye." He is neither sensuistic nor an analytic. He is psychic and constructive.

A naturist is a sort of neo-pagan. His philosophy is naïvely objective, so much so that it rises to a pure Objectivism, which is ideal enough to cover all the multiple principles of science and speculation of to-day. De Bouhélier's work has proved to be of

such character. The literary movement that hails him as its High Priest and calls him The Sage has absorbed Zolaism and all that æsthetic realism which for some time has been coquetting with science. And it has created a new movement in letters. It lends being and reality to all things and ignores all sophistry, all subjectivism, that takes an incorrect measure of man and makes him "the measure of all things." It sees the deceit and untruth of such philosophy.

A naturist prefers emotion to observation and analysis. He takes his promptings from "the temple of nature," be this temple, as in the case of De Bouhélier, the foundries, the market places, or shops and factories, or the peasant. He does not give us a description by weight or measure, he does not reproduce local colors or photograph physiognomies. He studies the laborer and the peasant at his work. In his work the toiler becomes a part of the great world machinery; he is seen as a wheel or as part of a spring or possibly only as a link in a chain. It is in his work that his importance to the World-soul appears. The naturist in proceeding thus is doing as does the true botanist, who attaches little importance to the flower of the herbarium. He studies the living flower in its environment in order to discover its place and value in the organic vibrations of existence. The naturist has an eye for relationship and may profess, with Millet, that "the beautiful is the suitable." The law of the whole, the *ensemble*, is of more importance to him than to the naturalist.

To "see life steadily and see it whole," to value universals and not individuals, and "to espy even in a bush a flaming Deity" is something original, and makes kinship between the early Aryan, the naturist and a modern Wordsworth. They all have "that inward eye which is the bliss of solitude" and they keep company with the principles of things. They all trust their feelings and keep them in tune with the synthetic force of existence. Naturists do not make much of the Cartesian Ego and they deny Zola's dictum that "art is nature seen through a temperament"; they declare "it is not the poet who creates the rhythm, but it is the essential rhythm of things

that scans and directs the poet." Yet, naturists are strong personalities and true artists. The secret of their art and realism is their personality. Personality is the chief equipment of the artist. But personality to an artist means something different from what it means to an ascetic or a naturalist. An artistic personality is an expression of the Pan-idea or the omnipresent reason. An artist, especially a naturist, is a specimen of *homo universalis*.

Naturism sees us all as heroes and ministers of Nature. De Bouhélier has said "it is not the white vesture and the shaven beard that make the servant of Isis." The saying is neither new nor startling to many moderns, but it has come from him with oracular force; hence it has been heard and accepted. We all, no matter where or how we serve, are ministers to Nature, the great mother, who entrances us with her beauty and slays us in callous cruelty; who, at one time overloads us with prodigality and at another denies us a morsel of bread; who does not know or recognize our standards of morality but nevertheless punishes mercilessly any infringement of her rights and laws. Nature, who is both deaf and dumb, sends us to preach her will and uses us much as she uses Darwin's earth-worms to triturate or pulverize the earth's crust, that it shall not harden and become unfit for seed. Each one of us is a kind of sieve by means of which the Great Mother assorts her world of appearance. In Thought, universal and individual, the dead masses of amorphic stuff are vivified and built into a mental world of everlastingness.

There is an immense buoyancy in this teaching of Naturism. It is a gospel of redemption. It redeems from despair, resurrects the soul and passes it into the heaven of self-respect. It explains the "moral uses of dark things"; it explains "the make-believe" of "the emperor's new clothes," and restores the most ancient doctrine of the brotherhood of all things.

De Bouhélier has a clear conception of all this. It lies in what he terms "the idea of heroism." Carlyle has defined the hero and De Bouhélier seems to have studied him. A hero is he who accomplishes his destiny: he who is a true sounding-board to enhance and

propagate the vibratory force of life. A laborer who does his work in unison with the laws of that work is a hero. A man who conquers his passion and leads it into a steady current to do the work of Reason, is a hero. Carlyle has so understood him and De Bouhélier teaches it. It must be so according to Naturism, for what else is heroism than obedience to Nature?—and Naturism is only an exposition of Nature's real life and mystery.

Much of the modern art, philosophy and literature need remodelling after the pattern of Naturism. Our mentality is too often blinded by its own light and far astray from nature. It is "out of keeping" and lacks the *ensemble*. We want a dynamic idealism and shall never be strong till we be intense. To be intense means to be natural. In art this means co-ordination and relationship. It means a religion of beauty or such an impassioned expression that the very elements become our servants. Man himself is the dynamism of existence. We must have faith in ourselves. Upon our faith depends our work. Man himself is part of the general world-soul, part of a living universe, a universe which is Thought. Man has Thought, hence he is Nature's Miracle. Nature is at first master, but ends by being servant. Aphrodite bore Cupid but obeyed the laws of Eros.

C. H. A. B.

The real harm done by the denial of a divine presence and providence in nature and life is that in the long run it will destroy our interest in the world, in men and in events. Such atheistic, pessimistic, cynical views take the life out of us. I see young men who are tainted by such notions, and what strikes me in them is that they seem to take very little interest in anything. Their inward man perishes, though the outer man may be renewed by God day by day. It is sad to see an old man whose heart is dry and whose soul is withered; but it is still worse to see this in the young, to whom God has given an inheritance of faith and hope, and to whom all things might appear new or fair.—*James Freeman Clarke.*

He whose face gives no light shall never become a star.—*William Blake, Inner Life.*

The Home Circle.

OPEN COLUMN.

EDITED BY ELIZABETH FRANCIS STEPHENSON AND EVA BEST.

NOTE TO OUR READERS.

In this Department we will give space to carefully written communications of merit, on any of the practical questions of everyday life, considered from the bearings of metaphysical and philosophical thought, which, we believe, may be demonstrated as both a lever and a balance for all the difficult problems of life.

Happenings, experiences and developments in the family and the community; results of thought, study and experiment; unusual occurrences when well authenticated; questions on vague points or on the matter of practical application of principles and ideas to daily experience, etc., will be inserted, at the discretion of the Editors, and in proportion to available space. Questions asked in one number may be answered by readers in future numbers, or may be the subject of editorial explanation, at our discretion. It is hoped that the earnest hearts and careful, thinking minds of the world will combine to make this Department both interesting and instructive, to the high degree to which the subject is capable of development.

THE CULTURE OF THE SELF BY THE SELF.

"Perfect ignorance is quiet, perfect knowledge is quiet: not so the transition from the former to the latter."—*Carlyle.*

The evolution of the human race from the physical-intellectual to the intellectual-spiritual planes of existence, must necessarily be accompanied by great upheavals in the hereditary details and accessories of existence; such as foods, medicines, literature and the general trend of thought. Each of these details has a most important bearing upon the difficult process of unfoldment, and the readjustment of the thinking principle: so much so, that, by a careful observance and avoidance of certain objective and subjective aids and hindrances, the new birth may be safely and vigorously accom-

plished, whereas, undirected and unguided, it would be assailed by dangers and undue mental and physical pangs.

There is no doubt that the great increase in nervous diseases—insanity, anæmia and kindred disorders—is induced by mental unrest, questionings, fears, etc., which seize the soul as it leaves the tranquillity of the animal consciousness to enter the undiscovered realm of responsible action. Especially in America and in France are the conditions peculiarly alarming, as these intelligent and excitable people are in that critical period of the transition where both the objective and subjective ego reaches the acme of unsettled relation to the Universe; a condition productive of acute disease and discontent.

Greater moral force is therefore required than ever before: greater understanding and stronger will-power. Civilized life has become more complicated, and its dangers are to be avoided only by a rigidly conscientious moralization. At this period, the dormant criminal that is said to inhabit each brain, is liable to awaken for the perpetration of some blind act of rebellious frenzy. The greater the intellectual development of nation or individual, the greater the danger of unbalancement and vertigo during unfoldment into higher conditions, unless the brain-mind can act independently of the animal impulse.

Now, in order to educate the consciousness to meet its future responsibilities, a slight degree of asceticism is recommended, as such discipline unquestionably leads to self-control and poise. To this end, avoid exciting or maudlin literature, which pampers the fancy and the sensuous nature without cultivating integrity and sincerity. Avoid a dependence upon drugs, as such dependence weakens the *will* more than it alleviates the *malaise*. Avoid gross foods and liquors which surcharge the stomach and vitiate the brain action. Especially should flesh-food be eliminated; not only because it dulls the wit and tethers each body-cell upon the lower planes of consciousness, but because it directly antagonizes the great "LOVE" principle of the Cosmos by its daily slaughter of the innocents, and

its maintenance of a vast army of slaughterers. Avoid superficial breathing. The Breath is the cord which unites the dependent organism to the great Cosmical spirit of life. Deep, full, rhythmic, *conscious* respiration equalizes the flow of magnetic energy to the blood and to the nervous centres. It harmonizes the inner and the outer forces.

Expressed affirmatively: self-culture, spiritual, mental and physical, may be urged forward

1st. *Objectively*: by means of

(a) The Breath: *i. e.*, by a thorough and persistent oxygenation, accompanied by direction of thought and will.

(b) By Food. *i. e.*, by cultivating the incoming body-cells (and reflexively the mind) with those refined aliments which have been magnetized and chemicalized by the sunshine: such as nuts, fruits, cereals and certain vegetables which grow above ground.

(c) By high-minded companions and literature; and by an æsthetic simplicity of life.

2d. *Subjectively.*

(a) By strong *desire* for a higher plane of consciousness.

(b) By *concentration* upon the state desired.

(c) By Auto-Suggestion: *i. e.*, directing the subconscious mind to be, to do, and to compass whatever will aid its serene progress and unfoldment toward Godlike wisdom and health.

This outer and inner discipline will lead to positive results in a time varying with the intelligence (cerebral strength) and the amount of resistance (habit) to be overcome.

ROSA G. ABBOTT.

BEAUTY.

The beauty of a woman lies in her delicacy—the beauty of a man in his valor; the grace of a woman lies in her sympathy—the grace of a man in his strength; the sweetness of a woman lies in her purity—the sweetness of a man in his tenderness; but the goodness of both lies alike in the soul, and the spiritual requirements of each are ever and always the same. E. B.

SONG OF REJOICING.

O thou great Harmony, soundless, eternal,
Filling all space with thy rhythmical sign,
Heart of the One Heart, exalted, supernal,
Word of all words, with its meaning divine!
So strong and beautiful, so sweet and tender,
Lifting the hearer to ecstasy's height,
Sweeps the pure melody straight from the Sender,
Like a clear flood from the Fountain of Light!

Soul of mine, drink of it, joy in its gladness,
Breathe with the Harmony, perfect and strong;
Let its white flood cleanse thy Being of sadness,
Lift thee, and bless thee, and bear thee along!
Think, in thy joy, of thy brother in sorrow,
Whisper to him the glad promise of old;
Fill him with hope of a brighter to-morrow,
Teach him to sow and to harvest his gold!

O Love, unfaltering, mighty, unending,
Infinite, tender, unfailing, divine,
Earth's heart and heaven's heart in Thee are blending
Fused by the flame on Truth's mystical shrine!
O my Soul, join in the anthem Love 's singing,
Soar like a bird to the unclouded skies;
Fear not, but upward thy glad flight be winging—
Higher and higher and higher arise!

Set sail, O Soul of mine, sweet winds are blowing
Fresh from the regions of Infinite Force;
Tides from the Sea of Compassion are flowing,
From the One Pure and Ineffable Source!

Through the wide ocean of evil and error—
Waters of ignorance, whelming thy youth—
Banishing fear and misgiving and terror,
Sweep the clear, rescuing Waters of Truth!

Infinite Glory, whose rays, permeating,
Gleam on through unending vistas of time—
Manifold Power, forever creating
Lives that shall climb to the regions sublime;
Thou with the flame of thy fire hath warmed me;
Into my spirit thy Spirit doth shine;
I am a part of Thee—Thou hast informed me,
Thine is my Being, thy Being is mine!

EVA BEST.

A PLEA FOR THE WORD GOD.

In these days when all is changing; when so much that has seemed to many to be stationary and final, is vanishing away; when customs and conditions are plainly in a state of transition to something new and different, there is a great deal to which we are glad to bid a last farewell, as it slips away, unregretted, into the past. Most conditions of to-day have served their end; most customs have lost the spirit of life which brought them into existence; most thought has become worn threadbare with parrot-like repetition; most ideals have outlived their usefulness in the service of developing mankind; most speech is but empty words. The inward meanings of things are encrusted by greed for the outward appearance. True symbolism, one of the greatest helps to growth of understanding, has sunk into superstition. The world is like an old curiosity shop, crowded with useless articles; for life, as expressed to-day in most of its varied forms upon the earth, is superannuated, exhausted of vitality, lacking in strength, devoid of real power.

Yet as the housecleaners of our earth work valiantly at their noble task of sweeping away the now useless débris of the usefulness of past generations, of clearing the space allotted for man's present home in

the Universe that it may be newly furnished and in better style, some of them are endeavoring to brush away one little word we would fain have left behind. It is perhaps the most ancient thing of all. Perhaps, also, it has not always served its highest and best purpose and meaning, but this has been, distinctly, the fault of man. It is not a limited thing, as a condition, a creed or a system; it is not an ideal which must be revivified, reborn, rehabilitated. It is not a thought which must grow. It is a word which has held from time immemorial, the highest meaning of which man's mind has been capable at any given moment. It is the little word, "God."

Around this word has accumulated the veneration of ages. The highest feeling of the finest individuals of many generations has centred upon it. The noblest ideals of ancient, mediæval and modern times have clustered about it. It has always stood for the best and greatest that faulty mankind could think; and to-day, as ever, the highest conceptions which man can grasp, lie grouped at this great base.

This word is removed from the considerations which must be given wornout customs and thought, inasmuch as it contains within itself a wealth of power; for about it, through the ages, has been built a meaning no other word or phrase could ever gain. Into its very sound has been wrought the magic influence of high thought and lofty ideal, until the word has become imbued with a genuine strength about which man's thought may safely cling and wind its growing tendrils, surely and steadily, to greater heights where awaits a clearer atmosphere in which meanings may easily unfold to more perfect blossoming.

God is the Most High of all quality, thought and feeling, and the little word expresses this, through the law of association, as no other ever will. There is no reason why we should leave behind us in our onward march this legacy from ancient days. There is nothing to be gained by doing so and much to be lost.

Jesus was the truest scientist that has ever lived. Think you not He knew of the "Law of Attraction"? Yet He said, "*God* is love." Think you not He could have said "First Cause," and "The Power," and "The Absolute"? Yet He only and always repeated "God" and "The Father."

So we beseech that this word from the marvelous past shall be left to us, and in the more marvelous future, which is coming, we will build about it still higher ideals, still greater conceptions, still truer

thought. Leave us the word God, and, little by little, we will raise our thought to more and more nearly fit the endless meaning this word has always held; and, from time to time, as our comprehension grows, we will enlarge and still further enlarge our conception of God, until God and humanity become a unit—until we all and "the Father are one."

BARNETTA BROWN.

AN OLD STORY.

"New Lamps for Old! New Lamps for Old!"
The Black Magician loudly cries,
The while he lifts one bright as gold
Before our foolish, tempted eyes.
And we, The Ignorant, fetch down
Our Master's precious Fire of Fires,
And trade it to the hawking clown
For something glass and brass and wires,
Whose Outer Splendor doth outshine
Its Inner Flame—alas, alas,
For dimly burns the feeble light
Within the jeweled dome of glass!

In vain we strive to move the wick
That seems so mean and poor and small;
We find the strands too coarse and thick
To let the fabric move at all.
And then we find the metal bowl
That seemed so ample to the eye,
And whose proportions cheered the soul,
A scanty basin, almost dry;
No place in its deceiving cup
For half enough of Wisdom's Oil,
To send sufficient moisture up
To light an hour of dreary toil!

The place which once was fair as day
(When burned the Old Lamp softly bright)
Is dark; we cannot find our way
In all this dreary, dismal night!

O, Master! watching this, thy world,
Thy fine compassion toucheth all
Who in their hour of ignorance
Spread o'er themselves this wretched pall!
In our unwisdom we have cried
To thee for help; made sorry moan;
And in the New Lamp's light denied
That we must help ourselves alone.
That which we lost we must reclaim,
Our foolish bargain be unmade
Before the Old Lamp's sacred flame
Shall pierce again Life's dreary shade!

EVA BEST.

THE WRONG DOOR.

Here is a story the genial Phillips Brooks loved to tell: "A little fellow, whose parents attended Trinity Church, was often to be seen in the congregation. In spite of churchgoing, however, he was given to mischief, and one night joined a band of boys who rang door-bells, and then took flight. The little fellow's success at escaping detection emboldened him, and at one doorway he lingered so long in sheer bravado that the door was flung open and the towering figure of the rector of Trinity loomed before him. The little fellow seemed rooted to the spot, opening wide his big, wondering eyes. And then he found voice to say, very slowly, 'W'y, Phillips B'ooks! Does *you* live here?'"

Life is a pure flame, and we live by an invisible sun within us.—*Sir Thomas Brown, Urn Burial.*

There can be no substance but God. Whatever is, is in God, and nothing can be conceived without God.—*Spinoza.*

THE WISE MAN AND THE SEA URCHINS.

V.

Next day a heavy fog veiled the land and sea. The waves rolled in in great angry billows, and the winds wailed above them.

But the Urchins, who were not to be kept away from their promised treat, came to the cave by the land path which screened them from the elements. Scrambling down the rocks which formed the roof of the cave, they found the cheeriest place in the world awaiting them.

On a big, round table stood a large lamp, its protecting globe sending a golden-rose glow to every nook and cranny. The heavy curtains were drawn close, so that not a hint of fog or dreariness could enter.

"My, this is jolly!" cried Brownie, by way of greeting. "If the folks at the hotel would only come here, they'd never have the blues. I'm glad it *is* so ugly out of doors, for it makes this seem so cozy!"

"What makes it seem so cozy, Brownie, *really?*" asked the Wise Man.

"You, sir, first of all, I think; then the bright light; then—well, then the *shut-in-ness.*"

"And what do I stand for, and the bright light, and the 'shut-in-ness'?"

Silence.

"What? Can no one tell me? I want you always to try to think out the real reasons of things—to find for yourselves the inner meaning of what outer things stand for. Every material thing—every object has a soul-nature. Back of what you see, dear children, is always something finer which you cannot see, but may *feel*, just as Brownie feels the coziness of the place. He feels glad to be here, just as he would be sorry to be obliged to stay outside all day in the disagreeable weather."

"Then it is because it is *agreeable* here?"

"Yes, Snowdrop; but I want you to tell me why it is agreeable. Try."

Still silence.

"If John O'Connell were your entertainer, would the place be agreeable?"

"No, *sir!*" This in chorus.

"Then what do I stand for?"

"Love," ventures Violet timidly.

"That was a splendid guess, my lassie. For without love even this shining light and the 'shut-in-ness' would fail to bring the *feeling* of pleasantness. The 'shut-in-ness' is simply a realization of the difference between our shattered state and the physical discomfort we should be obliged to endure if we remained outside. Now, what does the big lamp stand for?"

"Light—for *not darkness*, sir, which nobody likes."

The Wise Man laughed aloud. "Very true, Brownie," said he. "Yet darkness has its wonderful and necessary part to play, as we shall discover in time. This golden flame is fire—the Spirit of Life, and is always, for many reasons, a sort of magnet attracting us, who possess the vital spark, just as it attracts the poor little moths, who, being ignorant, die in its glory."

"Tell us about fire, *please?*"

"I must, Ruddy, if I tell you about life at all. Now we can understand the agreeableness of the place, for it possesses these simple things that go to make up the highest happiness mortals may know—Love, Light, and Home. The love I give to you, dear children, and which you so freely return, is the pure essence of unselfishness; the light which beams from your young faces in sunny smiles brightens this old cave *more really* than does the radiant flame; and the physical satisfaction your clean, dry little forms feel in being housed from the elements adds its sense of comfort to the other pair of joys. Which of these three 'agreeables' could you best do without? Let us suppose I put out the light."

"We'd still be sheltered here, and have *you*, sir!"

"Then suppose I should take you out of doors?"

"Oh, we'd go, because if you went with us we shouldn't mind, nor think about the weather!"

"Aha! So Love *is* the loveliest thing! I'm glad you realize that so clearly, my little ones, for *Love is the very foundation of everything that is.* It is the beginning, the continuing, and the end, or change of all that exists."

"Was Love alive before the world had land and water?"

"Love always was; and, because of it, land and water were able to form themselves into the world."

"Oh, tell us about it!"

"Very well," smilingly answers the Wise Man. "But before I begin to speak of the formation of the world, I wish to make plain to you the elements which are needed in the making. Name the elements, Ruddy."

"Earth, air, fire, and water."

"In other words, solid substance, atmosphere, heat, and moisture. Now these have, in science, some high-sounding names; but I think you can learn them. Do you remember the two words we learned the other day—the name of that world-stuff which always is?"

"Primordial Essence," cry the Urchins.

"And where do we find it?"

"All through space."

"Then space isn't empty, although, as Blackie has told us, it is that which affords room for anything. Now the elements needed to build the world and its people, are scattered about in space. First, let us find the most important one, to us, of them all—the element which figures most largely in our world. What do you think it is, Goldie?"

"Atmosphere, maybe. We couldn't live long without breathing, could we?"

"Surely not; living things need air almost more than any other known element, though to be sure without the other elements mere

air would avail nothing. For all our need of it, it yet is something we cannot see. Nor has it color, taste, or odor. The student of science knows it as Oxygen, a word made up of two Greek words, meaning 'acid' and 'to produce.' Air, or Oxygen, occurs (but not in what we call a pure or free state) in the atmosphere of the earth, and is used every second of time by every living thing. Besides furnishing us the breath of life it has other duties to do. Oxygen combines with, or adds itself to, other elements to form the two things we are going to learn about—land and water. Eight-ninths of all the water in the world is Oxygen by actual weight——"

"Can *air* be *weighed?*" queries Blackie.

"Everything can be weighed, my boy," said the Wise Man. "Even finer things than the invisible air."

"What could that be?"

"Let me tell you. I have said that everything in existence has a soul-nature—an invisible something which stands for it, and which is the *reality* of whatever it represents. For the object, itself, will, in time, perish and crumble into nothingness, as it is called; but the soul of it will live eternally. If you can understand this, you can understand that everything has weight, even the value of a spoken word."

"That's why true words seem so real and—and so *solid?*"

"Yes, Brownie, boy; and they *are* real, for they will endure forever. Therefore we should weigh our words in that delicate scale that Conscience provides for us all. If they weigh lightly in the balance they are waste words that cannot endure. But let us go back to our Oxygen. As I have said, it forms eight-ninths of all the water in the world, and one-half, by weight, of the entire crust of the globe."

"Air *in* the *earth?*"

"Every particle of earth is surrounded by its own little atmosphere, the word itself meaning 'soul,' 'breath,' or 'fluid air surrounding any sphere.' Even the tiny grains of granite, which seem, because of the rock's density, to cling in a closer and more

compact mass—for all solids we know to be made up of small atoms clinging together—even these grains of granite have their surrounding atmospheres, and, consequently, do not touch one another. More than this: they are in motion, every little tiny atom of them. There is absolutely no quiet atom in all the world."

"It doesn't seem possible, sir? Rocks seem so still."

"Comparatively speaking, they are. If, from a great height, we look down from a balloon at a mass of soldiers drilling, although each human atom of the mass of man is in motion, from our distant post of observation they seem perfectly motionless. Who has stood and watched a revolving fly-wheel?"

"I have!" "And I!"

"And it seemed motionless, so swift was its turning. The quiet stars, as we look at them, are moving one hundred and seventy-five times as rapidly as the swiftest rifle-ball shot from a gun."

Many and varied exclamations of surprise follow the Wise Man's statement.

"Then if these little moving atoms don't touch each other, and can move freely about, what holds them together to form the rock?"

"They are held together by the same power that holds this little trembling world of ours in ITS atmosphere secure in its place among the countless stars—the power of Love! Each attracts all the other atoms to itself, and as man learns his first lesson of life in just such forms as these grains of granite, his lessons in love begin early indeed! All Nature shows this beautiful spirit of helpfulness, and that Man has strayed away from his first teaching, and let selfishness rob him of his noble uses in the world—that is a thing that strikes discord everywhere!"

"But it seems like a *miracle*, sir, that Love can hold the granite rocks together."

"It will cease to be miraculous, though none the less wonderful, when you understand the law, Violet. To the ignorant savage the blowing of a soap-bubble seems the performance of a miracle. His wondering eyes see in the beautiful crystal globe the rainbow tints of

earth and heaven, the mirrored reflection of the landscape, and his own astonished countenance. Presto! it is gone, and he is doubly mystified, peering keenly into the empty pipe from which so wonderfully radiant a thing had come into beauty before his eyes."

"Then can all things that seem miraculous be explained to us as clearly as we could explain the bubble's existence to the savage?"

"Yes, Violet; in due time all will become clear to us. But come, we are forgetting our Oxygen. We have learned that it is one of the ingredients of the atmosphere everywhere."

"One of them, sir? Is there more than one in the air we breathe?"

"There are others, one of which is a gas called Nitrogen, and which is also colorless, tasteless and odorless. It makes four-fifths of our atmosphere. It also combines itself with other elements to produce what we know as the salts of the earth. The third element is Hydrogen. Like the other two elements, it also has no odor, taste nor color, and is over eleven thousand times lighter than water, which it forms by adding itself to Oxygen. Because of its lightness this gas is used in the filling of balloons."

"And now the last element?"

"With this, my Urchins, I think you are more familiar than with the others, for it is Carbon, and unlike the others, is not invisible. It comes from the Sanskrit word meaning 'to cook.' In its hardest state it is a diamond; in its softest, graphite, or black lead."

"I've seen it in both states, then," said Snowdrop. "And a diamond is Carbon!"

"Yes, Snowdrop, and it is the third element comprised in the atmosphere. So we have Oxygen, Nitrogen, Hydrogen and Carbon. Now let us talk about them."

An animated discussion followed, the children answering the Wise Man's questions eagerly and intelligently, demanding answers themselves, their every query delighting him with its proof of their comprehension of the subject in which he desired them to be interested.

"Before we go further, let us learn the true nature of an atom, or, as it is sometimes wrongly called, *molecule* (since this word means 'little mass' and one in reality composed of atoms); for out of these minute particles of stuff all existing things are created. An atom has been loosely termed 'the smallest indivisible particle,' but so long as it is an atom with shape, size and substance—that is, with *any dimension whatever*—it may, of course, still admit of division.

"Let us place this bit of substance (which from its size we may well call an atom) which I have caught upon this finest needle point —a something I know must be there, although my eyes cannot discern it under this ordinary microscope. Look at it, Snowdrop, and tell us what it looks like."

"O sir, it isn't little *at all!* It looks like a chunk out of a chain of mountains!" cries the girl, making room for the others at the table.

By turns each child peers into the little tube, and many are the exclamations of wonder and delight.

"Gold leaf affords an excellent example of the fineness to which something dense and heavy in itself may be worked. Gold can be beaten between leather by a gold-beater's hammer to a leaf one three hundred and forty thousandth of an inch thick."

"Of an inch *thin*, I should say!" cried Blackie.

"That *is* more expressive of its state," and the teacher laughed merrily. "But it can be worked far finer than that. Gold can be made to coat a wire, the coating being one thousand times thinner than the filmy gold leaf, and measuring, actually, one three hundred and forty millionth of an inch *thin*, as Blackie suggests. Yet under the lens of the microscope the atoms of gold are seen to be still piled one on top of another, and present a somewhat bulky appearance! This ordinary little microscope will initiate you into some simple mysteries, while that one which is now on its way from 'foreign parts,' will, I am sure, take you into fairy land."

"It seems almost impossible to believe that worlds as great as

ours could be made from such tiny particles." This from the gentle Violet, who gazed entranced into the microscope.

"'As great as ours,' my child? Compared to many other planets our earth is a pigmy. It would take thirteen hundred of our earths, for instance, to make a planet the size of Jupiter."

"And are all planets—all stars—formed of the same sorts of atoms?"

"Yes, Violet. This fact is supposed to have been satisfactorily proved by the analysis of meteoric stones. Meteors which have fallen in different localities have all shown themselves to be composed of the same world-stuff used to make our earth. In one meteoric stone, especially, which once fell in the south of France, upon being examined disclosed water and turf; this proving it came from some place where vegetable life existed."

"But are the four elements that you have taught us all there are?"

"No, Violet. There are supposed to be fifty-five in all. Of these forty are metals; twelve non-metallic bodies or *not metals;* the remainder are three solid substances which form a connecting link between the metals and non-metals. I wish you to know the four—Oxygen, Nitrogen, Hydrogen and Carbon—since these are the foundation of protoplasm, which compound substance alone produces life.

"And now let us partake of some of the elements needed by the animal Man, and which are furnished and made fit for our use by the chemical action of growing vegetation. Here on these bowl-shaped cabbage leaves I place these luscious berries, and over them I beg of you to sprinkle sugar from this sifter." EVA BEST.

(*To be continued.*)

O noble soul, put on these wings to thy feet and rise above all creatures, and above thine own reason, and above the angelic choirs, and above the light that has given thee strength, and throw thyself upon the heart of God; then shalt thou lie hidden from all creatures.

—*Eckhart.*

The World of Thought.

WITH EDITORIAL COMMENT.

TOLSTOI ANOTHER MIVART.

Count Tolstoi has likewise come under the ecclesiastic ban. The Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, Antonius, issued a private circular edict commanding all the clergy to refuse Tolstoi recognition as an orthodox member of the Russian Greek Church. No priest may absolve him or give him communion, and he is to be deprived of burial in consecrated ground, unless "before departing this life he shall repent, acknowledge the orthodox doctrine, believe and return to the Church." The three metropolitans, those of St. Petersburg, and Moscow and Kieff, desired to make a public proclamation of the matter, but the Synod feared the wrath of the Russian people, with whom the Count stands in high favor. His recent work, "The Resurrection," seems to have been the last straw which broke the ecclesiastical back. In it Tolstoi had declared that Christ actually forbade the very things that are continually done in churches, such as "the meaningless much speaking," and the "blasphemous incantation over bread and wine"; also in the clearest words that men should call other men their master, and pray in temples. One should worship, Christ had taught, not in a temple, but in spirit and in truth.

The career of Tolstoi has been that of an enquirer, inquisitive to know what is true, and changing his views as it appeared in new light. At eighteen he became an unbeliever in all religion, and he so continued for thirty years. He then experienced a revulsion of sentiment and concluded that as life itself is a matter beyond reason, he ought not to reject a faith that was beyond reason. He returned to the Greek Church, accepting its ordinances, but not its dogmas. He

accepted Christ, not as "very God" but as the author of the wisest system of philosophy ever put forward by man. He rejected the vicarious atonement of course, and the whole doctrinal framework of the scheme of redemption. Of immortality he said little. He neither approved the despotism of the Russian government nor that of the Russian religion. He declared that the sum of all the evil possible to the people, if left to themselves, could not equal the sum of the evil actually accomplished by the tyranny of Church and State.

Cardinal Vaughan, who excommunicated the late Dr. Mivart, in February, is now himself in low health and the physician enjoins strict quiet.

MOSQUITOES AND MALARIA.

A fad in medical fashions, at once recent and absurd, is the assumption that mosquitoes are disseminators of what are termed malarial diseases. It is but a decade or so that articles appeared in public journals to show that individuals owed their exemption from this class of maladies to a free exposure of their bodily surface to these insects. They are doctors, says one writer; they bleed us and with this they suck out the stagnant blood. Significantly, however, several regions where mosquitoes bite the fiercest are totally immune. One is Greenland; another, Alaska. On the other hand, an English author, narrating his experiences at Rome, where the word "malaria" was first coined, records that he shielded himself perfectly from attacks of malarial disease by putting on an additional coat in the latter part of the afternoon. The writer has himself witnessed enough of this sort to convince him that intermittent and other fevers may be entirely obviated by precautions of this character, and that the mosquito, pest as she is, is harmless and her bite innocuous, so far as malarial disease is concerned.

LEIBNITZ ON MATTER.

According to the Ideal Philosophy of Leibnitz, matter, motion, space, and time are only phenomena. They are not absolute realities. They have relative reality. They are real enough on the plane of the senses. They are real enough as modes of consciousness—as our present, imperfect interpretations of that which is spiritual and eternal.

Space, time, matter and motion are relatively real, but not absolutely real. Metaphysically, in the absolute sense, in the last analysis, from the Divine standpoint, all is mind, there is no matter.

SOME MISREPRESENTATIONS CORRECTED.

The Swami Abhedananda has summarily punctured some of the bubbles that floated around in our boyhood days. Our books on geography had pictures of a Hindu woman beside the river Ganges in the act of throwing her infant child to a crocodile; and there was another engraving of the car of Juggernât (Jaganatha) with fanatic worshippers casting themselves down to be crushed under the wheels. The Swami says that he has walked on foot along the Ganges for nearly fifteen hundred miles, mingling freely with Hindus of all classes and castes, but never heard of mothers feeding the crocodiles with their babes. Indeed it is now declared that crocodiles do not frequent the Ganges. In regard to the stories of the car of Juggernât which is drawn in procession every summer, the story that Hindus throw themselves under it to gain salvation by being crushed to death, the Swami declares to be utterly groundless and false. So, too, the suttee or burning of widows, has been a matter grossly misrepresented. It was never a tenet of the Hindu religion nor even a custom in the way that we have been told. It seems to have begun when the Mohammedans conquered the country. They behaved so brutally to the widows of Hindu soldiers that the latter often committed suicide to escape them. Then it also occurred that when the bodies of the dead were cremated, the widows in grief and despair over their woful and unprotected condition, went with the corpse to the pyre. It was a practice, however, only in certain parts of the country, and while the priests encouraged it, perverting the interpreting of their scriptures in its support, the educated classes strongly opposed it, attempting to suppress it by force. Finally, perceiving the necessity of official help, they appealed to the British rulers, and raised a large sum of money which was paid to the officers for their influence. In this way was obtained the law by which the suttee was forbidden. The Swami is doing an excellent work in correcting cherished false impressions of his countrymen, while instructing his hearers in just views of the older Aryan religion and philosophy. A. W.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

DISCOVERY OF A LOST TRAIL. By Charles B. Newcomb. Cloth, 270 pp., $1.50. Lee & Shepard, Boston, Mass.

THE COMING DEMOCRACY. By Orlando J. Smith. Cloth, 162 pp., $1.00. The Brandur Company, New York.

CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST. By L. B. Hilles. Cloth, 307 pp. Wright & Co., New York.

"THOU ART THE MAN." By Frederic W. Pangborn. Paper, 82 pp. Wright & Co., New York.

QUAINT NUGGETS. Compiled by Eveline Warner Brainerd. Cloth, 136 pp., 45 cents. Fords, Howard & Hulbert, New York.

PHILO-SOPHIA. By Anita Trueman. Cloth, 95 pp. The Alliance Publishing Company, New York.

MAHARSHI SWAMI DAYANAND SARASWATI ON INDIAN RELIGIONS. Being an English translation of His SATYARTH PRAKASH, in 4 volumes, Vol. III. By Durga Prasad. Cloth, 300 pp. Price, 12 annas per copy. Lahore, India.

GLAD SONGS OF PRAISE. By William H. Watson and Bertha M. Snow. Paper, 32 pp. W. H. Watson, 512 Tenth street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

THE LIVING UNIVERSE. By Henry Wood. Paper, 23 pp., 10 cents single copy. 12 for $1.00. Lee & Shepard, Boston, Mass.

THE HEART OF JOB. By Dr. W. C. Gibbons. Cloth, 167 pp., $1.00. Universal Truth Publishing Company, Chicago.

SEEK WISDOM. By Leo Virgo. Paper, 28 pp. Unity Tract Society, 1315 McGee street, Kansas City, Mo.

FROST FLOWERS ON THE WINDOWS. By Albert Alberg. Paper, 25 pp. Published by the author, Chicago.

NEWS STAND ACCOMMODATION.

The IDEAL REVIEW is for sale on news stands, everywhere. It can be procured by dealers through The American News Company, or any of its branches, or agencies, or from the publishers direct. If your dealer does not have it, or you fail to procure it at any news stand, you will do the publishers a favor by sending them the name and address of the dealer that he may be supplied direct.

LIST OF ADVANCE THOUGHT PUBLICATIONS.

We receive subscriptions for all the periodicals in this list, and will give club rates upon request for any combination of these with THE IDEAL REVIEW.

ABIDING TRUTH. Monthly. 50c. a year. Peabody, Mass.
ADEPT. Monthly. 50c. a year. Minneapolis, Minn.
AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST. Monthly. $2.00 a year. Washington, D. C.
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY. Monthly. $5.00 a year. Worcester, Mass.
ARYA BALA BODHINI. Monthly. 50c. a year. Adyar, Madras, India.
BANNER OF LIGHT. Weekly. $2.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
BRAHMAVÂDIN. Monthly. Rs. 4 a year. Madras, India.
CHRISTIAN. Monthly. 50c. a year. Little Rock, Ark.
CHRISTIAN LIFE. Quarterly. 50c. a year. Morton Park, Ill.
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE JOURNAL. Monthly. $2.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
COMING AGE. Monthly. $2.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
COMING EVENTS (Astrological). Monthly. 5s. a year. London, England.
COMMON SENSE. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
DAS WORT. Monthly. $1.00 a year. St. Louis, Mo.
DAWN. Calcutta, India.
DAWNING LIGHT. Weekly. $1.00 a year. San Antonio, Tex.
DOMINION REVIEW. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Toronto, Canada.
ECCE HOMO. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Richmond, Va.
ELEANOR KIRK'S IDEA. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Brooklyn, N. Y.
ESOTERIC. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Applegate, Cal.
EXPRESSION. Monthly. 6s. 6d. a year. London, England.
FAITH AND HOPE MESSENGER. Monthly. 50c. a year. Atlantic City, N. J
FLAMING SWORD. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
FOOD, HOME AND GARDEN. Monthly. 50c. a year. Philadelphia, Pa.
FRED BURRY'S JOURNAL. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Toronto, Canada.
FREEDOM. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Sea Breeze, Fla.
FREE LIFE. Monthly. 50c. a year. Ringwood, England.
FREE MAN. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Bangor, Me.
FREETHINKER. Weekly. 2 pence a copy. London, England.
HANDS AND STARS. Monthly. 50c. a year. Atlantic City, N. J.
HARBINGER OF LIGHT. Melbourne, Australia.
HARMONY. Monthly. $1.00 a year. San Francisco, Cal.
HEALER. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Brooklyn, N. Y.
HERALD OF PEACE. Monthly. 50c. a year. London, England.
HERALD OF THE GOLDEN AGE. Monthly. 50c. a year. Ilfracomb, England.
HERMETIST. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
HIGHER LAW. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
HUMAN FACULTY. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
HUMANITARIAN. Monthly. 6s. a year. London, England.
HUMAN NATURE. Monthly. 50c. a year. San Francisco, Cal.
IDEAL LIFE. Monthly. 50c. a year. Columbus, Tex.
IDEAL REVIEW. Monthly. $2.50 a year. New York, N. Y.
IMMORTALITY. Quarterly. $1.00 a year. Syracuse, N. Y.
INDEPENDENT THINKER. Hy. Frank, Editor. Monthly. $1.00 a year. New York, N. Y.
JOURNAL OF HYGEIO-THERAPY. Monthly. 75c. a year. Kokomo, Ind.
JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY. Quarterly. $3.00 a year. New York, N. Y
KOSMOS. Quarterly. $1.00 a year. Vineland, N. J.
LICHTSTRAHLEN (German). Monthly. $1.00 a year. West Point, Neb.
LIFE. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Kansas City, Mo.
LIGHT. Weekly. $2.70 a year. London, England.
LIGHT OF THE EAST. Calcutta, India.
LIGHT OF TRUTH. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Columbus, O.
LUCIFER. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.

LIST OF ADVANCE THOUGHT PUBLICATIONS—*Continued.*

LYCEUM. Weekly. 50c. a year. Cleveland, O.
MEDICO-LEGAL JOURNAL. Quarterly. $3.00 a year. New York, N. Y.
MEDIUM. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Los Angeles, Cal.
MERCURY. Monthly. $1.00 a year. San Francisco, Cal.
METAPHYSICAL KNOWLEDGE. Monthly. 50c. a year. Baltimore, Md.
MIND. Quarterly. 12s. a year; 3s. a copy. Williams & Norgate, London, England.
MODERN ASTROLOGY. Monthly. $3.00 a year. London, England..
MONIST. Quarterly. $2.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
MORNING STAR. Monthly. 50c. a year. Loudsville, Ga.
NATURARZT. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
NAUTILUS. Monthly. 50c. a year. Portland, Ore.
NEW CRUSADE. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Ann Arbor, Mich.
NEW MAN. Monthly. $1.00 a year. St. Louis, Mo.
NYA TIDEN (Scandinavian). Monthly. 50c. a year. Minneapolis, Minn.
OCCULT SCIENCE LIBRARY. Monthly. $1.50 a year. Chicago, Ill.
OCCULT TRUTHS. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Washington, D. C.
OMEGA. Monthly. $1.00 a year. New York, N. Y.
OPEN COURT. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
PALMIST'S REVIEW. Quarterly. 5s. a year. London, England.
PHILISTINE. Monthly. $1.00 a year. East Aurora, N. Y.
PHILOSOPHICAL MAGAZINE. $8.00 a year. London, England.
PHILOSOPHICAL REVIEW. Monthly. $3.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. Monthly. $1.00 a year. New York, N. Y
PHRENOLOGICAL MAGAZINE. $2.25 a year. London, England.
PRABUDDHA BHARATA. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Kumaon, India.
PRICE'S MAGAZINE OF PSYCHOLOGY. Monthly. $2.00 a year. Atlanta, Ga.
PROGNOSTIC STAR GAZER. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
PROGRESSIVE THINKER. Weekly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
PROPHET. Monthly. 75c. a year. Oaklyn, N. J.
PROPHETIC MESSENGER. Monthly. 50c. a year. Minneapolis, Minn.
PSYCHE. Monthly. $2.00 a year. Cambridge, Mass.
PSYCHIC DIGEST AND OCCULT REVIEW OF REVIEWS. $1.00 a year. Cleveland, O.
RADIX. 10c. a number. Boston, Mass.
REALM. Monthly. 50c. a year. Toronto, Canada.
RELIGIO-PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNAL. Weekly. $1.00 a year. San Francisco, Cal.
REVUE DE L'HYPNOTISME. Monthly. $3.00 a year. Paris, France.
SECULAR SCIENCE. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
SECULAR THOUGHT. Weekly. $2.00 a year. Toronto, Canada.
SUGGESTER AND THINKER. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Cleveland, O.
SUGGESTION. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
SUGGESTIVE THERAPEUTICS. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
SUNFLOWER. Monthly. 75c. a year. Lily Dale, N. Y.
TEMPLE OF HEALTH. Monthly. 25c. a year. Battle Creek, Mich.
THEOSOPHICAL FORUM. Monthly. $1.00 a year. New York, N. Y.
THEOSOPHICAL REVIEW. Monthly. $2.75 a year. London, England.
THEOSOPHIST. Monthly. $5.00 a year. Madras, India.
THE SPHINX (Astrology). Monthly. $3.00 a year. Boston, Mass.
THE LAMP. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Toronto, Canada.
THE VEGETARIAN. Weekly. 6s. 6d. a year. London, England.
THRESHOLD LAMP. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.
TORCH. Monthly Nottingham, England.
TRUE WORD. Monthly. Seattle, Wash.
TRUMPET. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Oakland, Cal.
TWO WORLDS. Weekly. $1.60 a year. Manchester, England.
UNITY. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Kansas City, Mo.
UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD PATH Monthly. $2.00 a year. New York, N. Y.
UNIVERSAL TRUTH. Monthly. $1.00 a year. Chicago, Ill.