

# The Coming Day.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

## DOES DEATH END ALL ?

A BRIEF but very serious discussion has caused some searchings of heart amongst the readers of *The Inquirer*. The editor of that paper published an article, in which, in the plainest terms, he said that death ends conscious existence : that, in fact, we are "brought to an end by death." This was severely commented upon by Mr. Page Hopps, who made a strong stand for belief in a personal future life. The editor replied by publishing and apparently praising a letter on the other side, which deliberately affirmed that "Unitarianism is not committed to a belief in the continued existence of personal identity after death," and by saying that Mr. Hopps held peculiar views about Spiritualism, and that it was not likely that he would convert Unitarians to them. It was not at all clear why reference was made to this subject of Spiritualism, because Mr. Hopps had not urged any peculiar views, but had only stood for bare belief in a future life, which is surely not a peculiarity of spiritualists only. This he explained in a letter to the editor for publication; but *the letter was suppressed*, the editor retiring under cover of the prejudice created by the dragging-in of Spiritualism, and with testimonials from some anonymous minister and from a vice-president of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, who "values very highly the liberty to remain uncommitted on the point of the continued existence of personal identity" after death !

Notwithstanding these astonishing testimonials, we do not believe that Unitarians to any large extent have lost faith in personal conscious existence after what we call "death."

The following is the letter which *The Inquirer* refused to publish :—

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE INQUIRER."

SIR,—Your comments upon my letter introduce matters of such deep seriousness that I am most unwillingly compelled to go further into this subject—a subject of vital importance. And first I must protest in the most solemn way against your perverse introduction of a matter to which I have not once referred, which was not in my mind, and which has nothing to do with our subject. What Spiritualism has to say about our next stage of personal and conscious existence is not the question. The question has all along been whether we shall have a continued personal and conscious existence at all. I did not, in any

sense, write as a spiritualist ; I wrote as an elementary christian, and I wrote simply to make a stand against what seemed and seems to me undiluted secularism.

What you said is not entirely contained in the sentence you now quote from your article, but it is sufficient. Here it is:—"When it is said that a man dies, what is usually meant is that he ceases to have a conscious existence, that the will is powerless, that all capacities and powers of which we have any knowledge are at an end. All that goes to make up what we know as life is extinct." And you adopted this view of death. I do not believe that this is what is "usually meant"; certainly no rational christian can consistently mean it. The rational christian believes in continued conscious personal existence, and in heightened powers of will, and love, and possibilities of service beyond the veil. Unitarians, at all events, believe that, or their hymns are shams, their prayers pretences, and their sermons lies. And when you suggest that my simple testimony in favour of the truth of what we profess is some special spiritualistic nonsense of my own, I solemnly ask you, as a responsible person, what you mean. And I ask that with all the more emphasis when I read, with pain and surprise, your compliment to "S," and your defence of him against my charge of secularism, when he flatly says, "Unitarianism is not committed to a belief in the continued existence of personal identity after death." Nothing more shocking could be said, and yet you go perilously near to its endorsement, for you say:—"We are quite certain that our correspondent "S" is fully capable of defending his statements, and we shall not undertake to do so for him, But we may be permitted to resent on his own and our behalf the charge of secularism which Mr. Hopps so freely makes." If the Unitarians have come to this, there would be only one motive for remaining amongst them - the desire to preach the rudiments of the Gospel to the heathen.

South Norwood Hill,  
September 22nd.

Heartily yours,  
J. PAGE HOPPS.

In refusing to publish this letter, *The Inquirer* was untrue to its name, though we can quite understand its anxiety to let the veil drop upon what must now be to it a painful subject. All we can say is that if the Unitarians are content to let the matter rest, and to permit its leading organ to cast grave discredit upon the most elementary and the most vital truth of religion, they will deserve to be regarded by the Christian world with deepened distrust. What does it matter that we are "rational" and "free" if we have lost faith in the only thing that can keep religion from being a decorous sham, and theology from being a bag of bones ?

The following is one of many interesting communications on the subject. It is from our dear old friend Mr. Blatchford, of Bristol:—"I have stood beside more than five hundred open graves; and in solemn memory there

strike me now those sobs, those cries, that tell of the very cracking of the heartstrings of poor suffering, stricken, dying humanity. But I do say, and I thank our loving Father for it out of a full heart, that every death bed, and every funeral, has but driven deeper into my mind the glorious thought that for all this, "the end is not yet!" I have nothing to *prove* all this, but I *believe* it with all my heart, and I could lay down my life, I think, if by so doing I could help any poor soul to fight this passing battle through with better heart, and with a sure trust that when the curtain drops upon the act of *mortality*, it shall rise again on that of *immortality*. And now we are called to "a policy of *non-committal*" on this the mightiest and most pathetic issue of poor humanity's struggle. Oh! for a lip of fire to take the better side, and cry once more with Isaiah, to some people, whose mission ought to be to sooth and guide, "lift up your eyes on high and see." How any of us, with the *Fatherhood* of God to stand upon, can utter any word but a jubilant and a hopeful one upon the life to come, passes my finding out. Yes, and man wants this belief, *and will have it*. That is what certain of ours have got to face. I am sick of jangling controversy: so I believe are many others. The future of our faith is more bound up with this great question than many might perhaps be willing to admit, but, questions of threes and ones, and questions of the authorship of this or that verse out of old books, what are all these in vital and pathetic interest and import, in comparison with the passionate cry of sundered human love: "If a man die, shall he live again?"

---

## LIFE :— WHAT ? WHENCE ? WHITHER ?

By W. STODDART, B. A.

"LIFE," says Herbert Spencer, "is the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external co-existences and sequences." This is to our mind rather an obscure definition, and, to the unlearned, must sound a mere jargon of words. Another definition of life given by Herbert Spencer is "the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations," which might be a very good description of the contraction and dilatation of the pupil of the eye under the influence of light, or of the changes that take place in the cooling of molten iron, but it can scarcely recommend itself to our judgment as a definition or explanation of life.

Other definitions of Life are, "the tendency to individuation" (Schelling); "a collection of phenomena which succeed each other during a limited time in an organised body" (Richerand); "the two-fold internal movement of competition and decomposition, at once general and continuous," (Dr. Blainville); "a series of definite and successive changes, both of structure and composition, which takes place within an individual, without destroying its identity." (G. H. Lewes.)

This last definition is the best of all those which have been quoted, but all of these definitions make the radical mistake of describing Life by what it does, rather than telling us what Life is. Life, in our opinion, is that which produces the changes and phenomena that take place in living bodies or organisms. Life produces organisation, but is not the organism produced. Life causes various changes in an organism, but Life is not the changes caused. We cannot define Life as "a collection of phenomena," or "a series of changes," for Life is a power—a force.

In order to understand what Life is let us consider briefly the constitution of the Universe, and the relation of things in general. The physical Universe is made up of Matter and Force. By this statement we do not wish to convey the meaning that there are two eternal substances or entities. There is, no doubt, an underlying Unity in the Universe, all things being related to one another, and having a common origin. Monism, which predicates the Oneness or Unity of the Universe, is doubtless the correct theory of the Universe, rather than Dualism. It is not, however, the Monism that represents Matter as being the One Eternal Substance and Source of all, that we advocate, but the Monism that considers Matter as merely a manifestation of Force, and regards Matter and Force as manifestations of Mind, and believes the whole Universe to be a revelation of the thought and will of Him who is All in All.

But although there is this underlying unity, Matter and Force being related and having a common origin, yet there is a vital distinction between Matter and Force. Force is not Matter, and Matter is not Force. Heat and electricity are forces, not substances. These forces were formerly regarded as imponderable fluids, because they can easily be transmitted from one object to another, and it is important to notice that although they are not now regarded as fluids or substances, yet science has to assume the existence of an invisible, and we might say imponderable ether, by whose vibrations heat, light and electricity are conveyed from one object to another, from the sun to the earth, from the fire to our bodies, and it is somewhat amusing to hear those who deny the existence of the soul and unseen spiritual agencies, assuming the existence of an unseen and unknown ether, a substance of such tenuity that it cannot be got hold of.

Now, as we have said, there is Matter and there is Force in the Universe. There are varieties of Matter. Chemistry tells us of more than sixty elementary substances, although it is thought that all these so-called elements may be but modifications of one primal element. It is by different combinations of these elements that all the various substances and objects on this earth are made up.

Then looking at the various forces, as heat, light, and electricity, we find that they are convertible, and they too may be regarded as different modifications of one primal force. Mechanical force will produce heat, as, when

a button is rubbed on a piece of wood, it becomes hot. Also, if a rod of glass is rubbed by a piece of silk, electricity is excited. Heat produces motion, as in a steam-engine ; it also causes a vibration in the particles of the substance heated. We know that electricity produces light, and light produces photographs. There is a relation between all these forces ; there is a similarity, and also a difference, and they are convertible one into another.

Now, Life is also a force, but we do not know whether it is able to be converted into the other forces, or whether the other forces can produce it. Light and heat and electricity do quicken the life of plants, of animals, and of human beings. Without light and heat plants will not grow. Without heat the egg cannot be hatched, and electric belts are used for invalids whose life-force is deficient. Whether such facts as these are sufficient to establish a correlation between the life-force and the other physical forces is doubtful ; but there is evidently some relation between them. Whether they are convertible we do not know. As far as we know, the life-force has never been manufactured, as it were, out of the other forces. It is possible to galvanise a dead body and make every muscle contract, so that the body shall assume the appearance of life, but no life is there. In the hatching of an egg, we have the nearest approach to the production of Life by another force. In that process heat is the agent that awakens Life within the shell, but then the life-forces were already within in a state of equilibrium, waiting for the application of heat to set them in motion.

Leaving, however, the question of the correlation of the life-force with the other physical forces, let us come to the consideration of the nature of Life.

Life, we are sometimes told, is one ; that it is physical and physical only ; that it is of the earth, earthy ; that there is nothing spiritual, nothing miraculous, nothing supernatural about it ; and that it is produced merely by the combination of chemical elements. We shall maintain, however, that it is very miraculous, that it is supernatural, and that there is spiritual life, as well as physical life. It must be evident to everyone that the unconscious life of a plant is not the same as the sensuous life of an animal, and that the sensuous life of an animal is not the same as the rational life of a man. There may be an underlying unity—a common origin—a relation—but they are different phases of life. The life of a cabbage is not the same as the life of a man, and the physical life of the body is not identical with the spiritual life of the soul. Thought is the life-force of the Mind, and the study of Thought would, I think, admit us further into the nature of man than the study of the physical life of his animal organism. There are various forces in man which require to be separated and analysed apart. There is, first of all, the physical life-force, which appears to be identical with that of animals, and perhaps with that of plants. This life-force is found, we are told, in connection with bioplasm or protoplasm, or rather bioplasm is Matter and Life combined. Bioplasm

is a jelly-like substance which fills every cell of a living organism. Life is not this jelly-like substance, but bioplasm is a jelly with Life breathed into it. If man could put life into jelly, he might perchance be able to construct an elementary cell or a simple organism, but he has no such power. He cannot manufacture Life out of heat, or light, or electricity, or chemical action. What we desire to point out is that Life is something distinguishable and separable from Matter, and although Life manifests itself through Matter and upon Matter, yet Life is not a mere attribute of Matter, as size, colour, softness or hardness, solidity or liquidity, but Life is something added to Matter, instead of being an attribute or a production of Matter.

We now come to the "Whence?" of Life. The "Whence?" is the same doubtless as the "Whence?" of Matter, the "Whence?" of the Universe. Matter, Force, Life, the Universe, Man, all had a common origin, they all had a spiritual source. The Universe is the thought of God, the laws of the Universe are governed by His will. Man is the son of God, and all living beings are God's creatures. Science can tell us nothing about the *cause* and *origin* of things, it can only describe the *order* in which different phenomena appear, and trace the laws that govern the evolution of life. It may trace the history of life back to the primal protoplasm, but it cannot tell why Life developed itself or was developed in the form it has assumed. In that jelly-like substance there is no prediction of plants and herbs and trees, of fish and fowl and animal. The first forms of Life gave no inkling of the grand evolution of life that we now see on this world. What prophecy of man is there in this speck of animated jelly? Science can describe the various phases through which Life has passed, how one species of organisms gave rise to another species, and can thus trace the history of the evolution of Life from the lowest form up to man. Science can analyze all the substances of this world, and separate the elements, and perhaps some day it may be able to trace them all back to one primal form of Matter, and resolve Matter itself into Force. Science can isolate the forces of Nature, and show them to be but different phases of one primal Force, but that is as far as science can go. Religion however, steps in, and says that this primal Force is the will of God. Or suppose science to trace the evolution of Life upward and forward, from the lowest form to the highest, from dead Matter to living tissue, from plant to insect, from fish to fowl, from reptile to animal, from savage man to the highest development of manhood, here it at present stops, and cannot see any higher development of Life; but Religion steps in and tells us of the immortality of the soul, and the Life beyond the grave.

Whence then came this wondrous Life of ours? Came it from above or beneath? Was it evolved out of dead Matter, or is there truth in that ancient idea that God—the Spirit of Life—breathed life into the dust of the earth? Life is a force, a power. Who put that force into the inert atoms of Matter? There was a time when no Life existed on this earth; there was a later time

when Life did exist. Whence came it? Who performed the miracle of converting dead matter into living tissue? Whence came that life-force which did not exist at one time on this earth? Came it from the sun or air? Was it transported by waves of ether from other worlds of Life or did it lodge in the atmosphere, ready to impregnate and quicken into Life the dead atoms of earth? It came, says the Materialist, by spontaneous generation. The atoms of Matter rubbing together produced Life, as the flint and steel produce fire. But, if so, who gave to Matter this wondrous power? Whence came Matter itself and all its magic qualities? Did it evolve itself out of nothing? Nothing can come out of nothing. Which is the more reasonable hypothesis: that everything sprang out of nought—that man and animal, fish and fowl, tree and flower, sun, moon and stars, worlds untold in number, laden with life and adorned with beauty, sustained by omnipotent power and controlled by unerring wisdom were all evolved by chance, or that there is a sufficient cause for all these things? Is it not evident that we must postulate the existence of an eternal Life-Giver, who is the Source of all that is? "He is the great Necessity for Life flowing through plant, through animal, through man, is not resultant from organic form, but flows through all and fashions them, and they are coins, deep-printed with the Eternal Name." The ceaseless flow of Life and its ever-rising tide reveal to us the Infinite Source whence the waters of Life do flow. Life came not out of the womb of vacancy, nor was it begotten by chance or chaos. Does not science prove to us that law, order, beauty, grandeur, design, intelligence, goodness, are manifested in the evolution of Life, which speak to us of the love, wisdom and might of the great Creator?

To the question, then, "Whence came Life?" we reply:—Life comes primarily from Him who is the Eternal Source of Life—God. It is in Him we live and move and have our being.

All Life is but the breath of the Great Soul  
That works in space. Through His divine control,  
Each atom is outwrought, and every sphere  
Rolls on throughout Eternity's vast year.

Life came—whence all things come—from God. We do not wish to maintain that man's life came from a different source than the life of an animal. We do not wish to maintain that man is a special creation, but that he is a higher creature than those beneath him, and therefore more worthy of a higher destiny. Man is a son of God, not because he was created in a special manner, but because he is more like the Creator, and invested with more of His nature and attributes.

Now let us address ourselves to the question "Whither?"

The history of the past bids us know and believe that progress is the law of Life, and fuller life the inheritance of the future. Who, gazing on the fiery ball that once spun through space, belching up volcanoes of molten lava from its fiery breast, could foretell that one day infant life should lie in

peace and safety upon it, and play with flowers where once the hot lava flowed ? Who, standing on this earth, when its crust was hard as flint and barren as a rock, and mighty seas beat with resistless fury on the rock-bound shore, could foresee the time when rich verdure and giant trees should grace the valleys and the plains ? Who, watching the seas swarm with fish, and reptiles sprawling over the shore, and monsters stalking through the forests, could predict the evolution of the Life we see to-day, and prophesy the apparition of man upon the stage of being ? And who, gazing at mankind to-day, can tell what gods shall one day walk upon this earth ?

And as with the human race, so with the individual unit. The babe grows into the child, the child blossoms into the boy, the boy into the youth, the youth into manhood, and man still goes forward. The body decays, and at length, when its work is done, drops into the dust and perishes, but man goes on, forward, upward. The mind perishes not with the material organism. The Life that once gave animation to the body is gone—gone somewhere—Whither ? It has been transferred to another form which we see not—an ethereal, celestial form. The soul—under which term are comprehended all the powers of mind which Life has unfolded in man—the soul creates—evolves—another house in which to dwell, and the Man, transformed, glorified, with all the powers and characteristics of his manhood, and with other powers and faculties added, begins a new life in a new world. Is there not being evolved within us something which belongs not to the dust of the body ? Is there not an individuality—a conscious personality—being developed, which depends not upon the flow and flux of the material atoms of the physical organisation ? Is there not a mind being created whose life-force is thought ? Is there not a character being formed, whose attributes of benevolence, goodness, justice, have no relation to the chemical properties of this earth-made body ? *That* mind, *that* soul, *that* character, are eternal. Does not science inform us that Force is persistent ? Then the life-force must also be persistent. Life, all admit, has evolved this “form” in which we now exist, and that same Life can evolve another “form,” more ethereal than this, in which a man’s personality will be retained, and by means of which he shall go forward in ceaseless life and activity.

The evolution of Life is still going on in the human race, and in every individual of the race, and instead of Life ending in dust and ashes—the catastrophe of final extinction—it goes for ever rolling on, widening and deepening like a mighty river.

Eternal process, moving on  
From state to state the spirit walks ;  
And these are but the shattered stalks  
Or ruined chrysalis of one.



## THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE astute move of the Established Church upon Birmingham has been very successful, notwithstanding the small racket over sacramental meats and drinks and posturings. Many things liberal and illiberal, wise and foolish, enlightening and darkening, were said, but the finest utterance was the concluding passage of the opening address by the president, the Bishop of Worcester:—

"Why look for ever backwards? Why attempt to resuscitate the past, to make the past the form and measure of the present, to array the present in the cast-off clothes of some effete system? God's voice is not a voice which spake once or twice in history, and is now for ever silent. The message given to the early Church cannot satisfy us. We feel sure that the mighty movement which gave us an open Bible and broke the fetters of the worst tyranny that ever enslaved the mind (for it was the slavery of the mind and conscience) can never lose its power. But the Church of the future has, I believe, a yet nobler mission. The Spirit of God lives and moves within her, prompting her to a yet larger conception of God's world, and of the

claims which that world has upon her. To set free the individual conscience was the work of the Reformation. To bind together free individuals in a brotherhood of freedom is the task which God has given us. Let us take care to recognise and fulfil it. God has been teaching His Church, and warning her by history, by science, by criticism, in spite of the suspicions and antagonisms of a too narrow faith, to evolve a more glorious harmony than any that the past has ever dreamed of. The antagonism of the Church, of all Churches, to the irresistible march of the world form; a melancholy page in their history. How vain to attempt to arrest that march when it is God's own hand that guides it."

What a fine justification of the heretics!

But, after all, this delightful liberality by no means represented the note of the Congress, and, at one painful meeting, the Bishop himself was hissed and almost mobbed. He had been guilty of going to the Grindelwald picnic, to dally with Dissenters and talk of Christian union, and for this he had been soundly scolded in the Church newspapers; so he tried to put himself right. The *Chronicle* says:—

"Almost at every phrase, interruptions of a scandalous character came from every quarter of the densely packed hall.

The Bishop said he had been told that he was not alive to the evils of dissent. It was just because he was alive to those evils that he went to Grindelwald as being the best proof that he wanted to get rid of them. Some Churchmen treated Nonconformists as moral and social lepers. (Cries of "No, no," and "Shame.") If they were lepers why not go to them as Father Damien did, and rescue them from their moral degradation. ("Oh.") He was accused of thinking lightly about the episcopate, but he wished there and then emphatically to say that he loved and cherished episcopacy with all his heart. (Laughter.) He believed it to be the best form of Church

government, but, mind you, he would not say it was the only form of Church government, denying that the Church of England anywhere declared that episcopacy was essential to the being as distinguished from the well-being of a church, and he was happy to take his stand on the same platform with Bishop Hall, Sancroft, Cosin, and Andrewes. He wished they were rid of the Act of Uniformity, and he would never concede that episcopal ordination was essential to the validity of a sacrament.

More to the same effect was greeted alternately with laughter, howls of derision, hissing, cries of "Shame" and "Traitor," and other tokens of disrespect towards the chair, while even the faithful few at his lordship's elbow were powerless to secure order."

The honest truth is that the Congress vibrated with a strong note against Dissenters. Even the Rev. Charles Gore, the reputed rationalist, said bluntly,

"We cannot admit Nonconformist ministers as validly ordained ministers of the Word and Sacraments."

"We cannot admit Nonconformist minis-

ters as on an equality of title in the ministry with those who have been episcopally ordained. Granted this, it follows also that we cannot attempt corporate recognition at all."

In the face of this, all talk of "christian unity" is the sheerest cant. These insolent priests need to be taught a lesson. What right have they to annex our "National Church," and to deny us even "corporate recognition"? If Dissenters were wise they would work, not for disestablishment, but for the breaking up of the priestly ring and the restoration of the national church to the nation.

---

### A SIGN OF THE TIMES ?

ONE of the sights of London every Sunday is Mr. Hugh Price Hughes' "service" at St. James's Hall. We had often heard of it, and were lately able to see and hear it. It happened to be a Good Templars' Day. In the body of the hall, hundreds of happy-looking people with queer neck decorations like flattened horse-collars, and two rows of them on the platform. The place all alive; brother this and brother that loudly cheered on coming on to the platform; and Mr. Hughes volleyed to his desk. To tell the truth, an almost rowdy meeting, with rowdy talk, rowdy merriment, and rowdy cheers, the fat and funny corner-man on the platform, front row, smacking his legs, shaking his big back, clapping his hands, or laughing with all his head, nearly the whole time. Mr. Hughes, ready, thorough, homely, racy, "cheeky," gave us a good fighting speech, just the thing for a rattling political meeting, full of straight, sharp talk: not a bit like Sunday. The best part of the "service" was a rousing intimation that some sisterhood connected with the place had taken in hand the miners' wives who had come from Yorkshire, to collect money in London. "Sister Mary" told us all about it, to a running accompaniment of noisy hand-clapping.

What does this betoken? Methodism has given birth to something that might have been expected from an entirely different wing of English Christianity: but extremes meet. "The West End Mission," as this movement is called, is intensely social, political, practical. It has discarded all the old traditions of Methodism, and is theological in but a surface sense. In fact, it seems to have only a formal connection with Methodism, and its influence will be to crumble away the power which called it into existence. But it is a sign of the times, and, with all its crudeness, may foreshadow an almost ideal church, alert, practical, direct, and in light marching order, responsive to the summons of the hour.

## MR. MONTEFIORE'S HIBBERT LECTURES.\*

IN every way a notable book, both because of the subject and the masterly treatment of it. Mr. Montefiore has aimed high. He does not shrink from saying, "I have endeavoured to group the religious material contained in the Old Testament in chronological order, and to trace the historical development which then becomes visible, from its beginning to its end." The book contains nine lectures, three interesting appendices, and a full index.

In a bold passage, at the very beginning of the first lecture, Mr. Montefiore takes his stand on the solid rock. He says, "It is, perhaps, hardly necessary for a Hibbert lecturer to say anything of the point of view from which he intends to treat his subject, even though that subject is the religion of Israel. He has only to take care that no personal opinions of his own shall obscure or prejudice the story he has to tell. That story must be told in the spirit and method of criticism as distinguished from the spirit and method of tradition. Tradition has been accustomed to regard the fundamental religious teaching of the entire Old Testament as one and the same throughout. Abraham and Moses and David and Isaiah and Ezra were assumed to have been, one and all of them, monotheists of the same pure type. Tradition has taken for granted the accuracy of the Bible narratives, and, speaking very generally, has regarded each book of the Old Testament as a contemporary record of the age with which it dealt. In this view the

chronological order of the different books is predetermined. The religious institutions of the Israelites and their system of sacred law become coincident in time with the beginnings of their national life. Criticism, on the other hand, makes the discovery that the laws of the Pentateuch are not always consistent with one another. Deuteronomy contradicts Leviticus and Exodus contradicts itself. The David of the Books of Samuel is very different from the supposed David of the Psalms, and both are different from the David of the Chronicles. The religious institutions of the monarchy are often flagrantly opposed to Pentateuchal ordinances, and the older prophets, who, upon the traditional hypothesis, must have regarded the Mosaic writings as the basis of their religious ideas, maintain complete silence about them. Criticism finds, in fact, that the Old Testament is neither homogeneous in doctrine nor consistent in standard of practice."

This is strong meat, but the lecturer stands up to it, and does his best to take his readers with him. The result is assuredly most enlivening and informing, and as Mr. Montefiore is not only a scholar and a resolute truthseeker, but a thinker who calls this a "solemn subject," and indicates his deep desire to treat it in a religious spirit, no one need fear any cause of offence. All that the reader requires is a desire to know the facts, and we only wish the book could be laid upon every religious teacher's study table.

## LIGHT ON THE PATH.

**THE UNSOCIAL CIGAR AND PIPE.**—The most curious thing about smoking is that it is called "social," a funny revelation of the curious state of mind induced by the weed. These smokers do not see far enough through their smoke. They do not reckon those who are excluded or annoyed. We very deeply regret to see the advance of "smoking concerts," smoking at political meetings, smoking after dinner—by women smoking in the streets—by boys.

**THE HUMANITARIAN LEAGUE.**—We are delighted to find that this useful and much-needed league is pushing on its work, especially in relation to the blackguardly doings of the Queen's buckhounds. We say "the Queen's," though we do not think Her Majesty can approve of what is done in her name. Mr. Gladstone's Government has the subject under consideration. We hope it will take off the gloves and hit home.

\* The Hibbert Lectures, 1892. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews. By C. G. Montefiore. London; Williams and Norgate.

THE FIGHT FOR THE SCHOOLS.—Wherever possible, a resolution something like the following should be proposed and pushed:—“This . . . while regarding the teaching of Religion as supremely important, deprecates the introduction of it, in the form of theological opinions, into the public schools, as a hindrance to education, as leading to the disqualifying or degradation of teachers, as involving injustice to many ratepayers, and as injurious to Religion itself. This . . . therefore urges upon all School Boards [or, better still, some local School Board should be named] to act upon the principle that Religion, considered as Theology, should be left to parents and to the various agencies for promoting and teaching it.”

OUR FATHER'S CHURCH.—We hope some day to have regular Sunday meetings in London; but we are not over-anxious about it, as some have still to be shaken out of the superstition about a Church being real only when it has a box to put the people in. Even a true friend of *Our Father's Church*, expressing his desire for these meetings, said:—“They would bring the movement from the realm of paper and theory to that of realisation and fact.” O, the dismal dreariness of this view!—as though even a Church were unreal until one put it into a box. The typical British man dearly loves his iron chest and his “securities,” and he carries that longing into religion. *Is it*, then, only “paper” and “theory,” when hundreds of happy and grateful kindred spirits in all parts of the world are led to feel their spiritual oneness? And *is it* “realisation” and “fact” only when we open our box and put our securities in? It is really very depressing to hear even sympathisers talk like this: and is enough to make one think that the best part of our testimony may be the testimony against the clerical and ecclesiastical superstition that there cannot be a church without a place to meet in.

THE INCARNATION.—The following paragraph in the Liberal Churchmen's Address to Mr. Gladstone has awakened considerable interest:—“To refuse the just demand of the Irish people is, in our judgment, to distrust the root-principles which underlie all true democratic government, while the arguments on which that refusal is based show a want of faith in human nature which we hold to be derogatory to the doctrine of the Incarnation.”

Both saints and sinners have asked, “And what has ‘the Incarnation’ to do with Home Rule?” The reply resides in a really remarkable shifting of the meaning of a vital phrase. The significance of that we pointed out in *The Coming Day* for July. Briefly stated, the new meaning of the phrase, “the Incarnation,” covers no more than the rational religionists' belief that the unseen God is ever manifesting Himself in the human race. That will repay watchful pondering.

THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.—The great Columbian Exposition at Chicago has been the centre around which has gathered some most notable congresses on social, psychological, and religious subjects, notably what has been called “the Parliament of Religions.” Its place of meeting was the Hall of Columbus, in the Memorial Art Palace, on the Lake Front Park. The attendance was very large, the hall, which seats 3,000, being crowded morning, afternoon, and evening throughout the entire two and one half weeks, with overflow meetings on many days into adjoining halls. The programme included addresses by or communications from England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Germany, Russia, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, India, Japan, China, Ceylon, New Zealand, Brazil, Canada, and the American States, and, indirectly, many other countries, and the leading “religions” discussed were Theism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Catholicism, the Greek Church, and Protestantism in many forms. This programme also announced for presentation the great subjects of revelation, immortality, the incarnation of God, the universal elements in religion, the ethical unity of different religious systems, the relations of religion to morals, marriage, education, science, philosophy, evolution, music, labor, government, peace and war, and many other themes of absorbing interest.

The meetings, as we can readily believe, were intensely interesting, and we hope a full report of the proceedings will be speedily issued. The result must be to bring into clearer view the tremendous fact that religion belongs, not to a nation, but to the race, and that what we call the varied religions of the world are only the varying modes of manifestation of one deep human longing for the ideal life and God.

## NOTES ON IRELAND.

**HITTING WILDLY.**—The Irish Unionist Alliance is issuing Anti-home-rule tracts. The one entitled "The House of Lords and the Home-rule Bill" is a grotesque curiosity. It rakes together a dozen instances of injustice to Englishmen threatened by Mr. Gladstone's Bill. Among these are the following amusing spasms. "The Bill would have lowered the English working man's wages, for the flight of capital from Ireland, and the ruin of many of the employers of Irish labour, would soon have led to the flooding of the English labour market with swarms of Irishmen thrown out of work, and willing to work at starvation wages." "Every man of you would be poorer. Every man of you would be less free. Every man, woman, and child among you would be less secure in the possession of that birth-right which belongs to you all as citizens of an empire on which the sun never sets." Then it adds:—"The House of Lords,—the reviled aristocracy whom you are urged to abolish as an anti-popular body—has struck this blow in defence of the taxpayers of England, the working men and working women of England, the free electors of England." The sobriety and sanity of this tract may be gathered from these specimens, and its truthfulness may be measured by the statement that "the Home Rule Bill which the Government introduced was completely changed in its progress through the Commons"—a sheer falsehood.

The only reply to this slush of mendacity and nonsense is the simple suggestion that Home Rule, by giving the people of Ireland the right to mind their own business and to make the best of their own home, would, in every way, tend to keep them at home. The statement that the House of Lords has been defending the taxpayers and the working people is the touch of farce in this flood of folly.

**LOYAL ULSTER.**—We understand that "the Ulster Parliament" is, or will in a few days, be in session. This "parliament" has been called into being for the express purpose of resisting and thwarting any legislature that may be created under a constitutionally-passed Home Rule Bill. It is incontinent

conspiracy and constructive treason. If Home Rulers in Ireland had done anything like it, Mr. Balfour, Lord Randolph Churchill and the rest of them would have screamed at the daring of the "Irish rebels."

**HOME RULE AND PRAYER.**—The Bishop of Meath has given permission to his clergy to discontinue the use of the specially appointed prayer against the passing of the Home Rule Bill. But he is astute. Inasmuch as the House of Lords has heard their prayer, he would like a "special thanksgiving"; but this might put people off their guard, and therefore he deprecates this, as it would, "by many persons, be construed as meaning that no further effort for the preservation of the Empire from dismemberment, and of Ireland from rapine, was required." This is a pretty instance of attention to the injunction, "Watch and pray." But what a *reductio ad absurdum* is this manner of prayer!

**TIME TRIES ALL.**—About twelve years ago Mr. T. Healy and others were imprisoned for inciting tenants in Ireland not to go into the land courts to have judicial rents fixed under the Act of 1881. Mr. Healy's special point was that the Act provided that the revised rents should stand for fifteen years, and the tenants were warned that the "relief" might turn out to be a millstone. What has happened? A few days ago, a first-rate authority made itself responsible for the following statement:—"Be it remembered that it is twelve years since the Commission began work, and that rents once fixed cannot be altered again for a period of fifteen years. And, yet rents fixed even two years ago are not fair now. The fall of agricultural prices since the Act of 1881 has been unprecedented. If ever the landlords had a godsend it was that Act which was destined to nail their rents up securely, no matter what might happen to prices. And the law having forbidden the landlord to raise his rent where the tenant has gone into court, neither justice nor mercy will induce him to lower it now that the state of agriculture has brought the tenant down to his knees."

---

 NOTES ON BOOKS.
 

---

"A biography of Isaac Pitman." By T. A. Reed. London: Griffith, Farran and Co. "Comparisons are odious," but we cannot avoid the reflection that the world wants fewer lives of fighting men and records of battles, and more lives of pioneers and records of useful work, and that the book before us in a model of its kind. We do not agree with the "long hand" phonetic spelling, though we badly want spelling reform, but no one can deny that Mr Pitman's work in the region of "shorthand" has been of priceless value. But the life—the life of patience, carefulness, devotion, hard work—that is the thing of greatest price, and for that the book is delightful.

"The Spiritual Songster: a new and choice collection of song and melody, in both notations, voicing the spiritual and progressive aspirations of the modern spiritual movement." Collected and arranged by H. A. and S. M. Kersey. Newcastle-on-Tyne: H. A. Kersey. A very creditable-looking production, from which many persons who think spiritualists beneath them might learn something. The work is well printed and bound. A neatly printed little book of words only (100 Songs or Hymns) is published, in cloth, at fourpence. No one would cite the majority of these pieces as specimens of real poetry, but as joy-songs by the way they will probably be very useful.

"The soul of the bishop." A novel in two volumes. By John Strange Winter. London: F. V. White and Co. A novel on an intensely religious subject by the author of "Bootle's Baby," must needs be a novelty—to be read and criticised on its own plane. There is nothing subtle, complex, or psychological in the book. It is an almost crude story, all on the flat, and simplicity itself. A manly Broad Church bishop falls in love with a great county magnate's only child, who really loves him in return; but, from the environments of conventional life, come sudden doubts of the

very foundations of the bishop's creed,—doubts that ripen into hot, questioning unbelief, and then revolt. The grand wedding had been arranged and everybody invited before the storm burst, and then the soul of the shocked but willing bishop had to be saved. There is an absence of the conventional ending,—no marriage, no death; only the sharp, hard, penetrating lesson, and then a sudden end. The story has many touches of "Bootle's Baby" in it, but, in the main, it is a huge attack upon the bankrupt doctrines of the church.

"Vivia Perpetua: a dramatic poem, in five acts." By Sarah Flower Adams. With a memoir of the author and her hymns. This interesting little work has, on the title page, the simple announcement "privately printed," but we understand it can be had at "The Christian Life" office, Essex Hall, London. The memoir is a simple and very brief story of a life, whose most notable result seems to have been the writing of the immortal hymns, "Part in peace," "He sendeth sun," and "Nearer, my God to Thee." The dramatic poem gives a vivid picture of the Christian conflict with paganism very early in the third century.

"A hand-book of rational piety." By H. W. Crosskey, LL.D. London: P. Green. A "Preliminary Note" frankly announces that this book consists of "extracts from printed and MS. discourses" by the author. There is, however, a very intelligent continuity in it, which, in the hands of a really thoughtful teacher, with some grip of ideas, might be exceedingly useful, and for many Sundays. In fact, accompanied by other "lessons" or class-work, the book might supply food for six months, and then, being put aside for six months, might usefully be gone through again in three months. Why is there no table of contents? It is just the kind of book that needs one.

## EMERSON DAY BY DAY.

*Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,  
Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,  
And marching single in an endless file,  
Bring diadems and fagots in their hands.  
To each they offer gifts after his will,  
Bread, kingdoms, stars, and sky that  
hold them all.*

*I, in my pleached garden, watched the  
pomp,  
Forgot my morning wishes, hastily  
Took a few herbs and apples, and the Day  
Turned and departed, silent. I, too late,  
Under her solemn fillet saw the scorn.—  
DAYS.*

1.—AT the top or at the bottom of all illusions I set the cheat which still leads us to work for appearances, in spite of our conviction, in all sane hours, that it is what we really are that avails with friends, with strangers, and with fate or fortune.—*Illusions.*

2.—WE live by desire to live, we live by choice, by will, by thought, by virtue, by the vivacity of the laws which we obey, and obeying share their life, or we die by sloth, by disobedience, by losing hold of life which ebbs out of us.—*Immortality.*

3.—TO believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you, in your private heart, is true for all men, that is genius.—*Self-Reliance.*

4.—THE importance of the one person who has the truth over nations who have it not, is because power obeys reality and not appearance; power is according to quality and not quantity.—*Aspects of Culture.*

5.—IF a man claims to know and speak of God, and carries you backward to the phraseology of some old mouldered nation in another country, in another world, believe him not. Is the acorn better than the oak which is its fulness and completion? Is the parent better than the child into whom he has cast his ripened being? The centuries are conspirators against the sanity and authority of the soul.—*Self-Reliance.*

6.—THERE is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide, that he

must take himself for better, for worse, as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given him to till.—*Self-Reliance.*

7.—THROUGH the years and the centuries, through evil agents, through toys and atoms, a great and beneficent tendency irresistibly streams.—*Montaigne.*

8.—THE use of history is to give value to the present hour, and its duty.—*Works and Days.*

9.—THERE is no virtue which is final; all are initial. The virtues of society are vices of the saint.—*Circles.*

10.—IN contemporaries it is not so easy to distinguish betwixt notoriety and fame.—*Books.*

11.—GOODNATURE is stranger than tomahawks.—*Clubs.*

12.—THE purpose of life seems to be to acquaint man with himself. He is not to live to the future as described to him, but to live to the real future by living to the real present. The highest revelation is that God is in every man.—*Journal.*

13.—THERE is somewhat in all life untranslatable into language. He who keeps his eye on that will write better than others and think less of his writing and of all writing.—*The Dial.*

14.—WHEN half-gods go the gods arrive.—*Give all to Love.*

15.—WHAT is the scholar, what is the man for but for hospitality to every new thought of his time?—*Lecture on the Times.*

16.—TIME, the great teacher, is always uttering his lessons, everyday is exposing some of the falsehoods that have deceived us; every day the Almighty Father accumulates knowledge in the mind of the race from endless sources. The Teacher is one, but He speaks by a thousand thousand lips.—*Sermon, "The Spirit of Truth."*

17.—I CANNOT but think that Jesus Christ will be better loved by not being adored. He has had an unnatural, an artificial place for ages in human opinions, a place too high for love. There is a recoil of the affections from all authority and force.—*The Spirit of Truth.*

18.—THE possibility of interpretation lies in the identity of the observer with the observed.—*Uses of Great Men.*

19.—THEY think that God causes a miracle to make men stare, and then says, "Here is truth." They do not and will not perceive that it is to distrust the deity of truth, its invincible beauty, to do God a high dishonour so to depict Him. They represent the old trumpery of God, sending a messenger to raise man from his low estate. Well, then, he must have credentials, and the miracle is the credentials. I answer, God sends us messengers always. I am surrounded by messengers of God, who send me credentials day by day. Jesus is not a solitary, but still a lovely herald.—*Journal.*

20.—YOUR actions are not registered in a book by a recording angel for an invisible king, action number one, number two, up to number one million, but the retribution that shall be is the same retribution that now is. Base action makes you base; holy action hallows you.—*Journal.*

21.—A STRENUOUS soul hates cheap successes.—*Aspects of Culture.*

22.—THINGS are saturated with the moral law. There is no escape from it. Violets and grass preach it; rain and snow, wind and tides, every change, every cause in nature is nothing but a disguised missionary.—*Perpetual Forces.*

23.—A BELIEVER, a mind whose faith is consciousness, is never disturbed because other persons do not yet see the fact which he sees.—*Journal.*

24.—IN your metaphysics you have denied personality to the Deity; yet when the devout motions of the soul come, yield to them heart and life, though they should clothe God with shape and colour.—*Self-Reliance.*

25.—EVERY truth leads in another. The bud extrudes the old leaf, and every truth brings that which will supplant it.—*The Sovereignty of Ethics.*

26.—GOD builds his temple in the heart, on the ruins of churches and religions.—*Conduct of Life.*

27.—UNLOVELY, nay, frightful, is the solitude of the soul which is without God in the world. To wander all day in the sunlight among the tribes of animals, unrelated to anything better; to behold the horse, cow, and bird, and to foresee an equal and speedy end to him and them. No, the bird as it hurried by, with its bold and perfect flight, would disclaim his sympathy and declare him an outcast. To see men pursuing in faith their varied action, warm-hearted, providing for their children, loving their friends, performing their promises, what are they to this chill, houseless, fatherless, aimless Cain, the man who hears only the sound of his own footsteps in God's resplendent creation? To him it is no creation; to him these fair creatures are helpless spectres, he knows not what to make of it; to him heaven and earth have lost their beauty.—*The Preacher.*

28.—THE history of the world is nothing but a procession of clothed ideas.—*Preface, The Hundred Greatest Men.*

29.—EVERYTHING is superficial and perishes but love and truth only.—*Representative Men.*

30.—'TIS a long scale from the gorilla to the gentleman, from the gorilla to Plato, Newton, Shakspeare, to the sanctities of religion, the refinements of legislation, the summits of science, art and poetry. The beginnings are slow and infirm, but 'tis an always accelerated march.—*The Sovereignty of Ethics.*