

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXV.—No. 15

SUNDAY, APRIL 9, 1905

PRICE TWOPENCE

*Why should we shrink from what we cannot shun ?
Each hath its pang, but feeble sufferer's groan
With brain-born dreams of evil all their own.
Pursue what chance or fate proclaimeth best ;
Peace waits us on the shores of Acheron :
There no forced banquet claims the sated guest,
But silence spreads the couch of ever-welcome rest.*

—BYRON.

The Chestertonian Philosophy.

THAT versatile and voluble performer, Mr. G. K. Chesterton, has been at it again. Indeed, to speak correctly, he has never ceased. One loses count of all the columns of trash, some entertaining, some dull, which he has poured out during the last three or four years. He is here, there, and everywhere. By this time, of course, his eccentricities are known and noted by everybody who bothers about such things. His psychological type may be recognised at once; he is of the *genus* "literary." To speak with exactness, in him the stress of consciousness is not on *what* he is saying, but *how* he is saying it; on the form, not the substance. And this always leads him to sacrifice truth to the desire of saying a paradoxical or a "clever" thing. Only the other day Mr. William Archer was taking him to task, if I remember rightly, for some absurd antithesis in an essay of his which made it appear that Mohammedans were more drunken than Christians. As everyone is aware, of course, the drink evil is unknown in Mohammedan countries. Quite recently, for instance, Mr. Harold Spender, in the course of some impressions of travel in Egypt which he is contributing to the *Daily News*, brings out this aspect of Mohammedan civilisation. He is describing Cairo, and thus he writes:—

"Your general impression, indeed, amid all the squalor of this quarter is one of contentment. Work and ease—labor and leisure—seem to go hand in hand. Crowded into these narrow, fetid alleys, cramped within those mud walls, these Arabs still seem soberly happy. Why not? There is no 'housing' question in a land without rain or frost. The blue sky is their roof, and the sun gives them warmth. The only pressing need is shade; and that is amply provided by these flat roofs of brown palm leaves and mud-brick.

"But perhaps this is not the only source of their calm. Ride through this Arab quarter in every direction—you cannot walk—and you will nowhere find a drink shop of any kind. No fermented liquor penetrates here. Only the water-carrier and the vendor of colored syrups move through the lanes with their melancholy, soothing cries. It is a dry and thirsty air. But the Mahomedan is quite content.

"The religion of Mahomet has many faults, but is this a light achievement?"

In view of the centuries of Christian experience it is, indeed, a wonderful achievement. Whenever any attempt is made to give some tolerable evidence of moral betterment in connection with the Welsh "revival" the two results most harped upon are less swearing in the coal-pits and factories, and less drinking. But notwithstanding all the efforts of the inspired Evan Roberts plenty of liquor is still consumed in Wales, and the drink bill of Great Britain amounts, I believe, to something like £163,000,000 per annum. Catholic Ireland, too, a poor country

which needs all her resources, moral and material, spends an enormous sum annually on intoxicating drinks. Far be it from my purpose to disparage the work of those, whether lay or clerical, who in these countries seek to win the people to temperance. Yet the fact remains that the Christian God, overlooking his own people, has saved the "infidel dogs" of Mohammedans from the drink curse altogether. Nor has the example of Christians been yet able to corrupt Mohammedan states in this particular respect. In Cairo we may well be sure that in the European quarter and in the European hotels there is plenty of champagne and other wine consumed. But the Arab population remains sober, with the result that the description of the poorer quarters of Arab towns compares very favorably with that of Christian towns.

However, I have sadly wandered from my point, for I did not set out with the intention of comparing the results of Christianity and Mohammedanism. What I set out to do was to call attention to a recent article by Mr. Chesterton in the *Daily News* entitled "Short Cuts"—it might as appropriately have been "Comic Cuts"—in which is expounded Mr. Chesterton's idea of the proper frame of mind to adopt towards philosophical problems and, for that matter, all problems. Of course some reader may say that Mr. Chesterton will, as likely as not, contradict the doctrine he now lays down, to-morrow or next day. Very possibly. But on more than one occasion he has set forth this theory of life, if one may so describe it, and which he assures us is true mysticism; and in any case, whether he stands by it or not, it is the attitude of a good many people at the present day, and may thus be worth exposing.

Mr. Chesterton, after his manner, begins with an absurdity or fantasy: "It may easily happen to any of us (to take a simple example) to lock our maiden aunt in the pantry, and three minutes afterwards see her running with immense rapidity along a distant horizon." The frequency of such interesting happenings is confined, I imagine, to Mr. Chesterton's diverting articles. Anyhow, here is a problem. "What are we to do," asks Mr. Chesterton, "with a seeming contradiction?"

In dealing with this question Mr. Chesterton says humanity divides itself into four classes, which one may set out in numerical order, with the descriptions given of them:—

1. "The first class may be dismissed; they are the people who don't know and don't care, who come to no conclusion at all.....their refusal to make any working compromise unfits them for the forcible management of life."

2. The "severely rationalistic or logical." "These people when confronted with two facts which seem to contradict each other, assert one and deny the other." There is more description to which we shall return.

3. The people who, being "certain" of both contradictory experiences, "devote their lives to finding the reconciliation between them." This type, according to Mr. Chesterton, says: "I will study chemistry, biology, electricity, physics, metaphysics, demonology, and the development of the aunt in human history, and when I have found out, if I am not dead, I will let you know." "Of this class are the ardent young men in turned-down collars who are founding a new religion; of these are the short-sighted old men in the British Museum who are writing huge books on the reconciliation of Christianity and science."

4. Here we come to the class after Mr. Chesterton's

own heart. "The fourth class consists of those who accept the paradox as a paradox, stated as a paradox, and go on earning their bread and cheese. These are the mystics, the religious people, the believers in spiritual and transcendental enigma, and they do the whole work of the world."

Let us now examine these "classes" for a moment. The description of the first, though the phraseology in one or two points seems to indicate that Mr. Chesterton was trying to gibe at Agnostics, may be dismissed. They are the indifferent, the dullards, the hopelessly ignorant, and the people too lazy to think about anything at all. The second class are described as "severely rationalistic or logical," but in reality Mr. Chesterton merely exhibits to us the fact, of which we were aware before, that he does not understand these terms. The Rationalist does not *arbitrarily* select one of two apparently contradictory sense-impressions and declare that it is the only real one; he explains why he makes the selection and his explanation is "rational" only in so far as it covers *all* the facts.

As a matter of truth there is no philosophic distinction between the second and third classes enumerated by Mr. Chesterton. The people who seek rational explanations of "contradictions" and the people who seek to "reconcile" them, provided they are honest, are one and the same class. They are both seeking a philosophy, they are both satisfying perhaps the highest desire which man can feel, the desire for intellectual consistency and harmony.

The fourth class, however, the "mystics" and "religious people" are thus further described by Mr. Chesterton:—

"They say somewhat impatiently to the logicians, who deny the contradiction, and to the speculators, who hope to disentangle it, 'Oh, we have no time for all that. In the ordinary sense of the word, the shield is gold. In the ordinary sense of the word it is silver. Therefore, it is both, and there is an end of it. I feel I come from a cause. I also feel free, irresponsible. Therefore, I am both, and am going on with my dinner.'"

That is to say, Mr. Chesterton, the nimble "defender of the faith," writing in the goody-goody *Daily News*, holds up to our admiration as the true type which we are to emulate, the "gross materialist" (to use a mouthful beloved of the Churches) who is so enamored of his dinner that he has no time to bother over problems to which his "answer" is no answer at all. We are to "accept the paradox as a paradox, stated as a paradox." What can this mean but that we are to swallow the contradiction without seeking in any way to solve it? If this be mysticism, then "mysticism" is merely another name for intellectual laziness or intellectual incapacity. Some of us thought as much before, but Mr. Chesterton, who seems to speak *ex cathedra*, has now set it down in black and white. We always come back to this. The people who indulge in continual rhapsodising about "faith" and "soul," and the rest, generally end by asking us in the name of their "spiritual and transcendental enigmas" to thwart the noblest part of our nature and stultify that desire for knowledge which is in truth the very highest manifestation of mind. After all the airs of superiority which the spiritual and transcendental people give themselves it is rather a descent to hear it proclaimed that they only want to eat their dinners and their paradoxes at one sitting, in mindless complacency.

Just, however, as the 2nd and 3rd sections in Mr. Chesterton's classification are really sub-divisions of the same class, so the 1st and 4th sections are sub-divisions of the same. Between those who are too lazy to think (first class) and those who, in the intervals of eating and working, have no time to think (fourth class), there is really little to choose. Neither of them count in the republic of mind. If one must divide humanity arbitrarily, there are only two classes in the end, however variously they may be described—the thinkers and the dullards, the wise men and the fools, the idealists and the oppor-

tunists, the people who love justice and truth and the people who prefer to go on with their dinner. This division, of course, is arbitrary, and not all religionists are like Mr. Chesterton's No. 4 class. They do not all agree with his "transcendental" contempt for intelligence. There would be small hope for human progress if they did. But unquestionably large numbers do conform to his standard. They do—to vary his description—accept absurdities, as absurdities, stated as absurdities, and, when criticised, fall back on "mystery." They "believe," for instance, in a God who is all-powerful and all-good, yet permits evil; they believe in an Omnipotent Being who yet does not get his way, in a Creator who is yet not responsible for all his creations; and so forth. They do emphatically believe, or profess to believe, that the shield is all gold and all silver in the same relationship at the same time. And inasmuch as such pseudo-beliefs are bound up with vast economic interests, there are great temptations to profess them. But there is something in the heart and mind of man which is apparently not dreamt of in the Chestertonian philosophy—the desire for truth. It is this desire, substantially, which made all the religions, and it is this desire which to-day is shattering them. And there is a nobler ethic than that which orders us to deliberately rest in a muddle without even striving for a way out. Mr. Chesterton assures us that what may be called the doctrine of the "accepted muddle" is the very essence of that doctrine of muddle Mr. Chesterton can go on spinning nonsensical little essays arguing that black is really white, and that a circle properly understood is identical with a square. It is a species of more or less harmless trifling. To admit ignorance where our knowledge ends is one thing. To stultify our higher nature by pretending to believe contradictions is another. Those who urge us to the latter course thereby show that they have no appreciation of that passion for clearness and for truth which is of the very essence of all progress.

FREDERICK RYAN.

Mr. Holyoake's Memories.—II.

Bygones Worth Remembering. By George Jacob Holyoake. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 2 vols. £1 1s.

Some Minor Incidents.

MR. HOLYOAKE has edited papers of his own, including the once famous *Reasoner*. He has also been connected with various newspapers. Probably his strangest adventure in this line was his week's editorship of a London evening paper paradoxically called the *Sun*, which was then owned by Mr. Horatio Bottomley. "The Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker," Mr. Holyoake says, "had been my predecessor." He does not mention that Dan Leno was his successor. "I was left at liberty," he continues, "to say whatever I pleased, and I did. In one week I wrote twenty-nine articles. But opulent opportunity of working was afforded me. As I was paid ten times as much as I had received before, I thought myself in a paradise of journalism."

Amongst the minor personages whom Mr. Holyoake mentions is Thomas Allsop, who started the fund for purchasing him an annuity with a subscription of £200. This gentleman was the eldest son of Thomas Allsop, the friend of Coleridge. Being a man of fortune, the first Thomas Allsop was able to render "generous assistance" to Hazlitt, Coleridge, and Lamb. "He was a watchful assistant," Mr. Holyoake says, "of those who contributed to the public service without expecting or receiving requital. His admiration of genius always took the form of a gift—a rare but encouraging form of applause." Of this a singular instance is given. When Feargus O'Connor was elected member for Nottingham, Thomas Allsop qualified him by conferring upon him lands bringing an income of £300 a year. Nothing could be more practical than such generosity. To help those who help the world is probably the most certain way in

which a wealthy man could spend money to advantage.

Mr. Holyoake devotes a chapter to Francis Place, whom James Watson calls the "English Franklin." Place was a sturdy, hard-headed reformer. He was also a character. Some of his sayings are very pithy. One of them was: "A man who is always running after his character seldom has a character worth the chase." He told Mr. Holyoake that in the course of his career as defender of the people "he had been charged with every crime known to the Newgate Calendar except wilful murder." Place's sayings were of "great use" to Mr. Holyoake in after life. His own comment on these particular sayings is as follows:—

"A man who is 'always' vindicating himself becomes tiresome and ineffectual. Yet now and then, sooner or later, and often better later than sooner, a personal explanation may be useful. Printed actionable imputations were made against Cobbett of which no notice was taken—so far as I knew—which created in many minds an inextinguishable personal prejudice against him." This may mean that Cobbett should have started libel actions against his accusers. If that is Mr. Holyoake's opinion I dissent from it. A notorious heretic or reformer is, in my opinion, a fool to take his character into court and leave it at the mercy of popular prejudice in the jury-box and on the bench. If he loses his action he will be in a worse position than if he had never started it. If he wins it he may be made ridiculous by infinitesimal damages. He stands to lose more than he stands to gain, and sensible men will regard such a venture as very bad business. Those who champion unpopular causes must expect calumny. It is one of the penalties of their position. The best of them cannot escape it.

Mr. Holyoake himself speaks out very plainly against this evil tendency on the part of the upholders of established opinions, although he does so in a different connection:—

"Christians from the Vatican to the Primitive Methodist conventicle, are all so persuaded of the infallibility of their interpretation of the Scriptures, and are so convinced of the perfect sufficiency of their tenets for the needs of all the world, that they regard difference of opinion as springing from wilful misunderstanding, or from the 'evil heart at enmity with God'—a mad doctrine beneath the notice of the average lunatic. Natural variety of intellect, the infinite hosts of personal views, and the infinitude of personal experience—which silently create new convictions—are not taken into account, and conscientious dissent seems to the antediluvian theologian an impossibility. Even the most liberal of eminent Unitarians in England, W. J. Fox, regarded what we now know as the Agnostic hesitation to declare as true that which the declarer does not know to be so—as a species of mental disease."

This is well and boldly said, and I for one shall always applaud the patriarch of Secularism when he speaks in this vein.

The Martineaus.

James Martineau was a man of considerable powers of mind and of considerable learning, but I have always thought him greatly overrated. What Voltaire said—not truly, in my opinion—of Bolingbroke might be well applied to the long-lived Unitarian, who posed as a kind of a heretic and piled up a fairly big fortune. "Plenty of leaves," Voltaire said, "and little fruit." And the fact that James Martineau is now widely adopted as a semi-inspired teacher by leading preachers in the more orthodox Churches only serves to countenance my view of his character.

The attitude of James Martineau towards his sister Harriet is a fair practical illustration of the passage I have just quoted from Mr. Holyoake on Christian bigotry. Harriet Martineau—a woman of great ability and beautiful character—chose to avow her disbelief in Christianity. She did not call herself an Atheist, but she held views identical with those which Atheists have professed. "I do not say there is no God," she wrote, "but that it is extravagant and irreverent to imagine that cause a Person." "There is no theory of a God, of an author of Nature, of an origin of the universe," she said, "which is

not utterly repugnant to my faculties; which is not (to my feelings) so irreverent as to make me blush; so misleading as to make me mourn."

These passages occurred in a volume of Letters which she published in conjunction with Mr. H. G. Atkinson, who was the son of a London architect, and the possessor of means that enabled him to devote himself to philosophy. According to Mr. Holyoake—and this agrees with all I have ever heard—Mr. Atkinson was "a gentleman of as pure a life and of as good a position in society as Dr. Martineau himself." Yet what happened?

"Dr. Martineau wrote of his sister and her friend in terms which seemed, to the public, of studied insult and disparagement, which, in educated society, would be called brutal. It was merely spiritual malignity, of which I had in former years sufficient experience to render me a connoisseur in it. All the while Dr. Martineau had heresies of his own to answer for, yet he wrote words of his sister which no woman of self-respect could condone, unless withdrawn. During her long illness of twenty years Dr. Martineau, her brother, never wrote to her nor addressed one word of sympathy to one who loved him so well. He had told the world that 'the subtle all-penetrating spirit of Christ has an inspiring nobleness philosophy cannot reach, nor science, nor nature impart.' Then how came Dr. Martineau to miss it?"

He missed it because it has never inspired Christians in their treatment of unbelievers. Dr. Martineau was no exception to a ghastly rule.

Mr. Holyoake prints with justifiable pride a letter in defence of himself which Harriet Martineau wrote to the *Liberator* of New York in 1855. He also relates that Lord Melbourne, when she was a young woman, offered her a pension, which she "declined on the ground that a Government which did not represent the people had no right to give away their money." Few persons offered pensions have ever been troubled with such scrupulosity. I do not believe her pious brother would have been.

Mr. Holyoake waxes eloquent over Harriet Martineau. Like other women of thought, she "grew handsomer as she grew older," and acquired a "queenly dignity." One of her frequent visitors was Matthew Arnold, and it may have been from her (Mr. Holyoake thinks) that he gained his idea of "Sweetness and Light." In reality, however, Arnold took his "Sweetness and Light" from Swift—from whom he also took his distinction between Attic and Asiatic prose.

The Newmans.

There were three Newmans. John Henry became a Roman Catholic, Francis William was a Theist, and Charles an Atheist. Some remarkable articles by Charles Newman were printed in the *Reasoner*. Mr. Holyoake refers to their "republication by the late J. W. Wheeler"—meaning, of course, J. M. Wheeler. But they were really republished by myself, under the title of *Essays in Rationalism*, and are still in print. I engaged Mr. Wheeler to see the book through the press, and Mr. Holyoake to write it an Introduction. While the author was sending those articles to Mr. Holyoake he would at times say "My mind is leaving me, and when it returns to me a few months hence, I will send you a further paper." He knew when his trouble was approaching, as poor Mary Lamb did; but, in Mr. Holyoake's words, he had "the thoroughness of thought of his family." It is good to hear that

"The two brothers—the Cardinal and the Professor—united to supply Charles with an income sufficient for his needs. The Cardinal, though he knew Charles' opinions, readily joined."

Another thing is pleasant to hear, namely, that "When some questioning remark on Professor Newman was made incidentally in the House of Commons, in consequence of his uncompromising views, the Cardinal wrote saying that 'for his brother's purity he would die.'" Mr. Holyoake says that this "was very noble in the Cardinal," considering "their extreme divergence of opinion." But it was not surprising. Cardinal Newman was built on noble lines. He had the greater genius, and

I believe the finer character. That beautiful utterance of his about his brother Francis William is in strange contrast to the rather sneering tone in which the latter spoke of John Henry in later publications.

Mr. Holyoake had the highest admiration for Francis William Newman, with whom he was personally acquainted, and speaks of him in the same breath as Mazzini—which seems to me a little extravagant. "Theism," he says, "never seemed so enchanting in my eyes as it appeared in the lives of those two distinguished thinkers who were inspired by it."

It appears, however, that Professor Newman, in spite of his Theism, lost his hold on the belief in a future life at the end of his career. This change of opinion cost him, in his own words, the regard of all who did not know him intimately. Which reminds one of Swift's bitter epigram that most men have religion enough to make them hate each other.

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be concluded.)

The Clergy and Truth.

IT will be news to many that there exists a Christian organisation with the revolutionary motto of "Truth at any cost." Whether the resolve goes any deeper than the title may well be questioned; and one may be forgiven the suspicion that the promoters of the society in question—the Churchmen's Union—have followed Artemus Ward's plan in entitling his lecture "The Babes in the Wood." There was nothing about the Babes in the lecture; and Ward explained, after an eighty minutes' address, that, as he wanted to have them mentioned somewhere, he put them in the title. Or it may be an ordinary case of bluff, something similar to what is played in the flotation of many commercial concerns, where huge profits are shown and extravagant dividends promised, and which induce the "smart" investor to plank down his money with the feeling that if only a proportion of the prospectus is accurate a fair return is assured.

The truth is that very few do really expect the clergy to stick to the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It may be also true that the majority of people would hesitate to say with David, "All men are liars," with special reference to the clergy; but this does not do away with the accuracy of the first statement. It merely implies that in the case of the clergy there is a tacit recognition that their handling of truth is of a different nature to that of other people, and that the careful exactitude one expects from a man of science is not to be expected from an occupant of the pulpit. And in the case of the clergy themselves there has developed a certain class ethic which enables them to underestimate or to exaggerate, to suppress facts or to manufacture them, without forfeiting their self-respect or the respect of their associates. It is upon this principle only that one can account for the shoals of manufactured incidents that one meets with in sermons—the death-bed ravings for Jesus, the characters who are miraculously converted by a chance tract, etc., etc. Everyone knows that these things do not occur—that they are merely introduced into the sermon for sensational effect; and yet no one but the poor demoralised unbeliever ever thinks of them as what they are—lies.

Mr. Campbell, of the City Temple, related a story the other day which may or may not have been true, but which at all events was suggestive. He was, he said, at a public dinner with the Bishops of the Established Church. The company had adjourned to another room, and a highly placed civic official said to Mr. Campbell, "Well, we have heard all you have to say; we have listened to your encomiums on the Church, and everybody seems to agree that all is in order, that the Prayer Book just as it is represents the deepest experience of all the persons sitting at the table. Do ten of you really believe it?" One may reasonably doubt

whether any "high placed civic official" ever did put such a blunt question in a gathering of Bishops; but true or not, the question was suggestive and the doubt was excusable. Many have doubtless asked themselves exactly the same question, How many of the clergy believe in the Christianity they are paid for preaching? And if it has not been answered, it is because of the difficulty of realising either that educated men can believe orthodox Christian doctrines, or that deliberate lying can be so easy and so general.

Consider all that a belief in orthodox Christianity involves—miracles, inspiration, virgin birth, resurrection from the dead, with many other subordinate improbabilities and impossibilities. How many of the clergy believe these things? Some—a minority—may: but that the majority do not seems beyond question. They repeat the old phrases, and that is all. The resurrection that was accepted as a fact becomes in the face of criticism an imaginary occurrence. Miracles are merely misunderstood natural events; inspiration is a mere poetic figure; the authenticity of the Scriptures of no consequence. But meanwhile all the clergy in their sermons continue using the old language knowing that while they use it in one, and a reserved, sense, the hearers understand it quite differently; they continue their references to what "our Lord said," or what "Moses said," or to what the children of Israel did, knowing quite well that they are dealing with myth and not fact, and without for a moment realising what a colossal lie is their whole life and language.

For three things seem clear. First, that the clergy, big and little, are lying; second, that they would not lie to a similar extent about any matter other than religion; and, third, that it is therefore to be attributed immediately to a certain recognised pulpit ethic, and ultimately to the character of Christianity itself. I say these things are clear because I have a difficulty in believing that any large body of men could both act the lie and state the lie so systematically as do the clergy, if it were wholly conscious and deliberate. I find it much easier to believe that time and custom have so sanctified the religious habit of lying about one's opponents, of concealing a portion of the truth, or of ignoring it in the interests of religion, that it is no longer thought of as an outrage against morals.

But all this would be impossible if Christianity had insisted upon the exercise of ordinary intellectual virtues. But this it never has done, and never will. Its whole history has involved such a sacrifice of the higher intellectual virtues, that the Christian intellect has been given a chronic twist, and in connection with religion behavior is tolerated, even applauded, which would be warmly denounced elsewhere. The duty of truth-seeking and truth-speaking has never been systematically encouraged by the Christian Churches, while independent mental activity has usually been vigorously denounced. Like all unintellectual individuals and systems, it has concentrated attention upon certain surface moralities, without perceiving that intellectual activity and honesty is a very essential part of a healthy progressive morality, and has thus struck, although unconsciously, at the very foundations of conduct.

In the same sermon from which I have already quoted, Mr. Campbell has something to say on the attitude of the modern press. He narrates a conversation with "One of the greatest newspaper forces in London," who told him that any one of his staff had to write exactly what was required of him. "What about his God?" "He must write what I want." "What about his principles?" "He must write to mine, and mine are what the public wants." And this conversation is preceded by the remark that he (Mr. Campbell) has the greatest pity for journalists because they are getting their living by writing what they don't believe.

Although one finds it again impossible to avoid the suspicion that this conversation with the Editor of a great London paper, who so frankly, on a first meeting, too, labelled himself a hypocrite, is apocry-

phal, it undoubtedly represents a truth. Newspaper editors *do* provide what the public require, the staff of writers *do* write what the editor demands, whether they believe in it or not, the press is honeycombed with hypocrisy and falsehood, and one of the greatest humbugs of to-day is the belief in the English Press as a leader and educator of public opinion. But admitting all this, one may ask why is it so? If newspaper editors and writers lie for a living it must be because a Christian public will not grant them a living so long as they speak the truth. With the exception of a paper like the *Daily News*, which misrepresents Freethought and suppresses facts that may tell against Christianity, on Christian principles, the ordinary secular press is acting in a similar manner chiefly because a Christian public would decline to purchase if they acted otherwise. If people are compelled to lie for a living part of the responsibility must always rest with those to whom the lie is told.

But why single out the secular press? Is the religious press any better? Does anyone expect the truth about Catholics from a Protestant paper? Do we get the exact truth about Dissenters from the *Church Times*, or the exact truth from the *Methodist Times* or the *Christian World* about Episcopalians? Do we get the truth from any of them about the Freethinkers? Is there any of them who are helping to force a man like Torrey to tell the truth? Are they not all lying, negatively or positively, week in and week out, and more detestable lying than even the secular press, because it is wrapped up in such a quantity of moral cant.

Here, then, is the simple and obvious moral of the whole story. Press, pulpit, and public are honeycombed with mental dishonesty, because in dealing with our present-day population we are dealing with a mentally debauched public. Surely it is plain that had Christianity, during its long career, insisted upon the duties of intellectual independence and culture, the mentally honest man would not to-day be so great a rarity as he is. We cannot escape our heredity, and we cannot escape our surroundings. Christian influences have in the past, and still in the present, make speaking the whole truth the most expensive luxury in which one can indulge. The mass of the people have no real desire for truth, because the instinct has never been cultivated. And the responsibility for this, again, rests with Christianity. It is Christian influence that insists on the press suppressing anti-Christian views and pandering to its religious prejudices. It is Christian influence that boycotts Freethought literature and refuses an opposite opinion a hearing. It is Christian influence in its shortsighted view of life that always has, and always will, make for the mental degeneration of the race.

C. COHEN.

Jesus and the Race-Factor.

THE theories that cluster round the person of Jesus are well-nigh innumerable. There is no agreement among his disciples as to the category in which to place him. To some, perhaps to the majority of professing Christians, He is "very God of very God" manifested in human flesh. These clothe him with all the attributes which Deity is supposed to possess; and his earthly life is looked upon as the supreme miracle in history. Others locate him midway between God and man. To them He is absolutely unique, forming a category by himself. In other words, He is more than man but less than God. To others still, He is man at his highest and best, or ideal man. They adore him as the perfect teacher, the faultless example, the supreme object of imitation.

Such, in brief, is the history of what is called the science of Christology. The above three schools of thought have always existed in the Church; and they have ever been, and, to a certain extent, still are, at fierce war with one another. Each claims to

be an accurate inference from or interpretation of the teaching of the New Testament; and each anathematizes the other two in the Holy Name. Even to-day the Unitarians are not included in the membership of the National Council of Free Churches. Evangelical divines classify Unitarians as dangerous heresiarchs.

Now, the very existence of these irreconcilable Christological schools is a conclusive proof that no definite knowledge of the person of Jesus is practicable. No school can boast of infallibility, although there are representatives of each school who write and speak as if to them alone the truth had been revealed. It never occurs to such a man as Dr. Torrey, for example, that it is within the range of possibility for *him* to be mistaken; and so he lashes all who differ from him with the whip of scorn and fury.

There is one point, however, on which all the schools are practically at one. They all alike contend that in some way or other Jesus is closely related to the human race, and acts as mediator between God and it. Even the Unitarians join in making this claim for him. To orthodox divines, however, the perfect humanity of Jesus is the strongest evidence for his divinity. In a recent Manchester Christian Defence Lecture, entitled, "Jesus Christ as the Son of Man: His Relation to the Race-Factor," this point is discussed with much vigor and eloquence. The lecturer is the Rev. Herbert B. Workman, M.A., Principal of Westminster Normal College and Member of the Divinity Faculty in London University; and I candidly acknowledge that he has stated his argument with great intellectual clearness and emotional force. Indeed, the merits of this lecture are of a specially high order: it has plausibility, lucidity, and fire. But when we come to the core of the argument we are woefully disappointed. It is an argument to which history gives the direct lie. Strictly speaking, it is not an argument at all, but a series of dogmatic assertions. If these assertions had only been true, an irresistible argument could have been built upon them; but as a matter of simple fact, they are the opposite of true.

Mr. Workman's central assertion is that "there is in Jesus Christ and his religion a universality which overleaps all race limitations." "The universal character of Christ," he says, "as distinct from the racial hero or the founder of a sectional and limited faith is, in a word, my argument." But this contention is not substantiated by facts. Jesus has never enjoyed universal recognition. After two thousand years two-thirds of our race do not know him. Even in Christendom his followers do not form more than about one in five of the population. The nation from which He sprang will have none of him. In Great Britain alone there are thousands upon thousands who profess unbelief in him. Bishop Diggle and General Booth have recently admitted, with mournfulness of heart, that the Christian religion is "a dismal failure." On what ground, then, does Mr. Workman regard Jesus as a universal character?

The lecturer makes much of the expression, "The Son of Man," as appropriated by Jesus in speaking of himself. "Bible readers," we are told, "are well aware that this title, 'Son of Man,' is our Lord's own favorite title, the title which no less than thirty times in the Gospel of St. Matthew alone we find our Lord giving to himself." Well, what does this title signify? Mr. Workman answers: "I need not say that it does not mean that Jesus Christ was man. Our Lord would not have needed to have gone out of his way thirty times or more merely to tell the people that He was bone of their bone, flesh of their flesh." Again:—

"It was left for Jesus to take this title, to enlarge it, enrich it, and apply it to himself. Son of Man, because no man's son, but child of the human race! Son of Man, because in him mankind finds the epitome of all that makes man man, the embodiment of every ideal. Son of Man, because only by touch with him, only by imitation of him, will man as man ever find his own true self."

That is a beautiful picture, and no doubt the majority in the Central Hall audience were delighted with it. I remember reading a similar description in some of Frederick Robertson's Brighton sermons. Many other divines have written and spoken to the same effect. But Mr. Workman omits to inform us that this phrase, Son of Man, found in the Gospels some eighty-one times, has been and is the occasion of endless and most heated controversy among Biblical scholars. No one can read Professor N. Schmidt's exhaustive treatise on it, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, without perceiving that he must be an audacious man who ventures to base a theological argument on so debatable a phrase. Some critics are of opinion that Jesus never employed this title at all. Others maintain that many of the passages in which it occurs are glosses or interpolations. Others argue that it was adopted by the compilers of the Gospels as a synonym of some now unknown phrase by which Jesus characterised himself. In the face of all this divergence of opinion, Mr. Workman gives his interpretation of the title as if it were the undoubted interpretation of Jesus himself.

Believing that Jesus claimed to be the one universal man, Mr. Workman proceeds to belittle other great men, in order that the infinitely superior glory of the man of Nazareth might shine with all the greater brightness. Shakespeare was an Englishman, and suffers loss in consequence. Dante was an Italian, and it is absolutely impossible to forget the fact in reading his immortal works. Cromwell was a Puritan, and only Puritans can fully appreciate him. But Jesus belongs to the entire race.

"Once, once only in all this time has there come one whom all men can understand; who is neither Jew nor Gentile, nor Roman, nor Greek, nor French, nor German, nor Englishman, nor Irishman; but with whom every race—Jew, Gentile, Roman, Greek, French, German, Russian, Japanese—feel perfect affinity..... Son of Man, for the life-blood of every nation flows in his veins. Son of Man, because all that is best and truest and tenderest in human life in every age and every clime finds in him its perfect expression. Son of Man, because East and West and North and South, white man, black man, and yellow man, those who dwell around the frozen Poles, those who wander amid the sands of Sahara, all alike feel—and it is true of no other one in this world—that He supplies their perfect ideal. Son of Man, because He is the magnetic centre to which every quivering heart is drawn, the hope of universal men through twenty centuries."

Here, indeed, is transparent clearness, but conjoined with transparent nonsense. Mr. Workman cannot but know that he is idealising. What right has he to speak for the 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 Buddhists in the world, or for the 200,000,000 Hindus, or for the 155,000,000 Mohammedans, or for several millions of other non-Christians? By what authority does he presume to represent people he has never seen, and concerning whom he possesses at best but little knowledge? He must know that millions of Indians look down upon and despise both the religion and the culture of the West; and the treatment meted out to them by many Christian whites is not likely to result in many conversions to the Galilean. It is a verifiable fact that the Japanese, for example, do not "feel perfect affinity" with Jesus Christ. The same thing can truthfully be said of the Jews and the Mohammedans. It would be sheer nonsense to assert the opposite.

Mr. Workman calls Jesus the "human link," although it is not easy to discover what he exactly means by the expression. Jesus has entirely failed to link the human race with himself, and He has equally failed to link them with one another. In what sense, then, can He be a human link when He cannot do a link's work? Although Mr. Workman makes this high claim for Jesus, he virtually admits that it is not true. Jesus "is the link, the human link in life to-day," he says, "as He has been for twenty centuries." Then he deliberately contradicts himself thus:—

"Look round on life. Think of the gulfs which separate the different classes of men, even if you restrict your outlook to the life in our own island. How

our social life is split up, like those volcanic plains of which we see pictures in physical geography text books, by great fissures, fissures made by fire between the tongues of land. And think of how the wider life of men in different countries is split up by even wider fissures. How we go through life with labels on our backs, like the bottles in a chemist's shop—political labels, social labels, intellectual labels; and how men rejoice in these labels, these signs of classification and division, and think that therein is truth."

How true to life that picture is; but how very strange that Mr. Workman did not realise that in drawing it he was furnishing his hearers with the strongest possible argument against the Christ and the power of his religion. The present condition of society in Christian countries is irresistibly eloquent in its proclamation of the fact that Jesus is *not* "the magnetic centre to which every quivering heart is drawn," and that He is *not* "the universal link of man and woman in every age." The most wonderful thing of all, however, is that, having painted that sombre picture of modern life, Mr. Workman goes on to say that Christianity is the supreme unifying force in the Universe. "Do politics unite?" he asks. "You laugh. There is nothing that divides as politics. Does wealth unite? Wealth is the accursed gulf that separates class from class, and man from man, that has given us in London our West End, with its unlimited and selfish wealth, and our East End, with its awful and degrading squalor." Again, I say, how true to life the picture is! But among all the forces that divide and create accursed gulfs, the first and chief is religion. Religion allows social inequalities and class jealousies and hatreds to prevail, and is productive of a huge crop of divisions and antagonisms peculiarly its own. No quarrels are so persistent and malignant as religious quarrels. Political factions are not one quarter as numerous as Christian sects, nor are they nearly as sharply distinguished. And yet, in spite of all this, Mr. Workman exclaims: "There is only one human link that binds men everywhere, that bridges all gulfs, that stretches over all the centuries, and knits together all the continents: it is the Son of Man..... Son of Man, because overleaping all barriers and all distinctions, He draws to himself, links with himself and with each other, universal manhood everywhere." An exquisitely beautiful dream, a fascinating romance, an enrapturing ideal; but as a veritable fact of history it has never been incarnate in this world yet. It is a dream, and nothing more.

As a Christian apology this lecture is a signal failure. It is up among the clouds and makes light of the grim realities below. It does not appeal to the Infidel at all. It will only perplex and bewilder the doubter. It may confirm and comfort those who prefer to keep their mental eyes shut and live in the dark. Its argument for the divinity of Jesus falls to the ground, because the foundation on which it is made to rest has not been and cannot be securely laid. We say nothing against Jesus, our sole point being that He has not been "the universal link of man and woman in all ages." J. T. LLOYD.

Acid Drops

John Hutchinson, who horribly murdered Albert Matthews, a boy of five, at Nottingham, was duly hung in Bagthorpe Prison on March 28. Before his execution he wrote a letter to the parents of the murdered child begging their forgiveness. Not that it mattered much whether they gave it or not, for "I know," he said, "that God has forgiven all my past sins." He felt sure that he was going to "meet his Father in Heaven." The Bishop of Southwell seems to have thought so too. He went over from Derby and confirmed Hutchinson in the condemned cell, and gave him the Holy Sacrament just before he was jerked to Jesus.

"Bishop on Lying" was the headline of a small paragraph in the *Daily Chronicle* of March 30. "The Bishop of Chichester," the paragraph ran, "speaking at a confirmation service at Cuckfield, Sussex, yesterday, said he much regretted to have to say that there were many Christian people who thought nothing of lying. There were many other

things of which they were ashamed, but they did not blush when they told lies." Was he thinking of Dr. Torrey?

The Lord gave Evan Roberts the straight tip at last, and he hurried off to Liverpool, where he had long been expected; from which we infer that the Welsh revivalist is a first-rate advertiser. His first meeting in the Calvinistic Methodists' chapel, in the Prince's-road, was described in *Daily News* as follows:—

"Mr. Evan Roberts' intervention in the service was most dramatic. For nearly an hour he had sat silent and unseen in the pulpit while the congregation were singing. Then he sprang to his feet as though he had received an electric shock, and for a quarter of an hour he spoke on the imperative duty of obedience to the promptings of the Spirit.

"When he had concluded, several women, some of them refined and well-to-do, gave vent to their overwrought feelings by reciting verses and portions of hymns.

"A lull followed, and then came the most dramatic scene of the evening. 'Come, come,' said the evangelist, 'the Spirit insists on being obeyed.' Then, leaning forward on the pulpit edge, he waited. Almost instantly men and women broke forth into prayer—plaintively, vehemently, heartbroken—everywhere pleading, amid loud cries of 'Amen, amen.'"

"This continued for an hour, relieved occasionally by a burst of congregational singing."

Such is the emotional debauchery which now passes muster as the highest religion.

Mr. Evan Roberts had another mad struggle in the pulpit on Saturday night at Liverpool. It was the first of April, and he rose to the occasion. He stood up in the pulpit, stopped the singing, and exclaimed, "There are five Church members here who have not prayed, and some are envious because of the conversions that have taken place. There must be no singing till these people have prayed for forgiveness." Calling out that they were "obstructing the Holy Spirit," he threw himself on his knees and groaned aloud. His colleagues tried to pacify him, but it was all no good. Presently he said that three of the wicked five were "preachers of the Gospel." Then he took to sobbing, and that cleared the air a bit, and soon afterwards he let the service continue. Unless this evangelist is shamming, he is certainly graduating fast for another place than the kingdom of heaven. And what is to be thought of the old practitioners of salvation who trade on the antics of this hysterical lad?

"Revival Anecdotes" is at present finding a weekly place in *Pearson's Weekly*. Mr. Alexander, Torrey's singing partner, is their author, and he is responsible for the following. A young lady in business with her sister in Glasgow had systematically robbed the latter until she had banked £130. Then she came to the mission and was, of course, seized by the spirit of God, and immediately went home and gave up the money to her sister. This is a very pretty story, only it strikes one that the Spirit of God would have done better work had it got to work when the stealing first began. But then it would have spoiled the story in *Pearson's Weekly*. Hence the delay. The worst of these stories is the ease with which they might have been told. Evangelists are as a rule healthy liars, but they are such inartistic ones. The end of the story is that the other sister—the one who had been robbed—finding what an excellent and inexpensive cash register the Lord was, also became converted.

The character of many of Torrey's converts is shown by the complaint of the *Church Times* that at Liverpool many of the "penitents" who had been in the habit of attending a High Church were solemnly warned to stay away in the future. No doubt these were some of the hardened Atheists captured by the gallant Torrey.

Dr. Aked is back again at his chapel in Pembroke-place, Liverpool, after another sojourn to Switzerland for the benefit of his health. We do not begrudge Dr. Aked his holiday, and we are pleased to hear that his health has improved. But what of the text of his sermon, "He leadeth me beside still waters, He restoreth my soul"? We are somewhat at a loss to find out what "He" had to do with Mr. Aked's recovery, especially as he was under medical attention all the time. One would have thought, too, that "He" might have effected the cure in Liverpool. Besides, there is a strong suspicion of egotism in the belief that God takes special care of Dr. Aked, and leads him to the "still waters" of the Swiss lakes, and leaves others to get better how and when they may. But egotism is always a strong feature of religious belief.

The outcry over the acceptance of the 100,000 dollars offered by Mr. Rockefeller to the Boston Congregationalists has ended as we anticipated it would—in the acceptance of

the money. As a matter of fact part of it had already been spent on foreign missions before the committee sat to decide whether it should be accepted or not. We are somewhat surprised that so much fuss has been made over the matter. Mr. Rockefeller, it is true, is noted for his unscrupulous business methods, but he certainly is not worse, in principle, than thousands of others whose money the churches take; and, after all, he is a sincere and earnest believer, and a most energetic Sunday-school teacher.

According to a Laffan telegram, the Brooklyn police made a raid on a house where a prize fight was suspected to be taking place. They found a decorous assembly engaged in singing hymns. A prominent sportsman sang the "Glory Song," which was followed by prayers. Had one or two got up and told some Dr. Torrey lies about Paine and Ingersoll the police would probably have been thrown right off the scent. But the failure to do that left a suspicion still lurking in their minds. So they lifted up the carpet and discovered a chalk ring, and also found a couple of battered bruisers in a cupboard. Moral: Glory Songs won't do without some rousing lies about "infidels."

There is a picture in the *Methodist Times* in connection with the revival at Lowestoft. Two gentlemen—one a man of God, judging by his attire—are shouldering the handles of an advertising structure bearing these remarkable words: "Conversion is a Scientific Fact as much as is Magnetism." Well, we have heard people say that Evan Roberts is "magnetic"—though we have not heard whether he gives off sparks in the dark. But the funniest part of this account of the Lowestoft revival comes at the very end, where it is stated that "immediate steps" are being taken "to renovate and furnish the infant schoolroom for the use of the new converts." The infant schoolroom is probably the right place for them.

The Gainsborough Branch of the Primrose League form a nice religious happy family. At their meeting the other evening a Mr. Pettifer observed that in the Primrose League there is room enough for "Methodists, Baptists, Roman Catholics, and Anglicans, but they had no room for Atheists or infidels, or anyone opposed to religious teaching in the public schools." Now, on consideration, we are not surprised at the above statement. An honest man, one who stood up for justice, would be out of place in such a crowd. We can equally appreciate Bill Sykes declaring to his "pals" that at the "Pig and Whistle" there was room for burglars, bruisers, watch-snatchers, and shop-lifters, but they had no room for policemen, detectives, "coppers' narks," or anyone opposed to the free exercise of such predatory talents as Providence had blessed them with.

There is really no limit to the insolence of religious busybodies. At the meeting of the Presbytery of Glasgow a Professor Cooper said that the report of the Registrar-General which was published some ago showed that a large proportion of those marriages which were contracted irregularly by so-called license before the sheriff without the blessing of God asked upon them, turned out so unhappily that they afterwards came up for revision—if it might be so called—in the Divorce Court. Lamb's comment, when bored by the praises of a, to him, unknown minister, was that he didn't know him, "but damn him at a venture." We have not seen the report in question, but we have no hesitation in branding what is involved in the statement as a falsehood, and one of a peculiarly mean and detestable kind. We are not concerned in disputing that some who are married before a Registrar afterwards appear in the Divorce Court. But we challenge Professor Cooper, or anyone else, to show that the proportion is larger than among those married in church with full religious ceremony. Such slanders upon thousands of decent men and women who have gone through a perfectly legal and binding ceremony are intolerable, and would not be listened to by any but a religious gathering where a sense of justice is reduced to as small a point as possible, and where a sense of common decency does not, apparently, exist.

"Secular or Religious Education?" was the title of a special article in a recent number of the *Methodist Times*. Our contemporary notes with regret that "secular education" has many friends among Congregationalists and Baptists, that it "raised its head at the recent meetings of the Free Church Council in Manchester," and that it found some favor in the Committee of the National Liberal Federation at Crewe. These facts are held to show the necessity of exposing the pretensions of a policy that would take away religion from "the notice of the school children." And our contemporary sets itself to work upon this necessary exposure.

In the first place, the *Methodist Times* remarks that "the distinction between things sacred and secular becomes thinner every day." Christians are carrying their Christianity into political and municipal life. Yes, that is true, up to a point. They are not trying to make the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount prevail, for that is absurdly impossible; but they are doing their best to carry the sectional spirit of Church and Chapel into the public affairs of the nation, to the detriment of the true spirit of citizenship. Instead of the Church theory breaking down, it is the Chapel theory that is coming to grief. The *Methodist Times* positively sneers at "the extreme technical theory of the abstinence of the State in matters of religion." Evidently the new Nonconformity has bidden the old Nonconformity farewell. Religion is henceforth to derive all the advantage it can from State assistance. The only question at issue is whether Church or Chapel shall get the lion's share of the advantage.

The *Methodist Times* proceeds to argue that subjects like writing and arithmetic can be taught "without trenching on religion," but other subjects cannot, and certainly reading cannot. Now we beg to point out that this is the Roman Catholic theory. Abstractly, the Roman theologians argue, the State is separate from the Church; but practically all questions run up into morals, and, as the Church controls men in the moral sphere, it cannot help controlling them indirectly in the social and political spheres. Thus do the old Romanists and the new Methodists reach out and shake hands with each other at last.

The real enemy to be fought, according to the *Methodist Times*, is not religion but clericalism. But what does this really mean? Does it mean anything more than than the Chapel trade hatred of the Church? And is this worthy of much respect? How can it be "clericalism" if the Bishop of London and his friends control the nation's schools, and "religion" if Dr. Clifford and his friends control the nation's schools? How is it possible for outsiders to view the struggle in that light?

As the *Methodist Times* article is carefully and ably written, in its way, we venture to quote a passage which shows what he and those he speaks for are driving at:—

"It is their place [Nonconformists] to hold the balance true, to insist that religion does not mean Church domination, but is the common property and the common inspiration of both Church and State, and, liberating education from clerical control, boldly to place that religious education which is our common heritage in the hands of the lay teachers, by knowledge of their Bible to keep the children in touch with the society around them in which they are, as men and women, to live and work, and at last to prepare the ground for those religious influences on character which the Churches are always striving to bring to bear."

This is a roundabout way of saying that the State schools are to be turned into feeders of the Churches. The nation's educational machinery is to be captured in order that the children may be trained into becoming customers at the various religious establishments as they grow up to be men and women. That is what the new Nonconformists want; and they want in addition to have equality of opportunity in the scramble for the children; that is to say, all Christian Churches are to have an advantage over all Non-Christians, but no Christian Church is to have an advantage over any other Christian Church. There is to be honor amongst

Nonconformists believe that this little game can be worked by means of the Bible. But they do not mean to stop at the Bible if it is safe to go farther. With their simple Bible reading they always combine, where they can, simple Christian hymns and simple Christian prayers. These are the men, therefore, that the friends of Secular Education have to fear and fight. We all know the Catholic Church and the Church of England; the one is a tiger, and the other a wolf; but the so-called Free Church is a wily serpent, which is quite as deadly and infinitely more sinister. Let us always be on our guard against it.

Your Free Church man of God is very fond of talking against "priests," while dressing and behaving as much like one, as his particular public will stand. But what is a priest? A priest is simply a person "in holy orders" above the rank of a deacon. Milton was a true scholar, as well as a shrewd hitter, when he said that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large." This was sound etymology and sound sense. As a matter of fact, there never was another priestly tyranny so absolute as that of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. And the pious Scotch "meenisters" thought they were going to set it up in England too; only they had to

reckon with Oliver Cromwell and his Ironsides, and got a terrible banging instead of the success they anticipated.

The Free Church "priest" talks about the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. You would fancy, if you didn't know him, that he meant people to read it for themselves and believe it as they pleased. But that is not his policy. Ruskin pointed out, in the *Bible of Amiens*, that the Protestant pastor has a trick of his own which is a good deal like that of the Catholic priest:—

"The Protestant reader, who most imagines himself independent in his thought, and private in his study, of Scripture, is nevertheless usually at the mercy of the nearest preacher, who has a pleasant voice and ingenious fancy; receiving from him thankfully, and often reverently, whatever interpretation of texts the agreeable voice or ready wit may recommend: while, in the meantime, he remains entirely ignorant of, and if left to his own will, invariably destroys as injurious, the deeply meditated interpretations of Scripture which, in their matter, have been sanctioned by the consent of all the Christian Churches for a thousand years."

The Catholic Church has one Pope; the Protestant Churches have thousands of Popes.

The way in which history is "doctored" to fit in with Christian claims has been often pointed out in these columns. A recent issue of the *Academy*, reviewing two books by Protestant writers on John Knox, gives a further illustration of the same point. In spite of many expressions, and even actions, that might be cited—notably the famous declaration that any godly person might lawfully kill a Catholic—the reverend writer asserts that Knox "never encouraged bloodshed." Of Knox's share in the actual forgery of the Great Seal, or of his deliberately making promises and afterwards breaking them, as well as the low and abusive tone of a good deal of Knox's writing, not a hint is given. To give only one more instance. Knox said that a few days after a sermon by him Mary's legs and stomach began to swell, and his biographer blandly asserts that a few days after a sermon by Knox "the Queen Regent was smitten with disease"; the truth being that Mary was seized with dropsy before Knox's sermon, and the reformer merely prophesied after the event. It is, of course, impossible for modern writers to reproduce the language of many of the sixteenth and seventeenth century religious writers; but in common practice some hint of this difficulty should be given to the uninformed reader. Judging from the *Academy's* review, the two books mentioned form a justification of the phrase "Christian truth." It is different to truth in general.

Robert Adams, formerly landlord of the "Engineers' Arms" at Nelson, Lancashire, was buried at Aberdeen, but, the ruling passion being strong in death, his ghost has turned up at the old "pub." Witnesses say they have seen him working the beer engine by night, while others have seen him drinking the new landlord's liquor. Going to see the ghost is a popular recreation at Nelson. We fancy, therefore, it will be a long time before the ghost gets "laid." There's money in him.

Rev. Arnold Streuli, a Moss Side Baptist minister, and a Passive Resistance martyr, has done two days' imprisonment, and it seems to have fairly broken him up. He says he would rather lose a year's salary than undergo another term. He found fault with the cocoa, the bread, and the warders. Poor man! He has our sympathy. We pity his awful sufferings.

The *Methodist Times* is much concerned, with Mr. Perks, over the incursions of Roman Catholics into this country, and also over the growth of Monastic establishments. We are not concerned for the moment whether the statement that this increase really is a social and political danger is correct or not, although our opinion is that it is a grave danger when there is an increase in any form of Christianity. For the moment it is enough to point out that the danger results simply and entirely from the increase in numbers of a particular Christian sect. And this is a clear proof of either injustice or social danger from Christian belief.

We referred last week to the case of Albert Edward Veal, market gardener, of Botany Bay, Sholing, Essex, who mutilated himself with a knife after reading the Bible, and died from loss of blood. We have since seen a local paper containing full details. The principal witness, his wife, Elizabeth Veal, said that deceased "had been bad in his head for the past fortnight through reading the Bible." "It was only since the revival at Sholing," she added, "that the deceased had been weak in his mind." This revival case will not be paraded by Dr. Torrey at the Brixton mission.

Mr. Foote's Lecturing Engagements.

April 16, Manchester; 30, Liverpool. May 7, Stratford Town Hall.

To Correspondents.

- C. COHEN'S LECTURING ENGAGEMENTS.—Address, 241 High-road, Leyton.—April 9, Glasgow; 16, Liverpool; 17 and 18, Debate at Skipton; 23, a., Victoria Park, e., Stratford Town Hall; 29, Hetton-le-Hole; 30, South Shields; 30, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
- J. LLOYD'S LECTURING ENGAGEMENTS.—April 30, Stratford Town Hall; May 7, Merthyr Tydfil; 21, Failsforth.
- H. MAYES.—Ingersoll simply did what many have done before—namely David Hume, the Freethinker, and John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's. He discussed the question whether suicide was a sin; that is, whether it could never be otherwise. To suppose that his Essay is the principal cause of suicide in America is one of those extravagances that may be expected from theologians. You will read the Essay and judge for yourself. We are unable to tell you what the reverend gentleman meant by his reference to Huxley.
- J. HARRISON.—Thanks for cutting. You can get a beautiful edition of Paine's *Age of Reason* from our publishing office for sixpence. The postage is twopence extra.
- H. W. SHARP.—Sent as requested. Thanks. We note that you are glad to see we "keep pegging away at Torrey."
- R. J. HOWELLS.—Get our *Bible Romances* (6d.) and *Bible Handbook* (1s. 6d.) first. You will find them very useful in your discussions with Christians. Thanks for cutting.
- TOM JACKSON.—Cuttings are always welcome. Thanks also for address.
- OUR ANTI-TORREY MISSION FUND.—Previously acknowledged, £98 5s. 11d. Received this week: A. Clarke 1s., J. H. Wigglesworth 1s., Major John C. Harris, R.E. £5, H. W. Sharp 1s., A. Lewis 2s. 6d., F. Schaller 2s., A. Baker 2s. 6d., J. Dunn 2s. 10d., Anti-Revival Committee (Glasgow) 4s., J. Greeves Fisher 3s. 5d., E. Dawson 1s., H. C. 2s. 6d., F. Wood 2s. 6d., R. Green 9s. 6d., L. Devereux 2s. 6d., H. R. C. 1s., W. S. T. 1s., G. Cook 1s., H. Fewster 1s., R. E. D. 5s., G. Brady £1. Per D. Baxter: Thompson 2s., Brown 1s.
- R. E. HOLDING.—Thanks for letter and cuttings. It was worthy of the *Express* to print that statistical table of Albert Hall proceedings. What tickled us most was "Words uttered by Dr. Torrey, 500,000." The grains of sense in them were not computed. Uttering so many words in a given time is a game in which many certified lunatics could beat Dr. Torrey hollow.
- J. A. MORRIS.—It is really too late to report in the *Freethinker* of April 9 a funeral that took place in Greater London on March 17. We are sorry, but we must observe the elementary rules of serious journalism.
- H. COWELL.—Mr. Foote was not invited to the Bradlaugh Dinner in London last autumn; consequently he did not "decline" the invitation. We believe the Dinner took place while he was attending the Rome Congress. You are quite right in supposing that Mr. Foote's admiration of Charles Bradlaugh can hardly be excelled by that of "some who now profess so much." Last week's *Freethinker* is a sufficient proof of that—if it were necessary.
- E. JAGGEL.—Thanks. Some of these Passive Resistance "martyrs" are wonderfully heroic. Their Savior doesn't appear to have said as much about his crucifixion as they do about a few days in one of the King's Hotels.
- W. BINDON.—The facts about Robert Pitman were printed in our last issue. We do not feel called upon to give an opinion on the extract you send us.
- W. P. PEARSON.—Pleased to see the "conspiracy of silence" breaking down, however slightly, at Liverpool. The famous Pliny passage has been questioned by more than one scholar. It was even questioned by the aristocratic translator of the current English version of the Epistles. The profoundly suspicious feature is the bringing of Christians before Pliny's tribunal at a time when there was no law or edict against them. Moreover, the reference to "torture" is out of all harmony with Pliny's mild and humane character.
- H. CROFT.—You must judge for yourself. It is not possible for us to assure you that a judge would not be prejudiced against you by your affirming instead of swearing. Some judges are first-class bigots. All we can say is that you are entitled to affirm if you choose to do so.
- J. L. G. MACKINNON.—cuttings are always welcome.
- W. P. BALL.—Always glad to receive your cuttings.
- F. SCHALLER sends us 2s. for our Anti-Torrey Mission Fund, being the amount handed him by a Torreyite outside the Albert Hall for a dozen copies of our pamphlets, which the said Torreyite stated he was going to "destroy," although he was told that the 2s. would print more than a dozen fresh copies. We are prepared to supply Torreyites with any quantity on the same terms.
- J. WEBSTER.—Hardly up to publication mark.
- G. A. ALDRED.—We are overcrowded with copy at present, but may have more space by-and-by.
- E. H. JOHNSTON, 69 Joicey-terrace, Oxhill, Stanley, invites members of the Stanley Branch and friends to meet at his residence to-day (April 9) at 2.30 p.m., with a view to reorganising Freethought work in the district.

T. E. MILLER, staiticer, King-street, Wigan, will be glad to supply customers with the *Freethinker* and other Secular literature. This correspondent begs us not to relax our efforts to expose Dr. Torrey, as our articles in this direction are "widely read and admired." The question is asked "Has Mr. Foote lectured at Wigan before, and where?" Yes, a great many years ago, in the Miners' Institute, we believe. Of course he has no objection to visiting Wigan again.

OLD SUBSCRIBER.—The correspondents on "Marriage and Freethinkers" and "Friendship and Freethinkers" appear to have written themselves out. We do not see that they got much "forrarder" after the first fair start. Perhaps we may print a few words of our own on the correspondence shortly.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED, office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

THE National Secular Society's office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LECTURE NOTICES must reach 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon street, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted. FRIENDS who send us newspapers would enhance the favor by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.

PERSONS remitting for literature by stamps are specially requested to send *halfpenny stamps*.

THE *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS: Thirty words, 1s. 6d.; every succeeding ten words, 6d. *Displayed Advertisements*:—One inch, 4s. 6d.; half column, £1 2s. 6d.; column, £2 5s. Special terms for repetitions.

Personal and Otherwise.

MY visit to South Shields took up three days of my time—which is a very big slice out of a week. The consequence is that I have less than the usual amount of time to devote to this number of the *Freethinker*, and should hardly have pulled through at all if Mr. Cohen had not kindly helped me a bit with "Acid Drops."

My statement respecting the litigation I alluded to last week must stand over for next week's *Freethinker*. Indirectly the case is of importance to the Freethought movement, and what I have to say should be said carefully. Meanwhile I may announce that the action was decided in my favor.

As soon as this week's *Freethinker* is off my hands I shall see my new Torrey pamphlet through the press. It will be distributed with the Paine and Ingersoll pamphlet, at the meetings of the Torrey-Alexander Mission at Brixton. This mission is to last two months, and I hope to make the most of it, if Freethinkers will only support my efforts by providing me (as they easily can) with ample sinews of war. Brixton is expected to furnish the revivalists with more working-class audiences, and in view of that expectation we ought to deluge the meetings with our pamphlets.

Of course the pamphlets will not be distributed *only* at the Brixton meetings. Applications still pour in for them from all parts of the country, and are being attended to as liberally as possible. And it is certain that the free distribution of so many myriads of copies is producing a considerable effect.

It will be remembered that I printed last week a copy of the letter I sent Dr. Torrey by registered post, correcting his pretence that my Paine and Ingersoll pamphlet was anonymous. In spite of my letter he still sticks to that ridiculous pretence, as the following answer will testify:—

66 Sinclair-road, London, W.,
March 28, 1905.

Mr. G. W. Foote,
2 Newcastle-street,
Farringdon-street, E.C.

DEAR SIR,—

Yours of March 27 received. You say, "I understand that you are professing ignorance as to who is the author of the pamphlet on 'Dr. Torrey and the Infidels.'" In reply would say, I am not professing any ignorance of the kind. I have referred to the pamphlet as "anonymous," and so it is. After the pamphlet was handed me I looked at the front to see if the name of the author

was given, and it was not. Then I looked at the end, and the name was not given there. Thereupon I treated it with the same silent contempt that I do all anonymous pamphlets and letters. I had not noticed the little note at the bottom. I am not in the habit of reading advertisements at the end of anonymous pamphlets; but even since you have called my attention to this advertisement of your paper, this does not alter the essential fact at all. The name of the author is not given in this advertisement. I think you are aware that it is not the usual custom of authors of pamphlets and books to declare their authorship in advertisements, and then not to declare it by name. I suppose a great majority of those to whom the pamphlet was given at the Albert Hall neither know nor care who the editor of the *Freethinker* is. I take it for granted that you know the meaning of the word "anonymous," and the pamphlet is anonymous.

Now as to the other matter in your letter, permit me to say that as soon as you or any one else will show me anything that I have said in any of my books, in any of my lectures as correctly reported, or in any authentic letter regarding Mr. Thomas Paine or Col. Ingersoll that is not strictly true, I shall be more than glad to retract it. But I am not likely to retract anything that I have not said, or to retract anything that I have said that is true. I am not willing to be held responsible for incorrect reports in papers of what I have said, nor any mere hearsay reports which are always inaccurate, nor am I willing to be held responsible for deliberate falsifications of my statements.

Sincerely yours,
R. A. TORREY.

I have sent Dr. Torrey the following reply:—

2 Newcastle-street, E.C.,
April 4, 1905.

DEAR SIR,—

Yours of March 28, apparently posted later, reached me safely, and I should have given it an earlier reply if I had not seen by the newspapers that several important personages, including the Queen and yourself, were taking a holiday on the continent.

You use a great many words to say very little. I infer rather than perceive from your letter that, in your opinion, a drama by the author of *Hamlet*, a poem by the author of *Paradise Lost*, or a novel by the author of *David Copperfield*, would be anonymous. Etymologically you may be right, but when such hair-splitting involves a pretence of ignorance, and an evasion of responsibility, it is more worthy of a prisoner in the dock than of a public teacher of religion and morality. However, I will take care that this hole of escape shall be closed up. Further impressions of my pamphlet shall state, not only that it is written by the editor of the *Freethinker*, but that the name of the editor is G. W. Foote.

You say that the majority of your auditors who saw my pamphlet did not know who was the editor of the *Freethinker*. Do you really believe this?

The last part of your letter is the unworthiest of all. You must know what you have said about Paine and Ingersoll, and if you were a straightforward person you would either admit what you did say or deny what you did not say. Instead of doing this, you stand absolutely on the defensive, like a person indicted for a criminal offence.

You want to know what you have said about Paine or Ingersoll that is "not strictly true." I have told you in my pamphlet. I shall not waste time in telling you again. My object now is to place the pamphlet in as many hands as possible.

When you come to your senses, which will probably be when your own people are tired of your perpetual evasions; when you lead the procession to your own penitent form, and confess your "sin" and resolve to make atonement; I shall rejoice to know that the revivalist is revived, and that the soul of the soul-saver has found its "Resurrection."

Yours truly,
G. W. FOOTE.

Dr. R. A. Torrey,
66 Sinclair-road, W.

Evidently no good can be done with Dr. Torrey in his present mood. But it is something to make him speak at all on this subject. Let us go on circulating the exposure of his slanders on Paine and Ingersoll, and we may bring him to book in the end. This is the only way to deal with him. He must be put under relentless pressure.

G. W. FOOTE.

Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote had fine meetings in the handsome Royal Assembly Hall, South Shields, on Sunday, and his lectures were highly appreciated and much applauded. Mr. S. M. Peacock, who occupied the chair on both occasions, expressed gratification at the large attendance, which proved that the recent work of the Branch had not been in vain. He hoped the very successful effort on Sunday would lead to an accession of new members and an increase in the circulation of the *Freethinker*. He also hoped that the friends would recollect Mr. Cohen's fresh visit at the end of the month.

A good many ladies were present at the South Shields meetings, especially in the evening. "Saints" came from Newcastle, Jarrow, Sunderland, and other places; some by train, and some on bicycles. Mr. Foote was glad to shake hands once more with the veteran Mr. Middleton, of North Shields, his oldest friend in the district, and with the stalwart Mr. John Sanderson. The Chapman brothers were, of course, as busy as usual; and Mr. White, an old member, but a new treasurer, took a paternal and benevolent interest in the day's proceedings.

A lady who heard Mr. Foote's lectures at Coventry sends him a very interesting letter, which he would gladly have replied to if she had not omitted to send her address. The "addressed envelope" she refers to was not enclosed. Should this meet the lady's eye she will understand. Should it not do so, we must regret that the circumstances may make us appear discourteous.

The Bethnal Green Branch successfully opened its new Victoria Park campaign on Sunday afternoon, when Mr. Cohen lectured to a large audience. Mr. James Neate, the active honorary secretary, informs us that everybody was asking for the Torrey pamphlets, and that there was a good sale for *Bible Romances* and the *Age of Reason*.

Another course of Sunday evening lectures, under the auspices of the Secular Society, Limited, in association with the West Ham N. S. S. Branch, has been arranged for April 23 and 30 and May 7 in the Stratford Town Hall. The lecturers are (in chronological order) Mr. Cohen, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Foote. Local "saints" who can assist in advertising these lectures, by displaying bills or distributing printed announcements, are asked to communicate with Miss Vance, at 2 Newcastle-street, E.C.

Branches of the National Secular Society, and individual members, in all parts of the country should be making preparations for attendance or representation at the Annual Conference at Liverpool on Whit-Sunday. Secularists ought to do their utmost to make this gathering a brilliant success. They owe it to themselves, and their cause, to answer the challenge of the Churches. The present "revival" in religion is a bold and unscrupulous attempt to retrieve lost ground. Secularism should also be ready with its own effort in the opposite direction. And a big assembly at Liverpool will be a demonstration of such readiness.

The Liverpool Conference will take place, as far as the morning and afternoon business sessions are concerned, in the Alexandra Hall, Islington-square. The evening public meeting will be held in the great Picton Hall, which has been specially engaged for the occasion. The list of speakers includes Mr. G. W. Foote, Mr. C. Cohen, Mr. John Lloyd, and Mr. H. Percy Ward.

A letter by "X." in the *Newark Herald*, replying to a correspondent who complained of Nonconformist head-teachers being excluded from 20,000 State-supported Schools, points out that it is a greater injustice to "exclude a devout Jew or conscientious Freethinker from not only about 30,000 situations as head-teachers, but some hundreds of thousands of situations as assistant-teachers in practically all the nation's schools." We hope Freethinkers will continue to press facts like these upon the attention of Nonconformists.

The *Shields Daily Gazette* prints some correspondence on "The Revival." We note a good letter from "Sceptic."

The *Consett Chronicle* finds room for a correspondence on "Atheism and Christianity," including a bright letter from "A Girl Atheist," who corrects the orthodox notion that Atheists are "gloomy," and describes herself as "a particularly cheery disposition." We offer the "Girl Atheist" our compliments and congratulations.

The Book of Daniel.—VI.

(Continued from p. 220.)

ALL the simulated visions ascribed to the "prophet" Daniel, as well as the "image" stated to have been beheld by Nebuchadrezzar in a dream, are merely enigmatical allusions to certain events in the world's history (as understood by the writer) from the age in which Daniel is supposed to have lived to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The author of the prediction, having no foreknowledge of future events, could not, of course, carry the history further; besides, the time at which he lived was to him "the latter days."

We will now look at the vision attributed to Nebuchadrezzar (Dan. ii. 31-45). The latter king is described as beholding an image in the form of a man, the head being of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, the legs of iron, and the feet of iron and clay (earthenware). This image, while standing erect, was struck on the feet by a stone "cut out without hands," which then "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." According to the interpretation given by Daniel, the image symbolised four kingdoms or dynasties which exercised supreme authority in the world during four successive ages—to be followed by a fifth. These were:—

- (1) Babylonian dynasty.—"Thou, O king.....thou art the head of gold."
- (2) Persian dynasty.—"After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee."
- (3) Empire of Alexander the Great.—"And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth."
- (4) Syrian and Egyptian dynasties.—"And a fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.....And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, it shall be a divided kingdom."
- (5) New Jewish kingdom symbolised by the stone.—"In the days of *those kings* [i.e., Syrian and Egyptian monarchies] shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."

These "kingdoms," regarded from the writer's point of view, were the great empires which had exercised suzerainty over his nation; he was not concerned with any others. The monarchies were to appear and bear rule in succession, and each was to be the dominant one during its own period, as shown in the annexed table.

NEBUCHADREZZAR'S VISION.

Gold	Babylonian Monarchy	
Silver	Persian Empire	
Brass	Empire of Alexander the Great	
Iron and clay	Syrian Monarchy	Egyptian Monarchy
Omitted	Roman Empire	

The writer's predictions do not extend as far as the empire of the Romans, for the latter had exercised no authority in Palestine up to his day. His history ends with the "divided kingdom." All these "predictions," save the last, were matters of history known more or less accurately to the author of Daniel. The only event which had not happened, up to the writer's time, was the establishment of a new Jewish kingdom—called in the vision last examined a "kingdom of everlasting righteousness"—which should "stand for ever." In the days of the Syrian and Egyptian kings, he says, would "the God of heaven" assist his chosen people to free themselves from the sovereignty of the kings who had exercised suzerainty over them. The writer knew that the armies then fighting under Judas Maccabæus and his brothers had gained some remarkable successes over greatly superior Syrian forces, and consequently believed that his countrymen would not only achieve complete independence, but that the predictions respecting the future greatness of the Hebrew nation recorded in the prophetic writings were about to be fulfilled. It is scarcely necessary to say that the "stone" that struck the feet of the image was Judas

Maccabæus, who "broke in pieces" all the hostile armies sent against him. The revolt against the authority of Antiochus Epiphanes, commenced by Judas, spread rapidly, so that the stone in a short time became a mountain; but it did not "fill the whole earth." It was the "sovereignty" exercised by "another people" over his nation which the author of Daniel desired to see overthrown, and which he did in some measure see under the Maccabees. Being a pious, as well as a patriotic, Jew he believed that the following "prophecies" were on the eve of fulfilment:—

"Micah iv. 13: "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many peoples; and thou shalt devote their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the lord of the whole earth."

"Isaiah lx. 10-14: "And strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favor have I had mercy on thee.....That nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.....And the sons of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet."

The author of Daniel believed that these predictions were the inspired word of God, and that they would assuredly be fulfilled. He was mistaken upon both points.

Before leaving this vision it should, perhaps, be stated that Christian advocates interpret the fourth kingdom as signifying the Roman empire, and the stone as symbolising the Christian religion. In so doing, however, they ignore the "divided kingdom"—the Syrian and Egyptian dynasties that bore rule contemporaneously—and they place the Empire of the Romans as immediately following that of Alexander the Great.

I turn next to the vision in chapter vii. in which the same "kingdoms" are described in another form. In this vision the writer represents Daniel as seeing four "beasts" come up from the sea "diverse one from another," and from his description they certainly were. The first, we are told, "was like a lion and had eagle's wings"; the second was "like to a bear" with "three ribs" between its teeth; the third was "like a leopard" with four heads and "the four wings of a fowl"; the fourth beast was "terrible and dreadful," etc., but its appearance is not described. Daniel is then informed by "one of them that stood by" that "these great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom for ever and ever."

The word "kings" here should be monarchies or dynasties, as is explained farther on. We have no difficulty in identifying these "kingdoms." The lion with the eagle's wings represented the Babylonian monarchs; the bear with three ribs in his mouth stood for the kings of Persia who ruled three kingdoms; the leopard with four wings represented the empire of Alexander the Great, and its four heads, to whom, it is said, "dominion was given," prefigured Alexander's four generals who divided his empire between them. The fourth beast symbolised the "divided kingdom" of the Syrian and Egyptian kings to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and denoted the latter more particularly.

As might be expected, only the fourth beast had any interest for the writer. Of this animal he says:—

"It had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet.....And it had ten horns.....and behold there came up among them another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots.....and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until.....the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom" (vii. 7, 8, 21, 22).

Here we arrive at Antiochus Epiphanes, who was the "little horn" that had been preceded by ten

others. Further explanation of these eleven horns is given by the "one that stood by."

"The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth.....And as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise; and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the former, and he shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High; and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time" (vii. 23-25).

As already stated, the Syrian and Egyptian lines of kings are taken together as one kingdom—the "divided kingdom"—on account of their reigning contemporaneously. The other dynasties arose and ruled in succession. Moreover, we find from Dan. xi. (where the same monarchs figure again) that the writer believed these two lines of kings to have commenced, immediately after the death of Alexander the Great, with Antiochus Theos and Ptolemy Philadelphus; and according to this method of reckoning there reigned exactly ten kings before Antiochus Epiphanes. These were:—

SYRIA.	EGYPT.
Antiochus Theos	Ptolemy Philadelphus
Seleucus Callinicus	Ptolemy Euergetes
Seleucus Ceraunus	Ptolemy Philopater
Antiochus the Great	Ptolemy Epiphanes
Seleucus Philopater	Ptolemy Philometer
Antiochus Epiphanes	

Of the eleventh king the writer says: "And he shall put down three kings." The events here referred to are the following: (1) Upon the death of Seleucus Philopater, in B.C. 175, the throne of Syria belonged of right to his son Demetrius; but Antiochus (who was the brother of Seleucus) set aside the rightful heir, and took possession himself. (2) In B.C. 171 Antiochus made an expedition into Egypt, and deposed the reigning king, Ptolemy Philometer; (3) After Antiochus had left Egypt the Alexandrians placed on the throne Ptolemy Physcon (brother of Philometer); but in B.C. 169 Antiochus again invaded Egypt, deposed Physcon, and replaced Philometer on the throne.

The attempt of this eleventh king to "change the times and the Law" can be applied to no other than Antiochus Epiphanes. The "time and [two] times and half a time" during which "the saints of the Most High" were to be "given into his hand"—styled in another vision "half a week"—referred, of course, to the 3½ years persecution during which the sanctuary was desolate.

The author of Daniel is unable to keep out of the vision his belief that his nation would one day become the greatest kingdom upon earth. Thus he says:—

"I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed.....But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume it, and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Here is the end of the matter" (vii. 12, 26-28).

Here certainly was an end of the matter, as far as the writer's knowledge went; he could not go beyond the events of his own time. He does venture on one prediction—a Jewish kingdom of everlasting righteousness—but this hope was never realised. Furthermore, the new Hebrew kingdom predicted was not to be a spiritual one, as Christian commentators allege, but temporal. "Dominion" was to be taken away from the kings of the earth, and given to the Jews who called themselves "saints of the Most High." The "times and the Law," that is to say, the Jewish festivals, the temple sacrifices, and the Mosaic ceremonies, though interrupted for a short time, would be restored, and remain in full force; then all other nations should be converted to Judaism, and should serve the god Yahveh for ever. As already stated, the author of Daniel firmly believed that the prophecies found in the Hebrew

sacred writings would certainly be fulfilled, the only question being as to the time. This he thought was now at hand. The following is another sample of the predictions which misled him:—

Isaiah ii. 2-3: "And it shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

This grand prediction, notwithstanding all Christian interpretations and allegations to the contrary, had no reference to Christianity. The "many peoples" were to be taught the "ways" of the God of Jacob as recorded in "the Law," and they were to walk in the "paths" therein prescribed: in other words, they were to become converts to Judaism. Fortunately for civilisation, this egotistical prophecy belongs to the same category as the thrice repeated promise of the second coming of Christ—having been proved by events to be false, the fulfilment is postponed to futurity.

ARRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

The Scripture.

Is it not strange and very suggestive that the word "Bible" is not found from Genesis to Revelation in the book known by that name, except on the outer cover and the title page, which are no part of it. Why was a foreign, untranslated word adopted as a name for a book which claims to be the word of God? Does it not suggest the designing hand of the wily priesthood? If it had been named by some vulgar word, the meaning of which the populace could understand, it would inspire no awe and reverence, nor conjure up a ghost to sit on the cover. Call it a Bible, a word the masses do not understand, and at once it becomes a fetish and a charm, invested with awful sacredness, and fearful to touch with irreverent hands. There it is on the parlor table, with gold letters on the cover, reading "Holy Bible," and from every letter a ghost stares at you in a warning way.

The word Bible is from the Greek *biblion*, a little book, and *biblos*, a book, from *byblos*, the papyrus from which paper was made; see dictionary. Fancy calling the word of God a little book, or the book. That would never do for the priesthood. It would produce a convulsion in the universe, by opening the eyes of the people to see the foundation of the divine system that keeps the world from decay. The word used in the Bible itself is "scripture." "Scripture" is an untranslated Latin word meaning a writing. Fancy giving the words of God to the world under such a common word as "writings." The very ground would revolt against such vulgarity, and the masses would never be able to swallow the pill. Why was the word "Scripture," and many others for that matter, left in the Bible untranslated? Can anyone believe it was an oversight, or an accident? I cannot. It seems to me certain that the artful, designing hand of the cunning priest is in clear evidence. The Bible is mostly a priest-made book, and certain words have been left untranslated by priests, or others under their influence and direction, in order to hide the truth from the ignorant masses on whose labor and fidelity the priestly craft depended. The outside world has not yet realised the depths and extent of the foxy ingenuity hereditarily possessed and transmitted in the wide world of priesthood.

Let us see what does the book or writings claim for itself. Remember the word "Bible" means a book, and "scripture" means a writing. Never mind what the priests say; they are only fallible men, and they are interested, for the Bible is the capital of their craft. Pay no heed either to the advanced few in the Church who renounce the Bible as the Word of

God. Thus the Bible: "All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16): "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter i. 20, 21). These declarations are explicit enough. But who are the witnesses? Who is it that says the writings are inspired by God? The only one who knew, and whose testimony would be of any value, is God. But it is not God that makes the claim; it is interested fallible men. In no part of the Bible have we got a declaration made by God that the Bible was inspired by himself, and no one else could possibly know. We know that man, and especially priests, can simulate, deceive, and lie. If they told us that God told them that he inspired the writers of the writings, we should want to know where and when they met him, what language he spoke, and who were present as witnesses. Even priests could not expect the world to accept their testimony in such important matter without any proof whatever. The fact is, that nowhere in the Bible have we got a first-hand testimony that God inspired the writers. Supposing the Creation Story was true, it was known to God only. The writer of the story was not there to see, and he does not say that God told him, or how he got the information. As far as the old writings are concerned, there is no evidence whatever of any inspiration of the writers in any sense by God. In all the Old Testament it is man that speaks in the name of God without any claim to divine inspiration. In the New Testament writings we have only the opinions of the writers, and they testify to the old writings only. The writers who wrote in the name of Paul and Peter do not claim to be inspired, and if they did we could not receive it without ample proof. So here again we have only the bare opinion of fallible men. The whole claim of inspiration is outside the Bible, manufactured by priests and their allies, to support their lucrative craft.

From Genesis to Revelation there is absolutely nothing in the Bible that required inspiration to write it. The greater part of the Bible is so commonplace that no great man would like to be thought the author of it. Even the best parts of the Bible pale in merit by the side of the literature of Greece and Rome. The claims made for the Bible by priests and their allies are simply preposterous, and I fear mostly dishonest. Many of the priests and Christian apologists are intelligent men, and I cannot conceive how it is possible for them to read the Bible and think for a moment that such a book was inspired by God. If any intelligent, educated men honestly believe in inspiration, they are a warning example of the awful harmfulness of superstitious teaching on the human mind. Of the new apologists, with their legerdemain arguments, asserting that the Bible is and is not inspired, that it is not the Word of God, but that his inspiration is in it, I dare not write what my brain suggests. And of all the ambiguous conundrums who reject the Bible and all its doctrines, and yet defend it, the few scientific men are the most difficult to understand or describe.

In a book inspired by God you would expect to find new facts, new thoughts, new lessons, new discoveries, and so on, not to be met with anywhere else. But there is nothing new in the Bible. The legends and myths of Genesis and all the moral precepts had been taught and believed by other ancient nations long ages before the Jews ceased to be a wandering tribe. There is no need for God to inspire man to imagine, invent, and dream. All nations are skilled in that work, as fairy tales, folklore, and ghost stories testify. And most of what is thought to be inspiration in the Bible is nothing more or better than fancies, imaginations, and dreamings of the human mind.

A book inspired by God ought to be perfect, free from errors, mistakes, falsehoods, or disagreements. But the Bible is full of all of them. I doubt if there

is in all the world a book containing so many errors and faults as the Bible. I venture to suggest, if it is worth the trouble for anyone to tabulate all the errors, faults, falsehoods, disagreements, ignorance, mistakes, deficiencies and so on, in the Bible, he would find they are far more numerous than the number of what is correct and true in it. It is ridiculous to suppose that an all-wise God inspired a book of that sort. The Bible contains no knowledge, morally or physically, above the age in which the writers lived, and they required no God to move them to write what they knew and thought to be true. If the science and philosophy of Greece and Rome could be written without any god to inspire them, surely the much inferior Jewish literature could be produced in the same natural way.

A book inspired by God ought to be free from all immoralities, doubtful actions, bad examples, or vicious teaching. The Bible is replete with myths, legends, superstitions, and false teaching, written as if they were truths and facts. It contains savage and wicked precepts, not only in the Old, but in the New Testament also. The Old Testament especially abounds in bad examples, filthy, lewd, indecent, and abominable actions. All the low morality and crudities found amongst savages and semi-civilised races teem in its pages. It would be almost as rational to claim inspiration for the folk-lore and fairy tales of savages as to claim it for most parts of the Old Testament.

A book inspired by God ought surely to contain a true pen portrait of God and his character. But what do we find in the Bible? We find the most revolting and fearful caricature of God that the wit of man could devise. He is represented as an ignorant, clownish man; as an irritable, jealous, and vainglorious cad; as a cruel, bloodthirsty monster; as partial, changeable, and revengeful; and actually as an idol of wood or stone, carried about in a box. Is it likely an all-wise God would inspire men to libel himself as the Bible does? Such an idea is a libel on the intelligence of a savage, let alone an educated man.

Just think what great poets, great historians, great astronomers, great chemists, great inventors, great scientists, great linguists, and great writers and orators have done in Britain and other countries as well, without any claim to inspiration, and compared with which most of the Bible is only the babblings of a child. Our complaints are not against the Bible as an ancient book, but against the senseless claims made for it by priests and their allies who have a vested interest in ignorance and superstition. As an old book the Bible is interesting and instructive. It reflects the morals, ignorance, and superstition of the times when its parts were written. But forced on the people as the Word of God by an ever unscrupulous Church, it cannot be looked upon as anything but a nightmare and a curse on the human race.

R. J. DERFEL.

National Secular Society.

REPORT of Monthly Executive Meeting held on Thursday, March 30, 1905.

The President, Mr. G. W. Foote, in the chair. There were also present: Messrs. J. Barry, C. Cohen, H. Cowell, F. A. Davies, W. Leat, Dr. Nichols, F. Schaller, T. J. Thurlow, F. Wood, S. Samuels, H. Silverstien, and the Secretary.

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

New members were admitted for the Camberwell and Cardiff Branches and also to the parent society.

Grants were made to the Coventry, Kingsland, and Battersea Branches, and the President reported upon correspondence with the Birmingham Branch, and also upon legal proceedings with which he had recently been concerned.

Other business having been transacted, the meeting adjourned.

EDITH M. VANCE, *Secretary.*

N.B.—Secretaries are requested to send a reply to the Birmingham resolution without delay.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, etc.

Notices of Lectures, etc., must reach us by first post on Tuesday and be marked "Lecture Notice," if not sent on postcard.

LONDON.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (North Camberwell Hall, 61 New Church-road): 3.15, Religious Freethought Parliament: A. D. Howell Smith (B.A.), "Agnosticism and Christianity"; 7, Business Meeting *re* Open-air Propaganda.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Liberal Hall, Broadway, Forest Gate, E.): W. J. Ramsey, "Beyond the Grave—What?"

OUTDOOR.

BATTERSEA BRANCH N. S. S. (Battersea Park Gates): 11.30, a Lecture.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 3.15, Mr. Marshall.

COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Coffee House, Bull Ring): Thursday, April 13, at 8, H. Lennard, "Robert Burns: Poet and Peasant."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon and 6.30, C. Cohen.

GLASGOW RATIONALIST AND ETHICAL ASSOCIATION (319 Sauchiehall-street): 6.30 (corner of Wellington and Sauchiehall-streets), Ignatius McNulty, "Will Jesus Save Us?" Monday, April 10, at 8 p.m., at the rooms, Miss Irwin, "The Problem of Home-Work."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Lecture by a Representative of the London Anti-Vivisection Society.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): 3, H. Percy Ward, "Great Evolutionists.—I. Herbert Spencer"; 7, "The Cant of Christian Charity." The Annual Meeting will be held at the close of the evening lecture.

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Rusholme-road, Oxford-road, All Saints'): 6.30, R. Whitehead, "Is Socialism Scientific?"

SHEFFIELD SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall of Science, Rockingham-street): 7, George Berrisford, "Should the State Maintain Our Children?"

SOUTH SHIELDS (Captain Duncan's Navigation Schools, Market-place): 7.30, Business Meeting—important.

THE BEST BOOK

ON NEO-MALTHUSIANISM IS, I BELIEVE,
**TRUE MORALITY, or THE THEORY and PRACTICE
OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.**

By J. R. HOLMES, M.M.L., M.V.S., M.N.SS.

160 pages, with portrait and autograph, bound in cloth, gilt lettered.
Price 1s., post free.

In order to bring the information within the reach of the poor, the most important parts of the book are issued in a pamphlet of 112 pages at ONE PENNY, post free 2d. Copies of the pamphlet for distribution 1s. a dozen post free.

The *National Reformer* of September 4, 1892, says: "Mr. Holmes's pamphlet.....is an almost unexceptional statement of the Neo-Malthusianism theory and practice.....and throughout appeals to moral feeling.....The special value of Mr. Holmes's service to the Neo-Malthusian cause and to human well-being generally is just his combination in his pamphlet of a plain statement of the physical and moral need for family limitation, with a plain account of the means by which it can be secured, and an offer to all concerned of the requisites at the lowest possible prices."

The Council of the Malthusian League, Dr. Drysdale, Dr. Allbutt, and others, have also spoken of it in very high terms.

Orders should be sent to the author,

J. R. HOLMES, HANNEY, WANTAGE, BERKS.

Pamphlets by C. COHEN.

- An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics - 6d.
Foreign Missions: Their Dangers and Delusions. Full of Facts and Figures. A Complete Exposure of the Missionary Movement - 9d.
What is the Use of Prayer - 2d.
Evolution and Christianity - 2d.
Pain and Providence - 1d.

The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

LADIES' SUMMER DRESSES.**REMNANTS**

DIRECT FROM THE FACTORY.

We have arranged to clear a Manufacturer's Stock of Remnants in all kinds of Dress Goods. We offer same in parcels,

21s. each.

Each parcel will contain not less than

24 yards

OF DOUBLE WIDTH MATERIAL, 42 inches wide.
Sufficient to make four Ladies' Dresses.

You can have any color, and made up in suitable lengths for either Ladies' or Children's Dresses. State colors and lengths preferred, and you shall have THE BEST BARGAIN ON RECORD.

CASH WITH ORDER.

Send at once, before they are all gone.

J. W. GOTT, 2 and 4 Union Street, Bradford

THE BOOK OF GOD

IN THE LIGHT OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

By G. W. FOOTE.

"I have read with great pleasure your *Book of God*. You have shown with perfect clearness the absurdity of Dean Farrar's position. I congratulate you on your book. It will do great good, because it is filled with the best of sense expressed with force and beauty."—COLONEL INGERSOLL.

"A volume we strongly recommend.....Ought to be in the hands of every earnest and sincere inquirer."—*Reynolds's News-paper*.

Bound in Stout Paper Covers - - - 1/-
Bound in Good Cloth - - - 2/-

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

By THOMAS PAINE.

With a Political Biography by the late J. M. WHEELER
Paper Cover, 1s. Cloth Edition, 2s.
Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-st., London E.C

Design Argument Fallacies. A Refutation of the argument that Nature exhibits marks of having been designed by an Intelligent Being. By the Editor of the *New York Truthseeker*. Price 8d., postage 1d.

Answers to Christian Questions and Arguments. By D. M. Bennett. Price 1s., postage 2d.

Sabbath Breaking. Giving the Origin of Sabbath Ideas. A book brimful of good reasons why the Sunday Laws should be repealed. By John Remsburg. Price 1s., Postage 2d.

Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-st., London, E.C.

FREETHINKER, Young Man, aged 29, single, wishes Situation as Porter (hotel or otherwise), Messenger, Warehouseman, or any position where honesty, sobriety, and willingness is desired. Good references; well known to members of N. S. S.—J. S., c/o *Freethinker* Office.

VOLTAIRE'S ROMANCES

"Voltaire was the greatest man of his country, and did more to free the human race than any other of the sons of men."

CHINESE CATECHISM. Dialogues between a disciple of Confucius and a Chinese Prince, before the Christian era. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

IGNORANT PHILOSOPHER, The. Containing portraits of René Descartes and Benedict Spinoza.—As entertaining as a French Comedy. Paper covers 1s., postage, 2d.

LETTERS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. With comments on the writings of the most eminent authors who have been accused of attacking Christianity. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

MICROMEGAS. A Voyage to Planet Saturn. By a native of Sirius; and Twelve others. Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

MAN OF FORTY CROWNS. Dialogues on National Poverty; Adventures with a Carmelite, etc. Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

THE SAGE AND THE ATHEIST. The Princess of Babylon. Adventures of a Young Englishman, etc. Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

ZADIG: or, Fate. The White Bull; The Blind of One Eye, etc. Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.

When ordering, a second choice should be given, to prevent disappointment

THE SECULAR SOCIETY, (LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office—2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Chairman of Board of Directors—MR. G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary—E. M. VANCE (MISS).

This Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this world is the proper end of all thought and action. To promote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Education. To promote the complete secularisation of the State, etc., etc. And to do all such lawful things as are conducive to such objects. Also to have, hold, receive, and retain any sums of money paid, given, devised, or bequeathed by any person, and to employ the same for any of the purposes of the Society.

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up and the assets were insufficient to cover liabilities—a most unlikely contingency.

Members pay an entrance fee of ten shillings, and a subsequent yearly subscription of five shillings.

The Society has a considerable number of members, but a much larger number is desirable, and it is hoped that some will be gained amongst those who read this announcement. All who join it participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest, or in any way whatever.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, consisting of not less than five and not more than twelve members, one-third of whom retire (by ballot) each year,

but are capable of re-election. An Annual General Meeting of members must be held in London, to receive the Report, elect new Directors, and transact any other business that may arise.

Being a duly registered body, the Secular Society, Limited, can receive donations and bequests with absolute security. Those who are in a position to do so are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favor in their wills. On this point there need not be the slightest apprehension. It is quite impossible to set aside such bequests. The executors have no option but to pay them over in the ordinary course of administration. No objection of any kind has been raised in connection with any of the wills by which the Society has already been benefited.

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Battcock, 23 Road-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

A Form of Bequest.—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—"I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £— free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy."

Friends of the Society who have remembered it in their wills, or who intend to do so, should formally notify the Secretary of the fact, or send a private intimation to the Chairman, who will (if desired) treat it as strictly confidential. This is not necessary, but it is advisable, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid, and their contents have to be established by competent testimony.

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT By G. W. FOOTE.

First Series, cloth 2s. 6d.
Second Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

Contains scores of entertaining and informing Essays and Articles on a great variety of Freethought topics.

The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., London.

Introduction to the History of Civilisation in England By H. T. BUCKLE.

New and Revised Edition with Annotations and an Introduction by JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

Demy 8vo, bound art linen, price Five Shillings.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.
2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

WANTED, Situation, by Young Man, aged 29, in any capacity; used to warehouse; total abstainer; good references from members N.S.S. and other employers.—X., c/o Secretary, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

Thwaites' Liver Pills.

The Best Family Medicine in the World.

Will cure Liver, Kidney, and all Stomach Diseases effectually.
Good for Heart Troubles and Cardiac Complaints, Female Ailments, Anæmia.

1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per Box.

Post free 14 or 33 stamps. Directions with each box.

G. THWAITES, Herbalist,

2, Church Row, Stockton-on-Tees, and
24, Linthorpe Road, Middlesbrough.

THWAITES' LIVER PILLS are not Sugar-coated or got up to deceive, nor factory made, but are made from Herbs by a Herbalist of nearly 40 years' experience in curing disease with Herbs and preparations from them.

Uncle Tom's Cabin Up to Date; or, Chinese Slavery in South Africa.

By E. B. ROSE.

One Penny. Post free, Three-halfpence.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

A BARGAIN

DIALOGUES CONCERNING NATURAL RELIGION

BY

DAVID HUME

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY G. W. FOOTE

The Most Exquisite Work of the Greatest Thinker of the Eighteenth Century: a Literary and Philosophical Masterpiece; and the First Defence of Agnosticism.

Handsomely Printed on Fine Paper, 105 Pages

Price **FOURPENCE**

(Post free, 5d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

NOW READY

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

"BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE

With a Portrait of the Author

Reynolds's Newspaper says:—"Mr. G. W. Foote, chairman of the Secular Society, is well known as a man of exceptional ability. His *Bible Romances* have had a large sale in the original edition. A popular, revised, and enlarged edition, at the price of 6d., has now been published by the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, for the Secular Society. Thus, within the reach of almost everyone, the ripest thought of the leaders of modern opinion are being placed from day to day."

144 Large Double-Column Pages, Good Print, Good Paper

SIXPENCE—NET

(Post Free, 8d)

ISSUED BY THE SECULAR SOCIETY (LIMITED)

Published by

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

A MIRACLE OF CHEAPNESS

"MISTAKES OF MOSES"

BY

COLONEL R. G. INGERSOLL

(THE LECTURE EDITION)

Thirty-two pages, good print, good paper

ONLY A PENNY

Twelve copies post free for tenpence for gratuitous distribution

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

FOR

FREETHINKERS AND INQUIRING CHRISTIANS

EDITED BY

G. W. FOOTE AND W. P. BALL

A New Edition, Revised, and Handsomely Printed

CONTENTS:

Part I.—Bible Contradictions. Part II.—Bible Absurdities. Part III.—Bible Atrocities.
Part IV.—Bible Immoralities, Indecencies, Obscenities, Broken Promises, and Unfulfilled Prophecies.

Cheap Edition, in paper covers, 1s. 6d.; Best Edition, bound in cloth, 2s. 6d.

"This is a volume which we strongly commend to all interested in the study of the Judaic-Christian Scriptures. It is edited by G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball, and Published by the Freethought Publishing Company, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C., price 1s. 6d. Indeed, we cannot conceive any Christian as having a faith worth regarding unless he has studied this remarkable volume. Teachers in Sunday and elementary schools will find it of special value as an aid to the exposition of the Christian religion from a thoughtful and critical standpoint. It is a perfect army of facts and comparisons. Since 1888 it has been the standard volume of the subject with which it deals, and its popularity is emphasised by the fact that the public have demanded a new edition."—*Reynolds's Newspaper*.